## APPENDIX G

 HydrogeologyTABLE 1 - MONTHLY WATER BALANCE

## Monthly Water Balance Analysis <br> Upper Little River EA

| Land Description Factors | Sub-Area 1 | Sub-Area 2 | Sub-Area 3 | Sub-Area 4 | Sub-Area 5 | Sub-Area 6 | Sub-Area 7 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Topography | 0.21 | 0.26 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.28 |
| Soils | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.15 |
| Cover | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Sum (Infiltration Factor) | 0.36 | 0.46 | 0.42 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.23 |
| Soil Moisture Capacity (mm) | 75 | 100 | 150 | 200 | 200 | 350 | 400 |
| Area (ha) | 560.9 | 704.4 | 2351.1 | 681.5 | 44.2 | 80.1 | 37.3 |
| Percentage of Total Site Area | $12.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Total Site Area (ha) | 4459.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sub-Area 1 Urban Lawn, Clay, Flat to Rolling
Sub-Area 1 Urban Lawn, Clay, Flat to Rolling 2 Uoll
Sub-Area 2 Urban Lawn, Clay Loam, Flat to Rolling
Sub-Area 3 Moderately Rooted Crops, Clay, Flat to Rolling
Sub-Area 4 Moderately Rooted Crops, Clay Loam, Flat to Rolling Sub-Area 5 Moderately Rooted Crops, Loam, Rolling
Sub-Area 6 Mature Forest, Clay, Flat to Rolling
Sub-Area $\mathbf{7}$ Mature Forest, Clay Loam, Flat to Rolling

|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Climate Data (Data from Windsor A Station via Environment Canada Website - Climate Normals from 1981-2010) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Daily Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -3.8 | -2.6 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 15 | 20.5 | 23 | 22 | 17.9 | 11.3 | 5.1 | -1.2 |  |
| Precipitation (mm) | 62.1 | 62.2 | 70 | 83 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 89.2 | 72.6 | 93.9 | 72.6 | 79.6 | 74.1 | 934.7 |
| Evapotranspiration Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saturation Vapour Pressure (mb) | 4.61 | 5.04 | 7.21 | 11.42 | 17.09 | 24.18 | 28.18 | 26.52 | 20.56 | 13.41 | 8.79 | 5.60 | 643.6 |
| PET (Malstrom, 1969) (mm/month) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 29.50 | 46.71 | 69.90 | 98.90 | 115.25 | 108.45 | 84.09 | 54.86 | 35.96 | 0.00 |  |
| Precipitation - PET (mm) | 62.10 | 62.20 | 40.50 | 36.29 | 19.40 | -12.80 | -26.05 | -35.85 | 9.81 | 17.74 | 43.64 | 74.10 |  |
| Weighted Soil Storage Capacity (mm) | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 |  |
| Actual Soil Moisture (mm) | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 146.49 | 133.69 | 107.64 | 71.79 | 81.60 | 99.34 | 142.98 | 146.49 |  |
| Change in Soil Moisture (mm) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -12.80 | -26.05 | -35.85 | 9.81 | 17.74 | 43.64 | 3.52 |  |
| Actual Evapotranspiration (mm) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 29.50 | 46.71 | 69.90 | 98.90 | 115.25 | 108.45 | 84.09 | 54.86 | 35.96 | 0.00 | 643.6 |
| Recharge/Runoff Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surplus | 62.1 | 62.2 | 40.5 | 36.3 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 70.6 | 291.1 |
| Deficit | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Weighted Infiltration Factor | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 | 0.439 |  |
| Runoff (mm) | 34.85 | 34.90 | 22.72 | 20.37 | 10.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.61 | 163.3 |
| Recharge (mm) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 103.30 | 15.93 | 8.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 127.7 |


| Volume-Based Balance ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Precipitation | 2,769,374 | 2,773,834 | 3,121,678 | 3,701,418 | 3,982,369 | 3,839,664 | 3,977,910 | 3,237,626 | 4,187,508 | 3,237,626 | 3,549,794 | 3,304,519 | 41,683,320 |
| Evapotranspiration | 0 | 0 | 1,315,762 | 2,082,841 | 3,117,042 | 4,410,667 | 5,139,563 | 4,836,276 | 3,750,119 | 2,446,628 | 1,603,730 | 0 | 28,702,630 |
| Runoff Groundwater Recharge | 1,554,027 | 1,556,529 | $1,013,385$ 4,606544 | 908,260 710317 | 485,576 3797 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,766,302 | 7,284,078 |
| Groundwater Recharge | 0 | 0 | 4,606,544 | 710,317 | 379,751 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,696,612 |

# TABLE 2 - MONTHLY WATER BALANCE 

## Windsor Annexed Area

## Monthly Water Balance Analysis <br> Upper Little River EA

| Land Description Factors for Pervious Areas | Sub-Area A | Sub-Area B | Sub-Area C | Sub-Area D | Sub-Area E | Sub-Area F | Sub-Area G | Sub-Area $\mathbf{H}$ | Sub-Area I | Sub-Area J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Topography | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |
| Soils | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.15 |  |
| Cover | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.05 |  |
| Sum (Infilitration Factor) | 0.42 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 0.42 | 0.47 | 0.52 | 0.57 | 0.62 | 0.42 | 0.47 |  |
| Soil Moisture Capacity (mm) | 150 | 100 | 125 | 150 | 100 | 200 | 250 | 250 | 150 | 100 |  |
| Percent Impervious (Assumed) | 90\% | 90\% | 90\% | 80\% | 80\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 50\% | 50\% |  |
| Area (ha) | 261.8 | 46.7 | 2.0 | 1006.1 | 510.5 | 637.9 | 203.8 | 1.5 | 1086.3 | 702.8 | 4459.5 |
| Impervious Area (ha) | 236 | 42 | 2 | 805 | 408 | 32 | 10 | 0 | 543 | 351 | 2429.5 |
| Pervious Area (ha) | 26 | 5 | 0 | 201 | 102 | 606 | 194 | 1 | 543 | 351 | 2030.1 |
| Percentage of Total Pervious Area) | 1.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 9.9\% | 5.0\% | 29.9\% | 9.5\% | 0.1\% | 26.8\% | 17.3\% | 100\% |
| Total Pervious Area (ha) | 2030.1 | 46\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Impervious Area (ha) Total Site Area (ha) | 2429.5 4459.5 | 54\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Land Cover Descriptions
Sub-Area A Commerical with Urban Lawn, Clay, Rolling to Hilly
Sub-Area B
Sub-Area B Commercial with Urban Lawn, Clay Loam/Clay Sand, Rolling to Hily
Law, Rolling to Hilly
ub-Area D Mixed Use (Urban Lawn), Clay, Rolling to Hilly
位-Area E Mixed Use (Urban Lawn), Clay Loam/Clay Sand, Rolling to Hilly
Sub-Area F Natural Environment (Pasture and Shrubs), Clay, Rolling to Hilly
Sub-Area $\mathbf{G}$ Natural Environment (Pasture and Shrubs), Clay Loam/Clay Sand, Rolling to Hilly Sub-Area H Natural Environment (Pasture and Shrubs), Loam, Rolling to Hilly Sub-Area J Residential with Urban Lawn, Clay Loom/Clay Sand, Rolling to Hilly

|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Climate Data (Data from Waterloo Wellington Airport Station via Environment Canada Website - Climate Normals from 1981-2010) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Daily Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -3.8 | -2.6 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 15 | 20.5 | 23 | 22 | 17.9 | 11.3 | 5.1 | -1.2 |  |
| Precipitation (mm) | 62.1 | 62.2 | 70 | 83 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 89.2 | 72.6 | 93.9 | 72.6 | 79.6 | 74.1 | 934.7 |
| Evapotranspiration Analysis - Pervious Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saturation Vapour Pressure (mb) | 4.6 | 5.0 | 7.2 | 11.4 | 17.1 | 24.2 | 28.2 | 26.5 | 20.6 | 13.4 | 8.8 | 5.6 |  |
| PET (Malstrom, 1969) (mm/month) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 46.7 | 69.9 | 98.9 | 115.2 | 108.4 | 84.1 | 54.9 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 643.6 |
| Precipitation - PET (mm) | 62.1 | 62.2 | 40.5 | 36.3 | 19.4 | -12.8 | -26.0 | -35.8 | 9.8 | 17.7 | 43.6 | 74.1 |  |
| Weighted Soil Storage Capacity (mm) | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 |  |
| Actual Soil Moisture (mm) | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 163.2 | 150.4 | 124.4 | 88.5 | 98.4 | 116.1 | 159.7 | 163.2 |  |
| Change in Soil Moisture (mm) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -12.8 | -26.0 | -35.8 | 9.8 | 17.7 | 43.6 | 3.5 |  |
| Actual Evapotranspiration (mm) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 46.7 | 69.9 | 98.9 | 115.2 | 108.4 | 84.1 | 54.9 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 643.6 |
| Recharge/Runoff Analysis - Pervious Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surplus | 62.1 | 62.2 | 40.5 | 36.3 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 70.6 | 291.1 |
| Deficit | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Weighted Infiltration Factor | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |
| Runoff (mm) | 32.6 | 32.6 | 21.2 | 19.0 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.0 | 152.6 |
| Recharge (mm) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 111.9 | 17.3 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 138.4 |



## MOE WELL RECORDS

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Township } & \text { Easting } & \text { Northing }\end{array} \begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { Buitt }\end{aligned}$
$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\text { Casing } & \text { Water } & \text { Static Pump Test } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Pump } \\ \text { Diameter } \\ \text { Found }\end{array} & \text { WL } & \text { WL } & \text { Rest } & \text { Well } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Well } \\ \text { Rate }\end{array} \\ \text { Time } & \text { Depth } & \text { Elevation } & \text { Static } \\ \text { Found } & \text { WL }\end{array}$
Pump


$\begin{array}{lllll}21-02795 & 9 & 19 & \text { Sandwich South } & \text { Sandwich South } 3423\end{array}$



## MOE WELL RECORDS

 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { ownship } & \text { Easting } & \text { Northing }\end{array} \begin{gathered}\text { Year } \\ \text { Buitt }\end{gathered}$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}\text { Year Casing } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Water } \\ \text { Built }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Static } \\ \text { Diameter } \\ \text { Found }\end{array} & \text { WL } & \text { WL Test } \\ \text { WL }\end{array} \begin{gathered}\text { Pump } \\ \text { Rate }\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}\text { Test } \\ \text { Time }\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}\text { Well } \\ \text { Depth }\end{gathered} \quad \begin{gathered}\text { Well } \\ \text { Elevation }\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}\text { Water } \\ \text { Found } \\ \text { Elevation }\end{gathered}$

## Static WL
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MOE WELL RECORDS
Well ID Conc.
Lot

| OE WEL | ECORD Conc. | Lot | Township | Easting | Northing | Year Built | Casing Diameter (inches) | Water <br> Found <br> (feet) | Static <br> WL <br> (feet) | Pump Test WL (feet) | Pump Rate (IGPM) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Test } \\ & \text { Time } \\ & \text { (hrs) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Well } \\ & \text { Depth } \\ & \text { (feet) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Well } \\ \text { Elevation } \\ \text { (ft. AMSL) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water } \\ & \text { Found } \\ & \text { Elevation } \\ & \text { (ft. AMSL) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pump Rate  m3/d | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pump } \\ & \text { Rate } \\ & \text { L/min } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Well } \\ \text { Depth } \\ (\mathrm{m} \text { BGS) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Wells } \\ \text { Depth } \\ \text { (m BGS) } \end{gathered}$ | Sreen <br> Length <br> (m BGS) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Well } \\ \text { Elevation } \\ \text { (m AMSL) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Water } \\ \text { Found } \\ \text { Elevation } \\ \text { (m AMSL) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Static } \\ \text { WL } \\ \text { Elevation } \\ \text { (m AMSL) } \end{gathered}$ | Test Water Elevation (m AMSL) | Water Level Drawdown <br> Drawo (m) | Height of Water (m) | Height of Water (m) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Spee } \\ \text { Capa } \\ \mathrm{m} 3 / d \mathrm{~m} \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21-04574 | 10 | 10 | Sandwich South | 343200 | 4676140 | 1979 | 4 | 111 | 32 | 35 | 10 | 3.0 | 111 | 620 | 509 | 588 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 33.8 |  |  | 189.0 | 155.1 | 179.2 | 168.6 | 0.9 | 24.1 | 23.2 | 71.6 | 49.7 |
| 21-04580 | 11 | 16 | Sandwich South | 343600 | 4680040 | 1979 | 4 | 100 | 14 | 20 | 4 | 3.0 | 103 | 603 | 503 | 589 | 26.2 | 18.2 |  | 31.4 |  |  | 183.8 | $\stackrel{153.3}{1545}$ | 179.5 | 173.4 | 1.8 | ${ }_{2}^{27.1}$ | ${ }_{23}^{25.3}$ | 14.3 | 9.9 |
| 21-04599 |  | 296 | Sandwich South | 342880 | 4675460 | 1980 | 4 | 113 | 34 | 36 | 15 | 3.0 | 113 | 620 | 507 | 586 | 98.2 | 68.2 |  | 34.4 |  |  | 189.0 | ${ }^{154.5}$ | 178.6 | 167.6 | 0.6 | 24.1 | ${ }^{23.5}$ | 161.1 | 111.9 |
| 21-04600 |  | 295 | Sandwich South | 342960 | 4675000 | 1980 | 4 | 109 | 32 | 45 | 12 | 3.0 | 109 | 625 | 516 | 593 | 78.6 | 54.6 |  | 33.2 |  |  | 190.5 | 157.3 | 180.7 | 167.0 | 4.0 | 23.5 | 19.5 | 19.8 | 13.8 |
| 21-04606 |  | 297 | Sandwich South | 341640 | 4675500 | 1981 | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 10 |  | 100 | 625 | 525 | 589 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 30.5 |  |  | 190.5 | 160.0 | 179.5 | 149.0 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 2.3 |
| 21-04618 |  | 300 | Sandwich South | 339680 | 4676160 | 1980 | 4 | 99 | 38 | 38 | 8 | 2.0 | 100 | 620 | 521 | 582 | 52.4 | 36.4 |  | 30.5 |  |  | 189.0 | 158.8 | 177.4 | 165.8 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 18.9 |  |  |
| 21-04619 |  | 301 | Sandwich South | 339360 | 4678288 | 1980 | 4 | 106 | 40 | 40 | 8 | 2.0 | 106 | 625 | 559 | 558 | ${ }_{5}^{52.4}$ | 36.4 |  | 32.3 |  |  | 190.5 | 158.2 | 178.3 | 166.1 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 20.1 | ${ }^{20.1}$ |  |  |
| 21-04643 | 10 | 16 | Sandwich South | 343540 | 4680260 | 1980 | 4 | 100 | 14 | 40 | 10 | 4.0 | 103 | 600 | 500 | 586 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 31.4 |  |  | 182.9 | 152.4 | 178.6 | 166.4 | 7.9 | 27.1 | 19.2 | 8.3 | 5.7 |
| 21-04644 | 12 | 10 | Sandwich South | 344500 34480 | 4678120 | 1960 | 4 | 94 |  |  |  |  | 95 | ${ }_{6}^{620}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 29.0 |  |  | 189.0 | 160.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-04645 | 12 | 10 | Sandwich South | 344480 | 4676120 | 1980 | 4 | 90 | 15 | 36 | 10 | 4.0 | 90 | 620 | 530 | 605 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 27.4 |  |  | 189.0 | 161.5 | 184.4 | 173.4 | 6.4 | 22.9 | 16.5 | 10.2 | 7.1 |
| 21-04662 |  | 302 | Sandwich South | 338700 | 4676960 | 1981 | 4 | 129 | 40 | 60 | 10 | 2.0 | 129 | 620 | 491 | 580 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 39.3 |  |  | 189.0 | 149.7 | 176.8 | 158.5 | 6.1 | 27.1 | 21.0 | 10.7 | 7.5 |
| 21-04664 | 10 | 11 | Sandwich South | 342060 | 4677380 | 1961 | 4 | 127 | 29 | 38 | 15 | 10.0 | 127 | 620 | 493 | 591 | 98.2 | 68.2 |  | 38.7 |  |  | 189.0 | 150.3 | 180.1 | 168.6 | 2.7 | 29.9 | 27.1 | 35.8 | 24.9 |
| 21-04711 |  | 296 | Sandwich South | 343000 | 4675320 | 1982 | 4 | 114 | 33 | 38 | 20 | 24.0 | 114 | 625 | 511 | 592 | 130.9 | 90.9 |  | 34.7 |  |  | 190.5 | 155.8 | 180.4 | 168.9 | 1.5 | 24.7 | 23.2 | 85.9 | 59.7 |
| 21-04728 |  | 303 | Sandwich South | 337920 | 4676600 | 1982 | 4 | 125 | 38 | 50 | 10 | 2.0 | 125 | 615 | 490 | 577 | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 38.1 |  |  | 187.5 | 149.4 | 175.9 | 160.6 | 3.7 | 26.5 | 22.9 | 17.9 | 12.4 |
| 21-04740 | 9 | 12 | Sandwich South | 341920 | 4677360 | 1983 | 4 | 133 | 29 | 34 | 20 | 10.0 | 133 | 620 | 487 | 591 | 130.9 | 90.9 |  | 40.5 |  |  | 189.0 | 148.4 | 180.1 | 169.8 | 1.5 | 31.7 | 30.2 | 85.9 | 59.7 |
| 21-04762 | 8 | 11 | Sandwich South | 340300 | 4677200 | 1963 | 4 | 86 | 24 | 29 | 5 | 24.0 | 96 | 620 | 534 | 596 | 32.7 | 22.7 | 24.0 | 29.3 |  |  | 189.0 | 162.8 | 181.7 | 172.8 | 1.5 | 21.9 | 20.4 | 21.5 | 14.9 |
| 21-04763 | 11 | 12 | Sandwich South | 344480 | 4677300 | 1983 | 4 | 78 | 24 | 31 | 7 | 0.4 | 91 | 610 | 532 | 586 | 45.8 | 31.8 |  | 27.7 |  |  | 185.9 | 162.2 | 178.6 | 169.2 | 2.1 | 20.4 | 18.3 | 21.5 | 14.9 |
| 21-04769 |  | 296 | Sandwich South | 343380 | 4675260 | 1984 | 5 | 115 | 32 | 80 | 15 | 1.0 | 115 | 620 | 505 | 588 | 98.2 | 68.2 |  | 35.1 |  |  | 189.0 | 153.9 | 179.2 | 154.8 | 14.6 | 25.3 | 10.7 | 6.7 | 4.7 |
| 21-04795 |  | 302 | Sandwich South | 337620 337920 | 4675620 | 1984 | 4 | 115 | 37 35 | ${ }_{15}^{45}$ | 12 | 8.0 | 115 | ${ }_{6} 620$ | 505 | 583 <br> 585 | $\begin{array}{r}78.6 \\ \hline 8.6 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 54.6 |  | 35.1 |  |  | 189.0 | 153.9 | 177.7 1783 | 164.0 | 2.4 | ${ }_{3}^{23.8}$ | 21.3 | 32.2 | 22.4 |
| ${ }^{211-04829}$ |  | ${ }_{3}^{303}$ | Sandwich South | 337920 | 4676500 | 1985 | 5 | 138 | ${ }_{31}^{35}$ | $\begin{array}{r}132 \\ \hline 60\end{array}$ |  | 2.0 | 138 | 620 | 482 | 585 589 | 26.2 | 18.2 1364 1 |  | ${ }_{38.1}$ |  |  | 189.0 | 146.9 | 178.3 | 138.1 | $\stackrel{29.6}{8.8}$ | 31.4 287 | 1.8 | 0.9 |  |
| 21-04907 | 9 | ${ }_{14}^{297}$ | Sandwich South Sandwich South | 342705 340825 | 4676210 | 1986 1986 | 4 | 125 132 | 31 15 15 | 60 25 | 30 3 | 18.0 48.0 | 125 132 | 620 620 | 495 | 589 605 | 196.4 19.6 | 136.4 13.6 |  | 38.1 40.2 |  |  | 189.0 189.0 | 150.9 148.7 | 179.5 184.4 | 161.2 <br> 176.8 | 8.8 3.0 | 28.7 35.7 | 19.8 32.6 | 22.2 6.4 | 15.4 4.5 |
| 21-04943 |  | 296 | Sandwich South | 342170 | 4675150 | 1987 | 4 | 103 | 32 | 38 | 12 | 3.0 | 110 | 630 | 527 | 598 | 78.6 | 54.6 |  | 33.5 |  |  | 192.0 | 160.6 | 182.3 | 170.7 | 1.8 | 23.8 | 21.9 | 43.0 | 29.8 |
| 21-04957 |  | 300 | Sandwich South | 338560 | 4675305 | 1987 | 5 | 122 | 41 | 45 | 40 | 3.0 | 122 | 620 | 498 | 579 | 261.8 | 181.8 |  | 37.2 |  |  | 189.0 | 151.8 | 176.5 | 162.8 | 1.2 | 24.7 | 23.5 | 214.8 |  |
| 21-04972 |  | 295 | Sandwich South | 343350 | 4675155 | 1987 | 5 | 118 | 36 | 41 | 50 | 2.0 | 118 | 630 | 512 | 594 | 327.3 | 227.3 |  | 36.0 |  |  | 192.0 | 156.1 | 181.1 | 168.6 | 1.5 | 25.0 | 23.5 | 214.8 | 149.1 |
| 21-04986 |  | 303 | Sandwich South | 336525 | 4676005 | 1987 | 4 | 122 | 32 | 70 | 3 |  | 122 | 620 | 498 | 588 | 19.6 | 13.6 |  | 37.2 |  |  | 189.0 | 151.8 | 179.2 | 157.9 | 11.6 | 27.4 | 15.8 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| 21-05291 | 7 | 17 | Sandwich South | 338875 | 4680864 | 1993 | 2 | 6 |  | 26 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4.6 |  |  |
| 21-05292 | 7 | 17 | Sandwich South | 338875 | 4680864 | 1993 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05293 | 7 | 17 | Sandwich South | 338875 | 4680864 | 1993 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05294 | 7 | 17 | Sandwich South | 338875 | 4688864 | 1993 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{21-05295}$ | 7 | 17 | Sandwich South | 338875 | 4688864 | 1993 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{21-05333}{21-05334}$ |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 336736 | 4688469 | ${ }^{1993}$ | 2 | 18 80 | 18 30 | $\stackrel{47}{86}$ |  | ${ }_{10}^{0.5}$ | 60 108 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.3 329 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{171}^{8.8}$ | ${ }_{2}^{12.8}$ | ${ }_{6}^{4.0}$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 | 4684469 | 1993 | 2 | 6 | O | 21 | 0 | 0.2 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.6 | 4.9 | 0.3 |  |  |
| 21-05344 |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 | 4684469 | 1993 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05400 | 7 | 5 | Sandwich South | 338004 | 4675178 | 1994 | 6 | 117 | 38 |  |  | 0.5 | 117 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 35.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.1 |  |  |  |
| 21-05405 | 10 | 10 | Sandwich South Windsor City | 342650 336736 | 446874746 | 1994 1996 | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 1111 \\ & \hline 150 \end{aligned}$ | 30 |  | 10 | 2.0 | 111 |  |  |  | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 33.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.7 |  |  |  |
| 21-05488 |  | 304 | Sandwich South | 336675 | 4676514 | 1997 | 8 | 153 | 37 | 150 | 0 | 1.0 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34.4 | 36.0 | 1.5 |  |  |
| 21-05535 |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 | 4684469 | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{21-05536}$ |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 336736 | 4688469 | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05589 | 10 | 11 | Sandwich South | 342691 | 4677320 | 2001 | 6 |  | 29 | 50 | 10 | 1.0 | 142 |  |  |  | 65.5 | 45.5 |  | 43.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.4 | 34.4 | 28.0 | 10.2 | 7.1 |
| 21-05605 |  |  | Windsor City | ${ }^{336736}$ | 4684469 | 2001 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05606 |  |  | Windsor City | 336736 | 4684469 | 2001 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-05626 | 7 | 7 | Sandwich South | ${ }_{3}^{338009}$ | 4675416 | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{21-05660}$ | 8 | 303 14 | Sandwich South Sandwich South | ${ }_{338507}^{33827}$ | ${ }_{466797887}^{4687}$ | 2002 |  | 130 | 52 |  |  | 1.0 | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.8 |  |  |  |
| 21-05689 |  | 303 | Sandwich South | 338720 | 4677636 | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-04669 | 7 |  | Sandwich South |  | 4680600 |  |  | 153 | 35 | 88 | 5 | 5.0 |  | 620 | 467 |  |  |  | 5.0 | 46.6 |  |  | 189.0 | 142.3 |  | 151.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Canadian Climate Normals 1981-2010 Station Data

Temperature and Precipitation Graph

Temperature and Precipitation Graph for 1981 to 2010 Canadian Climate Normals WINDSOR A


- Normals Data

The minimum number of years used to calculate these Normals is indicated by a code for each element. A "+" beside an extreme date indicates that this date is the first occurrence of the extreme value. Values and dates in bold indicate all-time extremes for the location.

Data used in the calculation of these Normals may be subject to further quality assurance checks. This may result in minor changes to some values presented here.


| $\checkmark$ Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year | Code |
| Daily Average ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -3.8 | -2.6 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 15.0 | 20.5 | 23.0 | 22.0 | 17.9 | 11.3 | 5.1 | -1.2 | 9.9 | A |
| Standard Deviation | 2.9 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 0.8 | A |
| Daily Maximum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -0.3 | 1.1 | 6.7 | 14.1 | 20.4 | 25.8 | 28.1 | 26.9 | 22.9 | 15.8 | 8.8 | 2.0 | 14.4 | A |
| Daily Minimum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -7.3 | -6.3 | -2.2 | 3.7 | 9.5 | 15.3 | 17.9 | 17.1 | 12.8 | 6.7 | 1.4 | -4.3 | 5.4 | A |
| Extreme Maximum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 17.8 | 20.4 | 26.6 | 31.1 | 34.0 | 40.2 | 38.3 | 37.7 | 37.2 | 32.2 | 26.1 | 19.6 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1950/25 | 2000/26 | 1986/30 | 1990/25 | 1988/31 | 1988/25 | 1941/27 | 1988/ 17 | 1953/ 02 | 1963/06 | 1950/ 01 | 1998/ 06 |  |  |
| Extreme Minimum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | -29.1 | -23.4 | -19.7 | -9.5 | -2.8 | 2.8 | 5.6 | 5.2 | -1.1 | -5.0 | -15.6 | -23.4 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1994/19 | 1982/06 | 2003/ 03 | 1982/07 | 1966/10 | 1945/05 | 1945/ 11 | 1982/ 29 | 1942/29 | 1965/29 | 1958/30 | 1983/30 |  |  |


| - Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year | Code |
| Rainfall (mm) | 32.4 | 35.6 | 50.9 | 77.7 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 89.2 | 72.6 | 93.9 | 72.0 | 74.5 | 48.3 | 822.4 | A |
| Snowfall (cm) | 37.2 | 30.5 | 20.9 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 5.5 | 28.8 | 129.3 | A |
| Precipitation (mm) | 62.1 | 62.2 | 70.0 | 83.0 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 89.2 | 72.6 | 93.9 | 72.6 | 79.6 | 74.1 | 934.6 | A |
| Average Snow Depth (cm) | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | A |
| Median Snow Depth (cm) | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | A |
| Snow Depth at Month-end (cm) | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | A |


| Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Year | Code |
| Extreme Daily Rainfall (mm) | 43.0 | 70.6 | 46.4 | 94.6 | 54.9 | 78.0 | 82.0 | 79.4 | 89.0 | 71.6 | 48.4 | 72.6 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1993/ 04 | 1990/22 | 2007/01 | 2000/20 | 1953/30 | 1968/25 | 1983/29 | 1994/13 | 1981/30 | 1949/11 | 2001/30 | 1967/21 |  |  |
| Extreme Daily Snowfall (cm) | 28.2 | 36.8 | 22.4 | 16.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 34.8 | 32.3 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1999/02 | 1965/25 | 1968/22 | 2005/23 | 1954/03 | 1941/01 | 1941/01 | 1940/01 | 1940/01 | 1989/19 | 1966/02 | 1974/01 |  |  |
| Extreme Daily Precipitation (mm) | 43.0 | 70.6 | 47.4 | 94.6 | 54.9 | 78.0 | 82.0 | 79.4 | 89.0 | 71.6 | 51.1 | 72.6 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1993/ 04 | 1990/ 22 | 2007/01 | 2000/20 | 1953/30 | 1968/25 | 1983/29 | 1994/13 | 1981/30 | 1949/11 | 1951/06 | 1967/21 |  |  |
| Extreme Snow Depth (cm) | 36 | 42 | 30 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 33 |  |  |
| Date (yyyy/dd) | 1999/12 | 1982/ 09 | 1960/04 | 1982/ 06 | 1955/ 01 | 1955/ 01 | 1955/01 | 1955/ 01 | 1955/01 | 1955/01 | 1966/03 | 2000/31 |  |  |


| $\rightarrow$ Days with Maximum Temperature |
| :--- |
| $\rightarrow$ Days with Minimum Temperature |
| $\rightarrow$ Days with Rainfall |
| $\rightarrow$ Days With Snowfall |
| $\rightarrow$ Days with Precipitation |
| $\rightarrow$ Days with Snow Depth |
| $\rightarrow$ Wind |
| $\rightarrow$ Degree Days |
| $\rightarrow$ Humidex |
| $\rightarrow$ Wind Chill |
| $\rightarrow$ Humidity |
| $\rightarrow$ Pressure |
| $\rightarrow$ Visibility (hours with) |
| $\rightarrow$ Frost-Free |
| Amount (hours with) |


|  | Legend |
| :---: | :---: |
| - A = WMO " 3 and 5 rule" (i.e. no more than 3 consecutive and no more than 5 total missing for either temperature or precipitation) | - C = At least 20 years <br> - $D=$ At least 15 years |

- Station / Element Metadata

Statistics listed below are provided as a guide to determine the validity of Normals and Extremes calculations. For example, a station with 30 years of record between 1981 and 2010 with no missing years would be a more reliable normal than a station with 15 years of record and 2 missing years. Less than $100 \%$ possible observations indicates that out of the total number of observations used, some records were missing.

WINDSOR A

| Province | ON | Latitude (dd mm) | 4216 N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | CAN | Longitude (ddd mm) | 8257 W |
| Time Zone | EST | Latitude (decimal degrees): | 42.28 N |
| Climate ID: | 6139525 | Longitude (decimal degrees): | 82.96 W |
| WMOID: | 71538 | Elevation (m): | 189.6 |
| TC ID: | YQG |  |  |


| - Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Begin Year | End Year | Total Number of Years | Missing Years | Total Count of Observations | \% of Possible Observations |
| Daily Average ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10956 | 100 |


| Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin Year | End Year | Total Number of Years | Missing Years | Total Count of Observations | \% of Possible Observations |
| Standard Deviation | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10956 | 100 |
| Daily Maximum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10956 | 100 |
| Daily Minimum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10956 | 100 |
| Extreme Maximum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 1940 | 2010 |  |  | 25718 | 100 |
| Extreme Minimum ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 1940 | 2010 |  |  | 25719 | 100 |
| $\checkmark$ Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Begin Year | End Year | Total Number of Years | Missing Years | Total Count of Observations | \% of Possible Observations |
| Rainfall (mm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 1 | 10926 | 99.7 |
| Snowfall (cm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 1 | 10926 | 99.7 |
| Precipitation (mm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 1 | 10926 | 99.7 |
| Average Snow Depth (cm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10955 | 100 |
| Median Snow Depth (cm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 0 | 10955 | 100 |
| Snow Depth at Month-end (cm) | 1981 | 2010 | 30 | 1 | 359 | 99.7 |
| Extreme Daily Rainfall (mm) | 1940 | 2010 |  |  | 25719 | 100 |
| Extreme Daily Snowfall (cm) | 1940 | 2010 |  |  | 25719 | 100 |
| Extreme Daily Precipitation (mm) | 1940 | 2010 |  |  | 25719 | 100 |
| Extreme Snow Depth (cm) | 1955 | 2010 |  |  | 20452 | 100 |
| - Days with Maximum Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Days with Minimum Temperature |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Days with Rainfall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Days With Snowfall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Days with Precipitation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Days with Snow Depth |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Wind |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Degree Days |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Humidex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Wind Chill |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Humidity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Pressure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Visibility (hours with) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Cloud Amount (hours with) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Frost-Free |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Calculation Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Calculation Method <br> - Normals Code <br> - Uncertainty due to shorter period <br> - Standard Deviation Calculations <br> - Climate Extremes <br> - Support Information <br> - Data and Observing Stations <br> - APPENDIXA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| "Climate averages", "climate means" or "climate normals" are all interchangeable terms. They refer to arithmetic calculations based on observed climate values for a given location over a specified time period. Climate normals are often used to classify a region's climate and make decisions for a wide variety of purposes involving basic habitability, agriculture and natural vegetation, energy use, transportation, tourism, and research in many environmental fields. Normals are also used as a reference for seasonal monitoring of climate temperature and precipitation for basic public interest, and for monitoring drought or forest fires risk. Real-time values, such as daily temperature, are often compared to a location's "climate normal" to determine how unusual or how great the departure from "average" they are. <br> The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) recommends that countries prepare climate normals for the official 30 -year normals periods ending in 1930, 1960 and 1990, for which the WMO World Climate Normals are published. In addition, WMO recommends the updating of climate normals at the end of every decade as provided here for 1981 to 2010. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## - Calculation Method

## Normals Code

## - Uncertainty due to shorter period

## - Standard Deviation Calculations

## Climate Extremes

- Support Information
- Data Adjustments
- Data and Observing Stations
- Temperature

Rainfall, Snowfall, and Precipitation
-Snow Depth

- Number of Days With Specified Parameters
- Degree-Days
-Soil Temperature
- Evaporation
- Frost and Freezing-Free Period
- Hourly Data

Wind

Bright Sunshine

- Humidex

Wind Chil

Humidity

Pressure

Solar Radiation

- Visibility (km)

Cloud Amount

- APPENDIX A


## Date modified:

2016-06-22

## APPENDIX H

 Hydrology|  |  | Proosed Land Use (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area Descripion | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Catchment } \\ & \text { Number } \end{aligned}$ | Area | Residential (Low Density) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Residential } \\ , \\ , \end{gathered} \left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Menium } \\ \text { Density) } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spen } \\ & \text { Spacel } \\ & \text { Papkre } \end{aligned}$ | Instituional | Commerial | Mixed Use | Employment | Industrial | Stormwater <br> Management | Existing Urban | Total | Total <br> mperviousness | $\underset{\substack{\text { Total Imperious } \\ \text { Area }}}{\text { and }}$ |
|  |  | (ha) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) | (ha) |
| Exisiting Urban | 2000 | 91.38 | \% | 0\% | \% | \% | \% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 54.8 |
| Exisiting Urian | 2002 | 156.40 | 0\% | 0\% | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 93.8 |
| Exising U Urban | 2005 | 48.04 | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 28.8 |
| Exising U Uroan | 2007 | 20.71 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 12.4 |
| Exisiting Urban | 2010 | 40.96 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 24.6 |
| Exising U Uroan | 2015 | 10.55 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 6.3 |
| Proposed Development | 2020 | 66.13 | 30\% | 5\% | 5\% | 25\% | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 100\% | 67\% | 44.1 |
| Exisiting Urban | 2025 | 12.64 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 7.6 |
| Exising U Uroan | 2027 | 59.42 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 35.7 |
| Proposed Development | 2030 | 117.58 | 45\% | 5\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 35\% | 100\% | 49\% | 57.9 |
| Proposed Development | 2035 | 81.42 | 40\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 20\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 63\% | 51.3 |
| Exising U Uroan | 2040 | 25.60 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 15.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2045 | 63.81 | 40\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 35\% | 100\% | 43\% | 27.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2050 | 97.34 | 20\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 55\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | $47 \%$ | 45.5 |
| Proposed Development | 2055 | 65.11 | 65\% | 20\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 50\% | 32.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2060 | 112.73 | 15\% | 5\% | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 70\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 57\% | 64.5 |
| Proposed Development | 2065 | ${ }^{116.33}$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 45\% | 0\% | 0\% | 45\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 77\% | 89.0 |
| Exising Agriculutral | 2070 | 94.85 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | \% | 0.0 |
| Exising U Uran | 2072 | 42.27 | \% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 25.4 |
| Exising Agriculutral | 2073 | 80.41 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0.0 |
| Proposed Development and Agri | 2075 | 117.69 | 0\% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 30\% | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 47\% | 54.7 |
| Proposed Development and Agrin | 2080 | 69.76 | 20\% | \% | 80\% | \% | \% | 0\% | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 11\% | 7.7 |
| Proposed Development and Agri. | 2085 | 100.90 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 35\% | 35.3 |
| Exising Agriculutral | 2087 | 133.74 | 0\% | \% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0.0 |
| Proposed Development | 2090 | 72.83 | 25\% | \% | 30\% | \% | 20\% | \% | \% | \% | 25\% | 0\% | 100\% | 31\% | 22.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2095 | 117.98 | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 30\% | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 100\% | 47\% | 54.9 |
| Proposed Development | 2100 | 50.57 | 45\% | 45\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 56\% | 28.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2105 | 60.91 | 90\% | \% | \% | \% | 0\% | \% | \% | \% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 50\% | 30.2 |
| Proposed Development | 2110 | 49.79 | 95\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 52\% | 26.0 |
| Proposed Development | 2115 | 113.58 | 20\% | 0\% | 20\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 40\% | \% | 20\% | 0\% | 100\% | 37\% | 42.0 |
| Proposed Development | 2125 | 93.38 | 100\% | \% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 55\% | 51.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2130 | 80.55 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 75\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 80\% | 64.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2133 | 93.08 | 0\% | 0\% | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 65\% | 60.5 |
| Proposed Development | 2135 | 22.82 | 90\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 50\% | 11.3 |
| Proposed Development | 2140 | 82.10 | 60\% | 0\% | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 33\% | 27.1 |
| Exising Agriculutral | 2145 | 104.35 | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 55\% | 57.4 |
| Proposed Development | 2155 | 77.27 | 90\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 50\% | 38.2 |
| Proposed Development | 2165 | 179.12 | 20\% | 20\% | 15\% | 10\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 25\% | 100\% | 53\% | 94.5 |
| Proposed Development | 2175 | 47.30 | 10\% | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 40\% | \% | 10\% | 0\% | 100\% | 66\% | 31.0 |
| Exising U Uraan | 2180 | 102.00 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 95\% | 100\% | 57\% | 58.1 |
| Proposed Development | 2185 | 65.40 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 85\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 100\% | 55\% | 36.1 |
| Proposed Development | 2190 | 84.96 | 30\% | 10\% | 5\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \% | 5\% | 50\% | 100\% | 54\% | 45.5 |
| Proposed Development | 2200 | 784.14 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 35\% | 5\% | 0\% | 100\% | 36\% | 284.3 |
| Proposed Development | 2210 | 58.24 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 0\% | 30\% | 0\% | 10\% | 30\% | 100\% | 63\% | 36.7 |
| Proosesed Development | 2215 | 106.67 | 15\% | 10\% | 5\% | 0\% | 10\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 50\% | 100\% | 5\% | 61.1 |
| Exising U Urian | 2220 | 144.51 | 0\% | 0\% | \% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 5\% | 0\% | 90\% | 100\% | 62\% | 88.9 |
| Exising U Uraan | 2225 | 42.22 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% | 60\% | 25.3 |
| Total |  | 4459.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2090.3 |
| Average |  | 94.88 | 23\% | 3\% | 15\% | 1\% | 7\% | 3\% | 10\% | $2 \%$ | 5\% | 32\% | 100\% | 50\% | 44.5 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Imperious Standards |  | Typical Pond CharacteristicsAverage pond cross section |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {\% }}^{\substack{\text { Impensious } \\ 0.55}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential (Low Density) |  | Average pond cross section <br> Top of PP width 65 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential (Medium Density) | 0.70 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Botom of PP width } \\ \text { PP Depth }}}{ }$ |  | 50 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Space/Paks | 0.00 |  |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Institutional | 0.85 | PP cross sectional area |  | 86 m ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Use | 0.70 | Active Depth |  | 2 m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment | 0.65 | Top of Active Depth (5:1 slopes) Active cross section area |  | $\begin{aligned} & 85 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 150 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industria | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stormwater Management | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exising Uraan | 0.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| CatchmentNumber | Water Quality Requirements |  |  |  |  |  | SW Corrido Sizing Calulations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water } \\ & \text { Quality } \\ & \text { Volume } \\ & \text { Required } \end{aligned}$ | Permanent Pool Volume Required | Extended Detention Volume Required | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Total Water } \\ \text { Oualite } \\ \text { Volumed } \\ \text { Required } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Permanent } \\ \text { Pool Volume } \\ \text { Required } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exerended } \\ & \text { Deiention } \\ & \text { Deoliume } \\ & \text { Reacaired } \end{aligned}$ | Average SWM <br> Area <br> Cranent Pool <br> Cross Section |  | depth | Assigned Corridor Length | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Surface } \\ \text { Area a } \\ \text { Permanent } \\ \text { Peool } \\ \text { Elevation } \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Extended } \\ \text { Exention } \\ \text { Surface Area } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Weir } \\ \text { Elevation } \\ \text { Surface Area } \end{gathered}$ | Active Storage <br> Surface Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Extended } \\ \text { Detention } \\ \text { Volume } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Total avialable } \\ \text { Storaseg Volume } \\ \text { (2m depoth) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Max Storage Volume / unit area | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline \text { Permanent } \\ \text { Pool Surface } \\ \text { Area per ha of } \\ \text { Drainage Area } \end{array}$ |  |
|  | (mha) | (mha) | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ /a) | $\left(m^{3}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | (m) | $\left(m^{2}\right)$ | (m) | (m) | (m) | $\left(m^{2}\right)$ | $\left(m^{2}\right)$ | $\left(m^{2}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | $\left(m^{3}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | $\left(m^{3}\right)$ | (mha) | (mha) | (m²ha) |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 126 | 86 | 40 | ${ }^{8,310}$ | 5.665 | 2,645 | 86 | 394 | 414 | 600 | 25,616 | ${ }^{26,538}$ | 35,198 | 35,198 | 5,215 | 60,814 | 60.814 | 920 | 97 | 532 |
| 2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2030 | 104 | 64 | 40 | 12,258 | 7,555 | 4,703 | 86 | 526 | 546 | 1400 | 34,160 | 35,345 | 46,370 | 46,370 | 6,950 | 80,530 | 80,530 | 685 | 73 | 394 |
| 2035 | 121 | 81 | 40 | 9,825 | 6,568 | ${ }^{3,257}$ | 86 | 457 | 477 | 600 | 29,998 | 30,746 | 40.536 | 40,536 | 6,044 | 70,234 | 70,234 | 863 | 91 | 498 |
| 2040 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2045 | 98 | 58 | 40 | 6,253 | 3,701 | 2,552 | 86 | 257 | 277 | 600 | 16,735 | 17,384 | 23,584 | 23,584 | 3,412 | 40,319 | 40,319 | 632 | 66 | 370 |
| 2050 | 102 | 62 | 40 | 9,904 | 6,011 | 3,894 | 86 | 418 | 438 | 600 | 27,179 | 28,49 | 37,242 | 37,242 | 5,533 | 64,421 | 64,421 | 662 | 70 | 383 |
| 2055 | 105 | 65 | 40 | 6,820 | 4,216 | 2,604 | 86 | 293 | 313 | 600 | ${ }^{19,063}$ | 19,784 | 26,629 | 26,629 | 3,885 | 45,992 | 45,992 | 702 | 73 | 409 |
| 2060 | 113 | 73 | 40 | 12,738 | 8,229 | 4,509 | 86 | 572 | 592 | 700 | 37,211 | 38,490 | 50,360 | 50,360 | 7,570 | 87,571 | 87,571 | 777 | 83 | 447 |
| 2065 | 139 | 99 | 40 | 16,131 | ${ }^{11,478}$ | 4,653 | 86 | 798 | 818 | 1000 | 51,900 | 53,631 | 6, 569 | 6, 6969 | 10,553 | 121,469 | 121,469 | 1044 | 112 | 598 |
| 2070 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2072 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2073 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2075 | 102 | 62 | 40 | ${ }^{11,946}$ | 7,238 | 4,708 | 86 | 504 | 524 | 1000 | 32,728 | 3, 869 | 44,498 | 44,498 | 6,660 | 77,226 | 77,226 | 656 | 70 | 378 |
| 2080 | 66 | 26 | 40 | 4,604 | 1,814 | 2,790 | 86 | 126 | 146 | 700 | 8,201 | 8,588 | 12,425 | 12,425 | 1,679 | 20,626 | 20,626 | 296 | 29 | 178 |
| 2085 | 90 | 50 | 40 | 9,081 | 5,045 | 4,036 | 86 | 351 | 371 | 700 | 22,812 | ${ }^{23,648}$ | 3,531 | 31,531 | 4,646 | 54,343 | 54,343 | 539 | 57 | 313 |
| 2087 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2090 | 86 | 46 | 40 | 6,245 | 3,332 | 2,913 | 86 | 232 | 252 | 600 | 15,066 | 15,664 | 21,402 | 21,402 | 3,073 | 36,468 | 36,468 | 501 | 52 | 294 |
| 2095 | 102 | 62 | 40 | 11,975 | 7,256 | 4,719 | 86 | 505 | 525 | 1000 | 32,809 | 33,952 | 44,604 | 44,604 | 6.676 | 77,412 | 77,412 | 656 | 70 | 378 |
| 2100 | 112 | 72 | 40 | 5,647 | 3,624 | 2,023 | 86 | 252 | 272 | 600 | 16,388 | 17,026 | 23,130 | 23,130 | 3,341 | 3,518 | 39.518 | 781 | 81 | 457 |
| 2105 | 105 | 65 | 40 | 6,365 | 3,929 | 2,436 | 86 | ${ }^{273}$ | 293 | 600 | ${ }^{17,765}$ | 18,445 | ${ }^{24,931}$ | 24,931 | 3,621 | ${ }^{42,695}$ | ${ }^{42,695}$ | 701 | 73 | 409 |
| 2110 | 107 | 67 | 40 | 5.340 | 3,348 | 1,992 | 86 | 233 | 253 | 600 | 15,140 | 15,740 | 21,499 | 21,499 | 3.088 | 36.640 | 36.640 | 736 | 76 | 432 |
| 2115 | 92 | 52 | 40 | 10,449 | 5,906 | 4,543 | 86 | 411 | 431 | 600 | 26,706 | 27,62 | ${ }^{36,623}$ | ${ }^{36,623}$ | 5,437 | 6,329 | 6,323 | 558 | 59 | 322 |
| 2125 | 110 | 70 | 40 | 10,272 | 6,537 | ${ }^{3,735}$ | 86 | 455 | 475 | 600 | 2,957 | 30,600 | 40,351 | 40,351 | 6,016 | 69,908 | 6,908 | 749 | 79 | 432 |
| 2130 | 143 | 103 | 40 | 11,546 | 8,324 | 3,222 | 86 | 579 | 599 | 700 | 37,637 | 38,229 | 50,917 | 50,917 | 7,657 | 88,554 | 88.554 | 1099 | 117 | 632 |
| 2133 | 123 | 83 | 40 | ${ }^{11,480}$ | 7,757 | 3,723 | 86 | 540 | 560 | 600 | 35,074 | 36,287 | 47,566 | 47,566 | 7,136 | 82,639 | 82,639 | 888 | 94 | 511 |
| 2135 2140 | 105 | 65 | 40 | 2,385 | ${ }_{1,472}$ | 913 | 86 | 102 | 122 | 600 | 6,656 | 6,994 | 10,403 | 10,403 | 1,365 | 17,059 | 17,059 | 748 | 73 | 456 |
| $\frac{2140}{2145}$ | 88 | 48 | 40 | 7,225 | 3,941 | 3,884 | 86 | 274 | 294 | 1000 | 17,819 | 18,502 | 25,002 | 25,02 | 3,632 | 42,821 | 42,821 | 522 | 54 | 305 |
| $\frac{2145}{2155}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{22,536}$ | ${ }^{23,363}$ | ${ }^{31,170}$ | ${ }^{31,170}$ | 4.590 | ${ }^{53,706}$ | ${ }^{53,706}$ | 695 |  |  |
| 2155 2165 | 105 108 | ${ }_{65}^{68}$ | ${ }_{40}^{40}$ | 8,075 19,300 | 4,984 <br> 12,135 | 3,091 <br> 7,165 | ${ }_{86}^{86}$ | ${ }_{844}^{347}$ | 367 864 | $\frac{600}{1100}$ | ${ }_{54,873}^{22,36}$ | ${ }^{23,663}$ | ${ }^{3,170} 7$ | 3,140 <br> 73,45 | $\stackrel{4,590}{11,157}$ | ${ }^{553,706} 1$ | 53,06 <br> 128,30 | 716 | ${ }_{77}$ | ${ }_{403}^{410}$ |
| 2175 | 124 | 84 | 40 | ${ }^{5,865}$ | 3,973 | ${ }^{1,892}$ | 86 | 276 | ${ }_{296}$ | 700 | ${ }^{17,966}$ | ${ }^{18,653}$ | ${ }^{25,194}$ | 25,194 | ${ }^{3,662}$ | 43,159 | 43,159 | 912 | 95 | 533 |
| 2180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2185 | 110 | 70 | 40 | 7,216 | 4.600 | 2.616 | 86 | 320 | 340 | 600 | 20,799 | 2, 1,573 | 28,899 | 28,899 | 4,237 | 49,698 | 49,698 | 760 | 80 | 442 |
| 2190 | 109 | 69 | 40 | 9,218 | 5,820 | 3,398 | 86 | 405 | 425 | 900 | 26,315 | 27,259 | 36,112 | 36,112 | 5,357 | ${ }^{62,428}$ | 62,428 | 735 | 77 | 425 |
| 2200 | 91 | 51 | 40 | 71,553 | 40,187 | 31,366 | 86 | 2796 | 2816 |  | 181,716 | 187,441 | ${ }^{239,329}$ | 239,329 | 36,916 | 421,044 | 421,044 | 537 | 58 | 305 |
| 2210 | ${ }^{121}$ | 81 | 40 | 7,028 | $\stackrel{4.698}{7,787}$ | ${ }_{2,330}^{4,37}$ | ${ }^{86}$ | 327 | 347 | 1000 | ${ }^{21,243}$ | ${ }^{22,031}$ | 29,480 | 29,480 | 4,327 | ${ }^{50,723}$ | ${ }^{50,723}$ | ${ }^{871}$ | 91 | 506 |
| 2215 2220 | 113 | 73 | 40 | 12,054 | 7,787 | $\stackrel{4,267}{ }$ | 86 | 542 | 562 | 600 | ${ }^{35,210}$ | ${ }^{36,428}$ | 47,744 | ${ }^{47,744}$ | 7,164 | ${ }^{82,955}$ | ${ }^{82,955}$ | 778 | ${ }^{83}$ | 448 |
| 2220 2225 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2225 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 337,107 | 207,128 | 129,980 |  | 14,409 |  |  | ${ }_{936,578}$ | ${ }_{969,416}$ | 1,275,756 | 1,275,756 | 190,599 | 2,212,333 | ${ }_{\text {2, 212,333 }}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 107 | 67 | 40 | 11237 | 6904 | 4333 | 86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 724 | 76 | 420 |


|  | SWM Corridor Elevations |  |  |  |  |  | Depth of Pond Check |  |  | SWM Outlet Configuration |  |  |  |  |  | Storm Sewer Depth Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catchment Number | Estimated Outlet Channel Invert | Permanent Pool <br> $\begin{array}{c}\text { Oftset From } \\ \text { Channel }\end{array}$ | Permanent Pool Elevation | Low Orifice Invert Elevation | High Oritice Invert Elevation | Overfiow Weir Elevation | $\underset{\substack{\text { Approximate } \\ \text { Ground } \\ \text { Elevation }}}{\substack{\text { are }}}$ | Permanent Pool Elevation | Depth of pond | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Low orifice } \\ \text { A. Averae } \\ \text { Flow of 36 } \\ \text { hour } \\ \text { drawdown } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Low Orifice } \\ \text { Diameter } \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { High Orifice } \\ \text { AAerage } \\ \text { Flow } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High } \\ & \text { Hife } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { High } \\ \text { Oifice } \\ \text { Diameter } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Permanent } \\ \text { Pelvation } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Estimate } \\ \text { Pipe Length } \\ \text { from Pond } \\ \text { to Upstream } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\|$Upstream <br> Elevation <br> E.35 at <br> slope <br> slo | Upstream Ground Elevation | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Cover } \\ \text { available with } \\ 1.2 \mathrm{~m} \\ \text { Diameter } \\ \text { Pine } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Essimated } \\ \text { deptet } \\ \text { dsorom } \\ \text { sewer } \end{array}$ |
|  | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} \mathrm{~s}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | (m) | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} \mathrm{~s}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 186.40 | 0.50 | 186.90 | 186.90 | 187.10 | 188.90 | 190.0 | 186.90 | 3.1 | 0.020 | 0.034 | 0.200 | 0.384 | 0.102 | 0.360 | 186.90 | 500 | 188.65 | 190.6 | 0.8 | 1.9 |
| 2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2027 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2030 | 184.80 | 0.50 | 185.30 | 185.30 | 185.50 | 187.30 | 188.5 | 185.30 | 3.2 | 0.036 | 0.061 | 0.270 | 0.882 | 0.181 | 0.480 | 185.30 | 1400 | 190.20 | 189.3 | 2.1 | ${ }^{0.9}$ |
| 2035 | 185.40 | 0.50 | 185.90 | 185.90 | 186.10 | 187.90 | 188.0 | 185.90 | 2.1 | 0.025 | 0.042 | 0.230 | 0.472 | 0.125 | 0.390 | 185.90 | 700 | 188.35 | 190 | 0.5 | 1.7 |
| 2040 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2045 | 183.20 | 0.50 | 183.70 | 183.70 | 183.90 | 185.70 | 186.5 | 183.70 | 2.8 | 0.020 | 0.033 | 0.200 | 0.370 | 0.098 | 0.350 | 183.70 | 800 | 186.50 | 186.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 2050 | 184.40 | 0.50 | 184.90 | 184.90 | 185.10 | 186.90 | 187.0 | 184.90 | 2.1 | 0.030 | 0.051 | 0.250 | 0.565 | 0.150 | 0.430 | 184.90 | 1000 | 188.40 | 190 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| 2055 | 182.20 | 0.50 | 182.70 | 182.70 | 182.90 | 184.70 | 185.0 | 182.70 | 2.3 | 0.020 | 0.034 | 0.200 | 0.378 | 0.100 | 0.350 | 182.70 | 800 | 185.50 | 186.4 | .0.3 | 0.9 |
| 2060 | 183.40 | 0.50 | 183.90 | 183.90 | 184.10 | 185.90 | 186.0 | 183.90 | 2.1 | 0.035 | 0.059 | 0.270 | 0.654 | 0.174 | 0.470 | 183.90 | 1400 | 188.80 | 190 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| 2065 | 185.72 | 0.50 | 186.22 | 186.22 | 186.42 | 188.22 | 189.0 | 186.22 | 2.8 | 0.036 | 0.060 | 0.270 | 0.675 | 0.179 | 0.470 | 186.22 | 1300 | 190.77 | 190 | -2.0 | ${ }^{-0.8}$ |
| 2070 | 185.72 | 0.50 | 186.22 | 186.22 | 186.42 | 188.22 | 189.0 | 186.22 |  |  |  |  | 0.550 | 0.154 | 0.440 | 186.22 | 1400 | 191.12 | 190 | . 2.3 | ${ }^{1.1}$ |
| 2072 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2073 | 185.72 | 0.50 | 186.22 | 186.22 | 186.42 | 188.22 | 189.0 | 186.22 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 0.000 | 0.000 | 186.22 | 1800 | 192.52 | 190 | ${ }^{3.7}$ | 2.5 |
| 2075 | 187.00 | 0.50 | 187.50 | 187.50 | 187.70 | 189.50 | 192.0 | 187.50 | 4.5 | 0.036 | 0.061 | 0.270 | 0.683 | 0.181 | 0.480 | 187.50 | 1800 | 193.80 | 190 | . 5.0 | ${ }^{-3.8}$ |
| 2080 | 187.00 | 0.50 | 187.50 | 187.50 | 187.70 | 189.50 | 191.0 | 187.50 | 3.5 | 0.022 | 0.036 | 0.210 | 0.405 | 0.107 | 0.360 | 187.50 | 900 | ${ }^{190.65}$ | 190 | -1.8 | -0.7 |
| 2085 | 187.25 | 0.50 | 187.75 | 187.75 | 187.95 | 189.75 | 191.0 | 187.75 | ${ }^{3} .3$ | 0.031 | 0.052 | 0.250 | 0.585 | 0.155 | 0.440 | 187.75 | 1900 | 194.40 | 190 | . 5.6 | 4.4 |
| 2087 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2090 | 180.92 | 1.50 | 182.42 | 182.42 | 182.62 | 184.42 | 184.5 | 182.42 | 2.1 | 0.022 | 0.038 | 0.210 | 0.422 | 0.112 | 0.370 | 182.42 | 1000 | 185.92 | 185.5 | ${ }^{-1.6}$ | ${ }^{-0.4}$ |
| 2095 | 182.40 | 0.50 | 182.90 | 182.90 | 183.10 | 184.90 | 185.5 | 182.90 | 2.6 | 0.036 | 0.061 | 0.270 | 0.684 | 0.182 | 0.480 | 182.90 | 1300 | 187.45 | 190 | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| 2100 | 180.92 | 1.00 | 181.92 | 181.92 | 182.12 | 183.92 | 185.0 | 181.92 | 3.1 | 0.016 | 0.026 | 0.180 | 0.293 | 0.078 | 0.310 | 181.92 | 1000 | 185.42 | 185.3 | ${ }^{-1.3}$ | ${ }^{0} .1$ |
| 2105 | 181.90 | 0.50 | 182.40 | 182.40 | 182.60 | 184.40 | 185.0 | 182.40 | 2.6 | 0.019 | 0.032 | 0.200 | 0.353 | 0.094 | 0.340 | 182.40 | 900 | 185.55 | 185.5 | -1.3 | -0.1 |
| 2110 | 180.06 | 1.50 | 181.56 | 181.56 | 181.76 | 183.56 | 185.0 | 181.56 | 3.4 | 0.015 | 0.026 | 0.180 | 0.289 | 0.077 | 0.310 | 181.56 | 900 | 184.71 | 184.1 | -1.8 | ${ }^{-0.6}$ |
| 2115 | 180.06 | 1.50 | 181.56 | 181.56 | 181.76 | 183.56 | 183.5 | 181.56 | 1.9 | 0.035 | 0.059 | 0.270 | 0.659 | 0.175 | 0.470 | 181.56 | 2300 | 189.61 | 186.1 | . 4.7 | ${ }^{-3.5}$ |
| 2125 | 179.10 | 1.50 | 180.60 | 180.60 | 180.80 | 182.60 | 184.5 | 180.60 | 3.9 | 0.029 | 0.048 | 0.240 | 0.542 | 0.144 | 0.420 | 180.60 | 1250 | 184.98 | 184.3 | -1.9 | -0.7 |
| 2130 | 182.40 | 0.50 | 182.90 | 182.90 | 183.10 | 184.90 | 186.0 | 182.90 | 3.1 | 0.025 | 0.042 | 0.230 | 0.467 | 0.124 | 0.390 | 182.90 | 1200 | 187.10 | 187.5 | -0.8 | 0.4 |
| 2133 | 183.40 | 0.50 | 183.90 | 183.90 | 184.10 | 185.90 | 186.0 | 183.90 | 2.1 | 0.029 | 0.048 | 0.240 | 0.540 | 0.143 | 0.420 | 183.90 | 1200 | 188.10 | 187.5 | -1.8 | ${ }^{-0.6}$ |
| 2135 | 178.67 | 1.50 | 180.17 | 180.17 | 180.37 | 182.17 | 182.0 | 180.17 | 1.8 | 0.007 | 0.012 | 0.120 | 0.132 | 0.035 | 0.210 | 180.17 | 1100 | 184.02 | 182.3 | -2.9 | -1.7 |
| 2140 | 178.70 | 1.00 | 179.70 | 179.70 | 179.90 | 181.70 | 183.0 | 179.70 | ${ }^{3} .3$ | 0.025 | 0.043 | 0.230 | 0.476 | 0.126 | 0.400 | 179.70 | 750 | 182.33 | 182.5 | -1.0 | 0.2 |
| 2145 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2155 | 178.68 | 1.50 | 180.18 | 180.18 | 180.38 | 182.18 | 183.5 | 180.18 | 3.3 | 0.024 | 0.040 | 0.220 | 0.448 | 0.119 | 0.380 | 180.18 | 1500 | 185.43 | 182.5 | ${ }^{4.1}$ | -2.9 |
| 2165 | 179.40 | 0.50 | 179.90 | 179.90 | 180.10 | 181.90 | 183.0 | 179.90 | ${ }^{3} 1$ | 0.055 | 0.093 | 0.340 | 1.039 | ${ }^{0.276}$ | 0.590 | 179.90 | 1400 | 184.80 | 185 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 2175 | 178.30 | 0.50 | 178.80 | 178.80 | 179.00 | 180.80 | 182.0 | 178.80 | 3.2 | 0.015 | 0.025 | 0.170 | 0.274 | 0.073 | 0.300 | 178.80 | 700 | 181.25 | 183.5 | 1.1 | ${ }^{2.3}$ |
| 2180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2185 | 178.00 | 1.50 | 179.50 | 179.50 | 179.70 | 181.50 | 182.0 | ${ }^{179.50}$ | 2.5 | 0.020 | 0.034 | 0.200 | 0.379 | 0.101 | 0.350 | 179.50 | 700 | 181.95 | 182.5 | ${ }^{0.6}$ | 0.6 |
| 2190 | 178.75 | 0.50 | 179.25 | 179.25 | 179.45 | 181.25 | 182.5 | 179.25 | 3.3 | 0.026 | 0.044 | 0.230 | 0.493 | 0.131 | 0.400 | 179.25 | 1000 | 182.75 | 184.5 | 0.6 | 1.8 |
| 2200 | 178.95 | 0.50 | 179.45 | 179.45 | 179.65 | 181.45 | 183.0 | 179.45 | 3.6 | 0.242 | 0.407 | 0.720 | 4.548 | 1.208 | 1.240 | 179.45 | 3600 | 192.05 | 189.1 | -4.1 | -2.9 |
| 2210 | 178.40 | 0.50 | 178.90 | 178.90 | 179.10 | 180.90 | 183.0 | 178.90 | 4.1 | 0.018 | 0.030 | 0.190 | 0.338 | 0.090 | 0.330 | 178.90 | 700 | ${ }^{181.35}$ | 183.5 | 1.0 | 2.2 |
| 2215 | 179.00 | 0.50 | 179.50 | 179.50 | 179.70 | 18.50 | 182.5 | 179.50 | 3.0 | ${ }^{0.033}$ | 0.055 | 0.260 | 0.619 | 0.164 | 0.450 | 179.50 | 1200 | 183.70 | 185 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| 2220 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2225 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.003 |  |  | 19.397 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.033 | 0.056 | 0.244 | 0.626 | 0.161 | 0.412 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| [AS] | [AT] | [AU] | [AV] | ${ }^{\text {aw] }}$ | [ AX ] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c | 0.60 |  | c | 0.60 |  |
| height $\Delta$ sheigh $t_{\text {max }}$ drawdown (hr) | 0.0 |  | height ${ }_{\text {mox }}$ | 0.2 |  |
|  | 0.2 |  | sheightmax | 1.8 |  |
|  | 36 |  | drawdown (hri | 12 |  |
| [AS] | Extended Detention Volume / Drawdown time |  |  |  |  |
| [AT] | (ASI ${ }^{2}$ ) ( $\left.0^{*}\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~g}^{*}+4 h\right)^{0.5}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| [AU] | $\left.2^{2}(A T) / \pi\right)^{0.5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| [AV] | 0.116 ${ }^{\circ}$ Area $0.05=$ muncipal drain capacity or 50 mm of unoff over 24 hours |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {aw] }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| [AX] | $\left.{ }^{2} \cdot(1 A W) /\right)^{0.5}$ |  |  |  |  |

Little River
Single Station Frequency Analysis


Transposition of Flood Discharges
As per Equation 8.31 in MTO Drainage Manual (1997)

$$
Q_{2}=Q_{1}\left(\frac{A_{2}}{A_{1}}\right)^{0.75}
$$

where
$\mathrm{Q}_{1}=$ known peak discharge
$Q_{2}=$ unknown peak discharge
$\mathrm{A}_{1}=$ known basin area
$\mathrm{A}_{2}=$ unknown basin area

## Modified Index Flood Method <br> Southern Ontario Type Basin Upper Little River

| Watershed Area - A | $\begin{array}{r} 44.9 \mathrm{~km}^{2} \\ 2 \mathrm{~km}^{2} \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water Storage Area - $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |  |  |
| Storage (\%) - $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{d}} / \mathrm{A}$ | 4.5 \% |  |
| CN | 82 |  |
| Slope | $0.15 \%$ |  |
| Base Watershed Class | 10.1 From Design Chart 1.17 |  |
| Slope adjustment | -0.82 From Design Chart 1.18 |  |
| Storage adjustment | -0.50 From Design Chart 1.19 |  |
| Net adjustment | -1.32 |  |
| Net Watershed Class | 8.73 |  |
| Class Coefficient | 2.38 From Design Chart 1.15 |  |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{2.33}=\mathrm{Q}_{25}{ }^{*} 0.46$ | 19.0 m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | From Design |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{5}=\mathrm{Q}_{25}{ }^{*} 0.65$ | 26.9 m/s | From Design |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{10}=\mathrm{Q}_{25}{ }^{*} 0.80$ | $33.1 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | From Design |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{25}=\mathrm{CxA}^{0.75}$ | $41.3 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{50}=\mathrm{Q}_{25} * 1.15$ | $47.5 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | From Design |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{100}=\mathrm{Q}_{25}{ }^{*} 1.29$ | $53.3 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | From Design |

Notes:
Based on Example 8.8 of the MTO Drainage Management Manual 1995-1997
Design Chart C5-10b from MTC Drainage Manual Volume 1 Chapter C

Existing Condition Flows

|  |  | 24-hour Chicago Flow from PCSWMM |  |  | Municipal Drain Capacity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catchment | Area | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-year } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text {-year } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 100 year $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ |
| 1000 | 96.4 | 5.00 | 7.24 | 14.22 | 0.559 |
| 1002 | 158.4 | 6.23 | 8.95 | 17.76 | 0.919 |
| 1005 | 51.6 | 4.41 | 6.32 | 12.26 | 0.299 |
| 1007 | 21.0 | 1.09 | 1.57 | 3.09 | 0.122 |
| 1010 | 38.4 | 2.47 | 3.52 | 6.77 | 0.223 |
| 1015 | 14.3 | 1.36 | 1.89 | 3.46 | 0.083 |
| 1020 | 92.9 | 1.26 | 1.74 | 3.29 | 0.539 |
| 1025 | 13.9 | 0.63 | 0.88 | 1.63 | 0.081 |
| 1027 | 56.5 | 3.97 | 5.68 | 11.32 | 0.328 |
| 1030 | 33.4 | 3.14 | 4.48 | 8.60 | 0.194 |
| 1035 | 105.2 | 1.44 | 2.00 | 3.80 | 0.610 |
| 1040 | 27.4 | 2.05 | 2.98 | 5.94 | 0.159 |
| 1045 | 26.7 | 0.39 | 0.55 | 1.07 | 0.155 |
| 1050 | 122.6 | 2.73 | 3.76 | 6.89 | 0.711 |
| 1055 | 32.0 | 0.45 | 0.62 | 1.19 | 0.185 |
| 1060 | 115.3 | 1.50 | 2.07 | 3.88 | 0.669 |
| 1065 | 29.0 | 1.19 | 1.65 | 3.02 | 0.168 |
| 1070 | 88.0 | 1.03 | 1.41 | 2.60 | 0.510 |
| 1072 | 53.6 | 3.41 | 4.92 | 9.55 | 0.311 |
| 1075 | 38.6 | 0.60 | 0.86 | 1.71 | 0.224 |
| 1080 | 279.4 | 5.14 | 7.17 | 13.28 | 1.621 |
| 1085 | 135.0 | 1.66 | 2.29 | 4.23 | 0.783 |
| 1090 | 24.8 | 0.37 | 0.52 | 1.02 | 0.144 |
| 1095 | 161.2 | 1.96 | 2.70 | 4.97 | 0.935 |
| 1100 | 53.8 | 0.66 | 0.91 | 1.69 | 0.312 |
| 1105 | 138.2 | 4.21 | 6.01 | 11.65 | 0.802 |
| 1110 | 59.5 | 0.81 | 1.13 | 2.14 | 0.345 |
| 1115 | 113.7 | 2.92 | 4.03 | 7.49 | 0.660 |
| 1120 | 142.0 | 1.96 | 2.72 | 5.18 | 0.824 |
| 1125 | 87.3 | 1.20 | 1.66 | 3.16 | 0.506 |
| 1130 | 226.5 | 2.69 | 3.71 | 6.82 | 1.314 |
| 1133 | 35.3 | 0.55 | 0.78 | 1.56 | 0.205 |
| 1135 | 24.4 | 0.35 | 0.49 | 0.94 | 0.142 |
| 1140 | 25.8 | 1.43 | 1.97 | 3.60 | 0.150 |
| 1145 | 161.9 | 3.02 | 4.21 | 7.78 | 0.939 |
| 1150 | 13.2 | 0.61 | 0.85 | 1.57 | 0.077 |
| 1155 | 110.5 | 1.43 | 1.98 | 3.69 | 0.641 |
| 1160 | 7.8 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 0.045 |
| 1165 | 188.4 | 2.40 | 3.31 | 6.16 | 1.093 |
| 1170 | 4.7 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.027 |
| 1175 | 145.0 | 3.11 | 4.30 | 7.87 | 0.841 |
| 1180 | 43.8 | 1.77 | 2.60 | 5.28 | 0.254 |
| 1185 | 131.5 | 4.11 | 5.87 | 11.34 | 0.762 |
| 1190 | 107.8 | 1.51 | 2.10 | 4.01 | 0.625 |
| 1195 | 147.8 | 1.98 | 2.74 | 5.16 | 0.857 |
| 1200 | 198.5 | 6.95 | 10.06 | 19.79 | 1.151 |
| 1205 | 59.6 | 2.38 | 3.50 | 7.11 | 0.346 |
| 1210 | 161.8 | 5.08 | 7.16 | 13.47 | 0.939 |
| 1215 | 127.9 | 4.46 | 6.24 | 11.60 | 0.742 |
| 1220 | 117.7 | 4.74 | 6.96 | 14.14 | 0.683 |
| 1225 | 40.5 | 4.89 | 6.85 | 12.71 | 0.235 |
| total | 4490.76 |  |  |  |  |
| average |  | 2.33 | 3.30 | 6.31 | 0.511 |

## Proposed Data from PC-SWMM

| Catchment | Area (ha) | Municipal Drain Capacity ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flow - } 2 \mathrm{yr} \\ \left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flow - } 5 \text { yr } \\ \left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fow - } 100 \\ & \mathrm{yr}\left(\mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flow - 2yr } \\ \text { (L/ha) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Flow- } \\ & 5 \mathrm{yr} \\ & (\mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{ha}) \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|} \text { Flow }-100 \\ \text { yr (L/ha) } \end{array}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Runoff - } \\ & \text { 2yr (ML) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Runoff - } \\ 5 \mathrm{yr} \text { (ML) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Runoff - } \\ 100 \mathrm{yr} \text { (ML) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Runoff - 2yr (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | Runoff-5yr (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Runoff- } \\ & 10 \mathrm{R} \\ & 10 \mathrm{n} \\ & \left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha)}\right. \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Max Vol - } \\ \text { 2yr (ML } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Max Vol - } \\ \text { 5yr (ML) } \end{array}$ | Max Vol 100 yr (ML) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Max Vol - } \\ 2 \mathrm{yr}\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Max Vol - } \\ 5 y r\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Max Vol - } \\ 100 \mathrm{yr}\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Max. Pond Depth - 2yr <br> (m) | Max. Pond Depth - $5 y r$ (m) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Max. Pond } \\ \text { Depth - 100yr } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52020 | 66.13 | 0.384 | 0.226 | 0.286 | 0.409 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 6.2 | 28 | 37 | 64 | 420 | 559 | 962 | 20 | 27 | 49 | 302.1 | 410.8 | 739.5 | 0.73 | 0.97 | 1.65 |
| 52030 | 117.58 | 0.682 | 0.396 | 0.512 | 0.742 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 41 | 56 | 99 | 349 | 475 | 844 | 29 | 40 | 72 | 247.4 | 341.2 | 613.3 | 0.80 | 1.07 | 1.82 |
| 52035 | 81.42 | 0.472 | 0.274 | 0.348 | 0.498 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 33 | 44 | 77 | 403 | 540 | 940 | 23 | 32 | 58 | 287.7 | 393.5 | 716.0 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 1.70 |
| 52045 | 63.81 | 0.370 | 0.209 | 0.274 | 0.413 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 20 | 28 | 53 | 312 | 440 | 828 | 12 | 18 | 36 | 194.8 | 277.6 | 562.3 | 0.69 | 0.96 | 1.81 |
| 52050 | 97.34 | 0.565 | 0.310 | 0.410 | 0.615 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 6.3 | 32 | 44 | 82 | 326 | 456 | 845 | 21 | 29 | 56 | 211.7 | 297.3 | 579.0 | 0.71 | 0.98 | 1.78 |
| 52055 | 65.11 | 0.378 | 0.233 | 0.294 | 0.399 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 24 | 32 | 56 | 362 | 493 | 866 | 18 | 24 | 44 | 269.8 | 374.8 | 679.0 | 0.85 | 1.15 | 1.94 |
| 52060 | 112.73 | 0.654 | 0.331 | 0.441 | 0.667 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 40 | 54 | 98 | 352 | 482 | 870 | 26 | 36 | 67 | 232.7 | 316.5 | 592.9 | 0.67 | 0.89 | 1.58 |
| S2065 | 116.33 | 0.675 | 0.326 | 0.417 | 0.603 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 51 | 67 | 114 | 439 | 578 | 984 | 36 | 49 | 89 | 313.6 | 420.1 | 769.0 | 0.67 | 0.88 | 1.53 |
| S2075 | 117.69 | 0.683 | 0.320 | 0.426 | 0.668 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 37 | 52 | 97 | 314 | 439 | 823 | 24 | 33 | 63 | 203.1 | 276.3 | 535.0 | 0.69 | 0.92 | 1.67 |
| 52080 | 69.76 | 0.405 | 0.151 | 0.246 | 0.686 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 9.8 | 12 | 20 | 46 | 176 | 289 | 654 | 7 | 10 | 22 | 96.8 | 145.3 | 312.7 | 0.75 | 1.08 | 2.09 |
| 52085 | 100.9 | 0.585 | 0.189 | 0.294 | 0.532 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 26 | 38 | 75 | 258 | 375 | 746 | 17 | 24 | 46 | 171.7 | 233.2 | 456.4 | 0.71 | 0.95 | 1.73 |
| 52090 | 72.83 | 0.422 | 0.195 | 0.265 | 0.424 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 5.8 | 18 | 26 | 53 | 241 | 357 | 725 | 10 | 14 | 30 | 133.2 | 190.5 | 407.5 | 0.61 | 0.85 | 1.68 |
| 52095 | 117.98 | 0.684 | 0.308 | 0.410 | 0.618 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 36 | 50 | 95 | 305 | 426 | 802 | 24 | 33 | 65 | 200.0 | 277.3 | 549.7 | 0.68 | 0.92 | 1.71 |
| 52100 | 50.57 | 0.293 | 0.194 | 0.231 | 0.299 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 19 | 26 | 46 | 372 | 512 | 903 | 14 | 20 | 37 | 275.7 | 395.9 | 737.6 | 0.79 | 1.10 | 1.90 |
| 52105 | 60.91 | 0.353 | 0.198 | 0.254 | 0.371 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 20 | 28 | 52 | 335 | 465 | 855 | 13 | 19 | 38 | 212.5 | 305.9 | 623.7 | 0.68 | 0.96 | 1.81 |
| 52110 | 49.79 | 0.289 | 0.174 | 0.221 | 0.313 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 18 | 24 | 44 | 357 | 490 | 886 | 12 | 16 | 32 | 234.9 | 329.3 | 636.6 | 0.72 | 0.98 | 1.77 |
| 52115 | 113.58 | 0.659 | 0.289 | 0.418 | 0.673 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 5.9 | 29 | 42 | 84 | 258 | 373 | 739 | 17 | 23 | 48 | 151.3 | 205.7 | 420.2 | 0.61 | 0.81 | 1.56 |
| 52125 | 93.38 | 0.542 | 0.273 | 0.349 | 0.505 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 32 | 44 | 80 | 345 | 474 | 862 | 21 | 28 | 55 | 222.2 | 304.5 | 592.1 | 0.66 | 0.89 | 1.63 |
| 52130 | 80.55 | 0.467 | 0.242 | 0.307 | 0.426 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 37 | 48 | 80 | 453 | 593 | 997 | 26 | 36 | 64 | 328.9 | 443.2 | 794.3 | 0.66 | 0.88 | 1.50 |
| 52133 | 93.08 | 0.540 | 0.271 | 0.353 | 0.528 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 36 | 49 | 85 | 388 | 522 | 917 | 24 | 33 | 60 | 261.4 | 352.2 | 645.3 | 0.66 | 0.87 | 1.51 |
| 52135 | 22.82 | 0.132 | 0.087 | 0.108 | 0.151 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 8 | 11 | 20 | 351 | 485 | 879 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 224.7 | 325.2 | 640.7 | 0.70 | 0.98 | 1.76 |
| 52140 | 82.1 | 0.476 | 0.234 | 0.315 | 0.482 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 22 | 32 | 63 | 265 | 387 | 766 | 13 | 19 | 41 | 156.6 | 232.6 | 497.8 | 0.68 | 0.98 | 1.92 |
| 52155 | 77.27 | 0.448 | 0.238 | 0.303 | 0.436 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 26 | 36 | 66 | 338 | 469 | 860 | 17 | 24 | 47 | 219.4 | 308.5 | 610.3 | 0.70 | 0.97 | 1.79 |
| 52165 | 179.12 | 1.039 | 0.442 | 0.635 | 0.952 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 5.3 | 61 | 83 | 153 | 338 | 466 | 853 | 41 | 55 | 106 | 227.1 | 305.4 | 589.5 | 0.70 | 0.92 | 1.68 |
| 52175 | 47.3 | 0.274 | 0.149 | 0.184 | 0.254 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 5.4 | 22 | 29 | 47 | 471 | 614 | 994 | 19 | 26 | 42 | 411.8 | 544.1 | 884.5 | 0.99 | 1.27 | 1.95 |
| 52185 | 65.4 | 0.379 | 0.204 | 0.260 | 0.374 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 23 | 32 | 57 | 354 | 486 | 878 | 15 | 22 | 42 | 230.3 | 330.1 | 648.2 | 0.68 | 0.95 | 1.74 |
| 52190 | 84.96 | 0.493 | 0.087 | 0.200 | 0.377 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 30 | 41 | 74 | 350 | 481 | 872 | 25 | 32 | 58 | 299.1 | 380.4 | 677.5 | 0.89 | 1.11 | 1.86 |
| 52200 | 784.14 | 4.548 | 1.018 | 1.599 | 3.142 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 176 | 252 | 511 | 225 | 321 | 652 | 119 | 157 | 287 | 151.5 | 199.7 | 365.8 | 0.62 | 0.81 | 1.42 |
| 52210 | 58.24 | 0.338 | 0.040 | 0.085 | 0.205 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 23 | 31 | 54 | 402 | 527 | 925 | 23 | 27 | 44 | 391.8 | 470.1 | 754.0 | 0.98 | 1.16 | 1.77 |
| 52215 | 106.67 | 0.619 | 0.146 | 0.256 | 0.499 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 38 | 52 | 94 | 357 | 487 | 878 | 31 | 39 | 68 | 290.2 | 370.0 | 641.8 | 0.82 | 1.03 | 1.69 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 3351.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1058 | 1465 | 2712 |  |  |  | 723 | 979 | 1825 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average |  | 0.63 | 0.26 | 0.36 | 0.58 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 34 | 47 | 87 | 341 | 469 | 853 | 23 | 32 | 59 | 238 | 325 | 609 | 0.73 | 0.98 | 1.73 |







## Town of Tecumseh Consolidated Official Plan Land Use Designations



1. Oldcastle Hamlet Settlement Area Expansion, as approved in County Official Plan
2. Proposed Business Park/Industrial.

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments appealed to the OMB.








| ;River: Gouin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Reach: Gouin ; Transect: 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {jo. }} 75$ | 178.4 | 3.6 | 0 | 5 |
| - River: Lachance |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Jo. 8 | 178.1 | 3.6 | 0 | 5 |
| ;River: Lachance |  |  |  |  |
| ;Reach: Lachance |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ј0.9 | 178.6 | 3.6 | 0 | 5 |
| ${ }^{1}$ | 185 |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: watson to Desj |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| iTransect: 10 |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| ;River: Watson Dra | 178.819 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| each: Watson Drain |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 180.729 | 2.1 | 0 | 5 |
| ;Reach: Watson Drain |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Transect: ${ }^{\text {J103 }}$ | 181.937 | 2.7 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | 5 |
| iRiver: Watson drain |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {J105 }}$ | 182.202 | 2.1 | 0 | 5 |
| ;Reach: Watson Drain |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {j }}^{\text {Transect: }}$ ( 106 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {iR }}^{\text {TRiver }}$ : Watson Dra | 182.812 | 1.739 | 0 | 5 |
| ;River: Watson Drain |  |  |  |  |
| ;Reach: Wat son Dr |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1} 107$ | 184.192 | 2.055 | 0 | 5 |
| ; Upstream end of watson Drain underpass culve |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {IT1 }}$ information from |  |  |  |  |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{J 13}$ | 182.19 | 5. | 。 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

```
# Reach: Baseline to wat,
V14
Transect: 15 to Wats
M15
\Mransect:16 180.509 4.29
M,
\18
i,River: Little 
#,Reach: Little River
M19
RNver: Little River
.Transect: 2 Lesjardeins and Iittle River
```



```
# RRach: Littte
MTransect:20 lllll
```












| ; River: ; Reach: CJ70 | Hurley Drain Hurley Drain | J69 | 40 | 0.045 | 186.2 | 186.1 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ; River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {i Reach: }}$ CJ71 | Hurley Drain | 570 | 50 | 0.045 | 186.3 | 186.2 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {a }}$ iReach: | Hurley Drain ${ }_{\text {J72 }}$ | 371 | 55 | 0.045 | 186.6 | 186.3 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hurley Drain | J72 | 20 | 0.045 | 186.6 | 186.6 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Hurley Drain Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {c }}$ | ${ }^{\text {Hurley }}$ Drain | J73 | 650 | 0.045 | 187 | 186.6 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| iReach: | Hurley Drain | J74 | 30 | 0.045 | 187.7 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| ; River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hurley Drain | J75 | 30 | 0.045 | 187.7 | 187.7 | 0 | 0 |
| ; River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (iReach: | Hurley Drain | ${ }^{376}$ | 10 |  | 187.6 | 187.7 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Washbrooke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (iReach: | Washbrooke |  |  |  | 186.5 | 186.5 | 0 | 0 |
| ; River: | Washbrooke |  | 55 | 0.045 |  |  | 0 |  |
| (iReach: | Washbrooke | J80 | 90 | 0.045 | 186.5 | 186.5 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Washbrooke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | J81 | 30 | 0.045 | 186.5 | 186.5 | 0 | 0 |
| ; River: | Washbrooke ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: | Washbrooke | J84 | 30 | 0.045 | 186.6 | . 5 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (iReach: | Washbrooke ${ }_{\text {J86 }}$ | J85 | 80 | 0.045 | 187 | 186.6 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: | Washbrooke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (iReach: | Washbrooke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; River: | Washbrooke ${ }^{\text {J8 }}$ | ${ }^{8} 6$ | 90 | 0.045 | 186.79 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| ; Reach: | Washbrooke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {CJ88 }}$ Civer | ${ }^{\text {J88 }}$ | J87 | 170 | 0.045 | 187.546 | 186.79 | 0 | 0 |

River: Lachance
;Reach: Lachance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: Lachano |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Festardetins drain sectio | N ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ons of 178.6 | $\underset{178.1}{\text { drain }} 1$ | 0 | ${ }_{0}^{\text {m bottom, }}$ 2:1 side slope: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: | Desjardeins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CJ4 | ${ }^{\text {J4 }}$ | J5160 | 35 | 0.045 | 178.1 | 178 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: Desjardeins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CJ4. 5 | J4. 5 | ${ }^{\text {J4 }}$ | 500 | 0.045 | 178.7 | 178.2 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hayes Drain | J5045 | 120 | 0.045 | 184.55 | 184.25 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Length, Manning's n from | SWMHYMO <br> J53 | 1720 | 0.045 | 186.831 | 184.55 | 0 | 0 |
| ; River: Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {CJiviver }}^{\text {CJ }}$ | Hurley Drain ${ }^{\text {J622 }}$ | J5060 | 55 | 0.045 | 185.013 | 184.846 | 0 | 0 |
| ; Reach: Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{563}$ | J62 | 110 | 045 | 185.1 | 185.0 | 0 | 0 |
| ;Reach: Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CJ64 | ${ }^{\text {J64 }}$ | ${ }^{6} 3$ | 80 | 0.045 | 185.1 | 185.1 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;River:; Rureach: Hurley DrainHrain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| ;River: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;Reach: | Hurley Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| CJ84 | irregular | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\text {CJJ85 }}$ | $\underset{\text { ITREEGULAR }}{\text { IRresurar }}$ | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ${ }_{\text {CJJ86 }}^{\text {CJ87 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {IR }}^{\text {IRrgeular }}$ | ${ }^{86}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { CJ88 } \\ \text { CJ8 }}}^{\text {ces }}$ | ${ }_{\text {I }}^{\text {Irregregular }}$ | ${ }_{88}^{87}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | : |
| CJ89 | ${ }_{\text {ir }}^{\text {irgegular }}$ | 89 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {IfRrgeular }}$ | 89 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |
| ${ }_{\text {OR1180-1 }}^{\text {OR1205-1 }}$ | $\underset{\text { CIRCULAR }}{\text { CTRCUIAR }}$ | 1 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |



; High-chord transect for bridge 0.35 (River: Gouin; Reach: Gouin).
$;$; COPY OF DESTARDEINS DRAIN SECTION 44
$\begin{array}{lll}\text {; COPY OF } \\ \text { NC } \\ 0.1 & \text { DESJARDEINS } \\ 0.1 & 0.045\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\mathrm{X} 1 & 0.35 . \mathrm{HC} \\ \text { GR } & 181.505 & 2605\end{array}$
; copy of desuardeins dratin sectid
 ; Copy of desjaddeins drain section 4
NC 0.1
0.045


 ;COPY OF DESJARDETNS DRATN SECTION 4 - based on 1997 SWM report, dimensions of the drain are accurate; 3 m bottom, $2: 1$ side slope


























| $\begin{array}{cl}\mathrm{GR} & 180.062 \\ \mathrm{GR} & 183.3\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3004.032 \\ & 3240 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180.699 \\ & 183.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3006.35 \\ & 3270 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5683.031 \\ 183.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3009.792 \\ & 3350 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 183.047 \\ & \hline 184.37 \end{aligned}$ $184.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3015.242 \\ & 4000 \end{aligned}$ | 183.3 | 3040 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | transect | for bridge 14.5 (River: Little River; Reach:0.045 |  |  |  |  | Baseline to Wats). |  |  |
| $\times 114.5$ |  |  | 2994.2 | 3009.7920 .0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0 |
| GR 184.2 | 2250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.203 | ${ }^{2994.2}$ | 183.073 | 2994.597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183 | 3100 | 183.5 | 3105 | 183.8 | ${ }_{3180}^{3015.242}$ | 184.1 | 3370 | 184.4 | 3900 |
| GR 184.208 | 3900 | 184.3 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | ${ }_{19} 0.045$ | 2994 | 3015.242 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| ${ }_{\text {X1 }} 15$ |  | 19 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 262 | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| GR 184.2 | ${ }_{2830}^{2250}$ |  | ${ }_{2890}^{2350}$ | ${ }_{183.3}^{184 .}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2480}$ | 183. 183. | ${ }_{2620}^{2984}$ | 183.3 180.87 | ${ }_{3001.339}^{2675}$ |
| GR 180.062 | 3004.032 |  | 3006. | 183.031 | 3009. | 183.04 | 3015. | 183.3 |  |
| GR 183.3 | 3240 | 18 |  | 183.7 | 3350 | 184.3 |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | ${ }_{18}^{0.045}$ | 2993 | 3007.155 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 183.6 \\ & 180.509 \\ & 183.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 2825 \\ 3001.337 \\ 3075 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 183.5 \\ \hline 180.512 \\ 184 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{c} 2925 \\ 3020.636 \\ 3130 \end{array} \\ & \hline 130 \end{aligned}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {X1 }} 116$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR GR 183.8 183.5 | 2380 |  | 2575 | ${ }_{181.681}^{183.6}$ | ${ }_{2997}^{2720} .937$ |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.126 | 3007.155 | 183.5 | 3010 | 183.6 | 3025 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 184 | 3210 | 184.8 | 3260 | 184.8 | 3450 |  |  |  |  |
| gh-cho | transect | ${ }_{\substack{\text { for bridge } \\ 0.045}}^{16.5}$ |  | River: Little River |  | ; Reach: | Baseline | to Wats) | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 303.1 \\ & 30700 \end{aligned}$ |
| ${ }_{1}^{0.1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 186.2 | 1000 | 185.2 | 2000 | $\begin{aligned} & 185.2 \\ & 184.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 3300 \\ 3170 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 184.6 \\ & 184.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2710 \\ 32710 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 184.6 \\ 184.6 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| GR 184 | 30 | 184.6 | 3050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185 | 4000 | 186 | 5000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | ${ }_{16}^{0.045}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2993 \\ 2300 \\ 8 \\ 8903 \\ 8170 \end{gathered}$ | 3050 180.91 184.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 2550 \\ 2997.879 \\ 3225 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 184.2 \\ & 180.961 \\ & 184.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2710 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 2999.52 \\ 3425 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{184}^{0}$ <br> 180.944 <br> 184.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{c} 2880 \\ 3001.733 \\ 3700 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |
| X1 GR 185 185 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.7 |  | 183.938 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 3050 \\ & 4000 \end{aligned}$ | 183.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.045 \\ & 7^{0.045} \\ & 185.2 \\ & 185.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2999 \\ 2999 \\ 3009.5 \end{gathered}$ | 3009.5184.3 | ${ }_{3000}^{0.0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 182.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 3004 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 181.6 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{3006.1}^{0}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R 18 | 3008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





$\begin{aligned} & \text { iHigh-chord transect for bridge } \\ & \text { iThis } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { NC } 0.1\end{aligned}$ a REPERATED Section.
in
0.1


| i This is a | Repeated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\times 135183$ | .1 | 23 | 2992.7 | 3007.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GR 183 | 2500 | 180.6 | 2630 | 180.5 | 2830 | 180 | 2900 | 179.4 | 2950 |
| GR 179.9 | 2983 | 177.9 | 2989.2 | 177.9 | 2989.3 | 176.8 | 2992.7 | 177.4 | 2992.8 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} \mathrm{Cl} 176.8$ | 2994.6 | 176.8 | 3300 | 176.8 | 3007.4 | 176.8 | 3007.5 | 179.3 | 3013.9 3095 |
| GR 179.3 GR 180.5 | 3014 315 | 179.9 | 3015.3 | 179.5 | 3018 | 179.5 | 3065 | 180 | 3085 |
| GR 180.5 | 3145 | 180.6 | 3170 | 180.7 | 3275 |  |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 35404 |  | ${ }^{11}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2991}$ | 3009 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| GR 181.9 | 2640 2996 | 180.4 176.8 | 2665 3004 | 180.4 179.4 | 2800 3009 | 180.4 179.9 | ${ }_{3025}^{2920}$ | 179.9 180.4 |  |
| GR 176.8 GR 180.9 | 2996 3370 | 176.8 | 30 | 179.4 | 3009 | 179.9 | 35 | 180.4 | 3175 |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3007.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {GR }} 186.5$ | 2893 | ${ }^{186.3}$ | ${ }^{2993}$ | ${ }^{185.85}$ | 2994 | 184.35 | 2996.702 304.351 | 184.19 | 2997.51 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 1886.3$ | ${ }_{3008}^{2998.331}$ | ${ }_{1}^{186.5}$ | ${ }_{3108}^{3000.603}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x136000 |  | 11 | 2991 | 3009 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 182 | 2640 | 180.5 |  | 180 | 280 | 180 |  |  |  |
| GR 176.9 | 2996 | 176.9 | 3004 | 179.5 | 3009 | 180 | 3035 | 180.5 | 3175 |
| GR 181 | 3370 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |













| $\begin{aligned} & \text { GR } 178.1 \\ & \text { GR } 177.2 \\ & \text { GR } 180.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993 \\ & 306.1 \\ & 3060 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 178.1 \\ 177.2 \\ 181 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993.1 \\ & 3906.2 \\ & 3220 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 178 \\ & 181 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993.9 \\ & 3007 \\ & 3300 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 178 \\ & 181.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2999 \\ & 3007.1 \\ & 340 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 179.9 \end{aligned}$ | 3000 3009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ; High--hord transect for bridge 40573.5 (River: Little River; Reach: Gouin to DS end). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| is is |  | section. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 140573.5$ | нс | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 182.5 | 2730 | 182.6 | 2750 | 183 | 2920 | 183 | 2993 | 183.8 | 2993 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 183}$ | 2994 3009 | 183 181 |  | 183.8 |  | 183.8 |  |  |  |
| ; This is a Repeated section. <br> $\begin{array}{lll}\text { NC } 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.045\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 140824$ |  |  | 2993. | 3006. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| 182.5 | 2730 | 180 | 2750 | 180 | 282 | 18 | 2920 | 179 |  |
| 178 | 2993 | 178. | 2993. | 177.2 | 2993 | 177 |  | 177 |  |
| GR 177 | 3006 | 177.2 | ${ }_{3006 .}$ | 178 | 3007 | 178 | 3007 | 179 |  |
| GR 180.5 | 3060 | 181 | 3220 | 181 | 330 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3001.712 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{GR}_{\text {GR }} 188.18$ | ${ }_{2}^{2893}$ | 186.9 | ${ }_{2}^{2993}$ | 186.575 | ${ }_{3094}$ | 185.38 | 2996 3102 | 184.838 |  |
| GR 185.18 | 2999.93 | 186.677 | 3001.7 | 86.9 | 3002 | 187 |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {X1 }}^{\text {C1 }} 181106$ |  | ${ }_{181.5}^{16}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2950.3}$ | ${ }^{2965.7}$ |  | ${ }_{181.3}^{0.0}$ |  | ${ }_{179} 17$ |  |
| GR 177 | 2954.36 | 177.3 | 2961.64 |  | 2965.7 |  |  |  | 3045.5 |
|  |  | 181.1 | ${ }^{3203}$ | 181.2 | 3308 | 181.5 | 3413 | 181.8 |  |
| 0. | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187. | 2893 | 186.9 | 2993 | 186.75 | 2994 | 185.322 | 2995.817 | 184.846 | 2997. |
| GR 185.1 | 2999 | 186.801 | 3002. | 186.9 | 3003 | 187. |  |  |  |
| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 142000$ |  | 16 | 2989 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {GR }} 183$ | 2860 | ${ }^{181.5}$ | 2880 | 180.7 | 295 | 181 | 2983 | 179 |  |
| GR 177.3 | 2994.8 | 177.3 |  | 179.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 182.181 .3$ | 3220 4700 | 181.1 | 3350 | 181.2 | 3500 | 181.5 | 3650 | 181.8 | 4000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 | ${ }^{8}$ | 8. | 2994 | 3001.12 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| GR 187.2 GR 186.865 | $\begin{aligned} & 2893 \\ & 3001.123 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1877 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993 \\ & 3002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 186.941 \\ & 187.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2994 \\ & 3102 \end{aligned}$ | 84.889 | 2995. | 185.528 | 998 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 44 |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }^{3003.375}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{20}{ }^{\circ}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| $\mathrm{GR}_{\text {GR }} 1888.2$ | ${ }_{2999.884}^{2893}$ | 187.8 187.8 | ${ }_{3003.375}^{2993}$ | ${ }^{187.6} 188$ | 2994 3103 | 18 | 2997.03 | 185 | 998. |
| HLocation of TwinNc 0.10.10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 183$ | 26 | ${ }_{182}$ | ${ }_{2680}^{2989}$ | ${ }_{181} 18$ | 2790 | 180.5 | 2820 | 180 | 2840 |
| 1177 | ${ }_{3006}^{2800}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{3010}^{2989}$. |  | ${ }_{3060}^{2991.5}$ | 177 | ${ }_{3150}^{2993}$ |
| GR 181.2 | ${ }_{3250} 300$ | 181.2 | ${ }_{3350} 308$. | 181.4 | 3600. | 181.7 | 4000 | ${ }_{182.2}^{181}$ | 4600 |
| (loction of Twin oaks Drive Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 14432$ |  | 20 | 2989.8 | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 183 | 2660 | 182 | 2680 | 181 180 | ${ }_{2989}^{2790}$ | ${ }_{178}^{180 .}$ | 2820 | 180 | ${ }_{2940}^{2893}$ |
| GR 177. | 3006.2 | 178.9 | 3008.5 | 180. |  | 178. | 2991. | 181 |  |
| GR 181.2 | 3250 | 181.2 | 3350 | 181.4 | 3600 | 181.7 | 4000 | 182.2 | 4600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.2 |  | ${ }^{20}$ | 2680 | 181.2 | 2790 | 180.7 | 2820 | 180 | 284 |
| GR 181.2 | 2860 | 181.2 | 2950 | 180.2 | 2989.8 | 179.1 | 2991.5 | 177 | 2993 |
| GR 177.7 | ${ }_{3}^{3006.2}$ | 179.1 |  | ${ }_{181.6}^{180.3}$ | 3010.4 3600 | 181.2 |  | 181.2 |  |
| GR 181.4 |  | 181.4 | 3350 | 181.6 |  | 181.9 | 4000 | 182.4 |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 <br> GR <br> 187 |  |  |  | 2999.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR ${ }_{\text {GR 187.5 }}$ | ${ }_{3000}^{2894}$ | 187.7 | ${ }_{3100}^{2994}$ | 185.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 145100$ |  | 20 | 2989.8 | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 183.4 | 2660 | 182.4 | 2680 | 181.4 | 2790 | 180.9 | 2820 | 180 |  |
| GR 181.4 | 2860 | 181.4 | 2950 | 180.4 | 2989. | 179.3 | 2991 | 177 | 2993. |
| GR 177.9 | 3006.2 | 179.3 | 3008.5 | 180.5 | 3010. | 181.4 | 3060 | 181 | 3150 |
| GR 181.6 | 3250 | 181.6 | 3350 | 181.8 | 3600 | 182.1 | 4000 | 182.6 | 4600 |


| NC | 0.1 | 20 |  | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR 183 | 2200 | ${ }_{182}$ | ${ }_{2250}^{2989}$ | ${ }_{181} 3010.4$ | 2300 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2825 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2840 |
| GR 181 | 2860 | 181 | 50 | 180 | 2989.8 | 178.9 | 2991.5 | 178.2 | 2993.6 |
| GR 178 | 3006 | 178.9 | 8.5 | 180.1 | 3010.4 | 181 |  | 181 | 3150 |
| GR 181.2 | 3250 | 181.2 | 3350 | 181.4 | 3600 | 181. | 4000 | 182. | 4600 |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 146$ |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | 3001.45 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| GR 187.8 | 3001.45 | ${ }_{188.1}^{188.1}$ | ${ }_{3008.62}^{2948}$ | 186 | ${ }_{3109}^{2996006}$ |  | 2996.766 |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {nc }} 0.1$ | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ ${ }_{\text {C1 }} 4848$ |  | ${ }_{181}^{18}$ | ${ }_{2250}^{2995}$ | ${ }^{3005.7} 181$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 181 | 2992 | ${ }_{181}^{181}$ | 2992.1 | 178.9 | 2995 | 178.9 | 2995.1 | 178.4 | 3000 |
| 178 | 3005 | 178.4 | 3005.7 | 181 | 3008 |  | 3008.1 |  | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 181 | 3600 | 182 | 425 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nc } & 0.1 \\ \text { X1 } & 46203\end{array}$ |  | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 184 |  | 18 | 2250 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2500 | ${ }^{181}$ | 2700 | ${ }_{181}^{01}$ |  |
| GR 181 | 2992 | 181 | 2992.1 | 178.9 | 2995 | 178.9 | 2995.1 | 178.4 | 3000 |
| GR 178. | 3005.6 | 178.4 | 3005. | 181 | 3008 | 181 | 3008.1 | 181 | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 18 | 360 | 182 | 425 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X146304 |  | 18 | 2992.1 | 3008 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 181818$ | ${ }_{2}^{2240}$ | ${ }_{181}^{181}$ | ${ }_{29250}^{2250}$ | 181 178.9 | 2500 2995 | 181 188.9 | ${ }_{2995}^{2700}$ | ${ }_{1781}^{181}$ | 50 |
| GR 178 | 30 | 178. | 3005.7 | 181 | 3008 |  |  |  | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 181 | 3600 | 182 | 4250 |  |  |  |  |
| ; Upstream | ttl | ver an | ine | junctio |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 184.79 | 2894 | ${ }_{184.59}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }_{\text {3011.01 }}^{384}$ | 0.0997 .573 | ${ }_{184.23}^{0.0}$ | 2998.34 | ${ }_{182.32}$ | 30 |
| GR 181.23 | 3003.576 | 181.24 | 3004.4 |  | 3005.132 | 182.32 | 3006.611 | 184.39 | 3011.01 |
| GR 184.59 | 3011.5 | 184.79 | 3111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 710 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2766.47 | 2771.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 6 GR 180.98 | ${ }_{2}^{22406.4}$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2245}^{2247}$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2768} 24$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2762} 27$ | ${ }_{188.9}^{180.9}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2667}$ |


| GR 178. GR 180. | $\begin{aligned} & 2775.92 \\ & 2912 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178.3 \\ & 180.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2775.99 \\ & 3192 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180.9 \\ & 181.9 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{3647}^{2777 \cdot 6}$ | 180.9 | . 67 | 180.9 | 2789.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 148$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008.902 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 184.75 | 2894 | 184.55 | 2994 | 184.4 | 2995.178 | 182.28 | 2999.297 | 181.47 | 3001.13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & G \mathrm{GR} \\ & \mathrm{GR} 184.43 \\ & \mathrm{GR} 184.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 301.905 \\ & 3109 \end{aligned}$ | 5181.57 | 3002.728 | 8 184.31 | 3006.35 | 184.41 | 3008.902 | 4.55 |  |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48500 |  | 14 | 2992 | 3008 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2010 | 0 | 0 |
| 184.9 | 2300 | 181.4 | ${ }^{2310}$ | 181.4 | ${ }^{2650}$ | 181.4 | 2810 | 181.2 | 50 |
| GR 1880.9 GR 180.9 | 2980 3035 | ${ }_{181.1}^{180.7}$ | ${ }_{3150}^{2992}$ | 178.2 181.5 | ${ }_{3500}^{2997}$ | ${ }_{188.2}^{178 .}$ | 3003 4000 | 180 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{49}^{0.1}$ | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 185.26 | 2894 | 185.06 | 2994 | 184.94 | ${ }_{2997.328}$ | 184.76 | 2997.913 | 181.84 | ${ }^{0} 004.357$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{GR} & 181.69 \\ \mathrm{GR} & 185.26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3004.762 \\ & \mathbf{3} 117 \end{aligned}$ | 281.81 | 3005.941 | 1184.42 | 3008.955 |  |  | 185.06 |  |
| vc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 16 | 2991 | 3009 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 184 | 22 | 18 | 2300 | 181.5 | 2525 | 181.5 |  | 181.5 |  |
| 181.3 | 2850 |  | 2925 |  | 2991 | 178.2 | 2996.7 | 178.2 | 3003.3 |
|  | 3009 | 181.2 | 3075 | 181.4 | 3140 | 181.5 | 3250 | 181.6 | 3450 |
| 182 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 20 | 2952 | 2971.34 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2280 2850 | ${ }_{182}^{182}$ | 2290 2950 295 | ${ }_{181.2}^{181.2}$ | ${ }_{295}^{2300}$ | 181.1 |  | 181 |  |
| 181 | ${ }_{2}^{2850} 0$ | 181 | 2950 | ${ }_{181}^{181.3}$ | ${ }_{3050}^{2952}$ | 180.1 | ${ }_{\substack{2959.032 \\ 3150}}$ |  | 2961.8 |
| 180.1 181.6 | ${ }_{3450}^{2964.914}$ | 181.2 181.9 | ${ }_{3750}^{2971.34}$ | 181 182 | 3050 4000 | 181.1 182.4 | 3150 4650 | 181.3 182.9 | 3250 5500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | ${ }_{10}{ }_{10} .045$ | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185.5 | 2894 | 185.3 | 2994 | 185.2 | 2997.059 | 184.9 | 2998.084 | 182.8 | 3003. |
| GR 182.3 | 3004.059 | 181.7 | 3007.922 | 184.8 | 3009.343 | 185.3 | 3010 | 185.5 |  |
| is is | EATED | section. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50350 |  |  | 2991 | 3009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 184 | 2295 | 181.5 | 2300 | 181.5 | 2525 | 181.5 | 2700 | 181.5 | 2800 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 1881.3$ | 2850 | ${ }^{181.1}$ | ${ }_{3}^{2925}$ | 181 | 2991 | 178.2 | 2996.7 | 178.2 | 3003.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3450 |



; High-chord transect for bridge 58.76 (River: 7th Concession D; Reach: 7th Concession).
;CORIED SECTION FROM SEC 58










| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 187.4 | $\begin{gathered} 2994 \\ 2994 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3001.572 \\ 185.3 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{0.0}{ }_{295.71}$ | 0.0 185 | ${ }_{2996.6}^{09}$ | $\stackrel{0}{185.2}$ | ${ }_{2997.64}$ |
| GR 187.2 | 3001.572 |  | 3002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 ${ }_{\text {GR }} 56$ G8. 18.7 |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }_{\text {3001. }}^{1875}$ | ${ }_{2994}$ | ${ }_{186.555}^{0.0}$ |  | 186.09 |  |
| GR 186.66 | 2999.644 | 187.999 | ${ }_{3001.675}$ | 181.66 | 3092 | ${ }_{188}^{186.555}$ | 3102 |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{2994}$ | 3008.541 187 | ${ }^{0.0} 9$ | ${ }_{10}^{0.0} 08$ |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |
| GR 187 | 3001.32 | 187.911 | ${ }_{3008.591}^{2993}$ | 188.8 188.7 | ${ }_{3010}^{2994}$ | ${ }_{188.9}$ | ${ }_{3110}^{2998.621}$ |  |  |
| nc 0. | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\times 1} 58$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008.551 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{CRR}_{6 \mathrm{CR}} 188.95$ | 2594 | 188.555 | 2994 | 187.7 | 2998.05 | 187.701 | 2999.828 | 187.8 | 3002.522 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}\text {; COPIED } \\ \text { NC } \\ \text { NECTION } & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.045\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 58.5 |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | 3008.551 <br> 189 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 189.5$ | ${ }_{3}^{2894}$ | 189.3 | 2993 | 189.055 | 2994 | 188.2 | 2998.05 | 188.201 | 2999.82 |
| GR 188.3 | 3002.522 | 189.065 | 3008.551 | 189.3 | 3009 | 189.5 | 3109 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - ${ }_{\text {GR }}$ 194.1 |  | 193.905 | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }^{30089} 1851$ | ${ }_{2998.05}$ | ${ }_{193.051}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{2999.828}$ | ${ }_{193.15}^{0}$ | ${ }_{3002.522}$ |
| GR 193.915 | 3008.551 | 194.11 | 3108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; High-chord transect for bridge 58.74 (River: 7 th Concession D; Reach:COPIED SECTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 158.74$ HC | . | 3.04 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GR 194.45 | 2594 | 194.4 | 3347.3 | 194.46 | 3408 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}\text {; Copied } \\ \text { NC } & 0.1 & \text { SECtion } \\ 0.1 & \text { FROM SEC } 58 \\ 0.045\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 58.745 |  |  | 2994 | 3008.551 | . 0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 194.45$ | 2594 | 194 | 2994 | 189 | 2998.05 | 193.201 | 2999.828 |  | 3002.52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DECTIoN from |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |












| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 0500 \\ 3000.177 \\ 31000 \\ 3900 \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 181.7 \\ & 179.8 \\ & 182 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \begin{array}{c} 2700 \\ 3007.135 \\ 3105 \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }_{182}^{19}$ | $\begin{array}{r}2994 \\ 203 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }^{3015.8}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ |  |  |  |
| GR 181.9 | 2850 | 181.6 | 2950 | 181.6 | 2994 | 179.6 |  |  |  |
| GR 179.8 | 3009.548 |  | 3015.8 | 181.5 | 3050 | 181 |  |  |  |
| GR 182.3 | 3180 | 182.6 | 3370 | 182.7 | 3600 | 182.9 |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \begin{array}{c} 2996.175 \\ 3101 \\ \hline 186.5 \end{array}{ }^{0} 0 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2997.781 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\times 180$ |  |  | 2994 | 3000.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2893 |  |  | 188 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {GR }}$ | 2998.638 | 188.1 | 3000 | 188. | 3001 | 189 |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0. | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{2996.891}{ }^{\text {187.6 }}$ |  | ${ }_{2997.571}$ |
| $\times 181$ |  |  | 2994 | 2999. | 0. | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188.9 | 2594 |  | 2994 | 187 | 2996.045 | 187 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188. | 2999.293 | 188 | 3399 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0. | . 045 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2995.925}^{0} \quad \stackrel{0}{187.6}$ |  | ${ }_{2996.651}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {X1 }}$ |  |  | 2994 | 998.552 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188 | 2998.552 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2998.696}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {C1 }} \mathrm{X1} 188.9$ |  | 188.5 | 299494 | ${ }^{30001.561} 18.6$ | ${ }^{0} 2994.908$ | 0.0 187.1 | $\stackrel{0}{2997.794}$ | ${ }_{187.6}$ |  |
| GR 188.5 | 3001.561 | 188.9 | 3401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  | 2994.0343100310 |  | ${ }_{2994.987}$ |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 2999 | . 0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 189.5 | 2893 | . 2 | 2993 | 188.71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188.45 | 2996.398 | 188.71 | 2999 | 189.2 | 3000 | 189.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{c} 094.583 \\ 2997.54 .525 \\ 299746 \\ 18.58 .35 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2995.032 \\ & 297967 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\times 187$ |  |  | 2994 | 2997 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 189.3 | 2893 | 相 | 2993 |  |  | 188.366 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187.4 | 2995. | 186.791 | 299 | 11 | 299 | 88.3 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 189. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0995.171 \\ 187.546 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | ${ }_{2996.074}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {K1 }} 1888$ |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }^{2998.364}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187.711 | 2996.87 | 535 | 2993 | 18988 | ${ }_{2999}$ | 187. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2893 |  | ${ }_{2993}$ | ${ }^{3000.356}$ | 2994 | 187 | $\bigcirc$ | 7.555 | 2996 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 189.6 184.6 | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{303.1 \\ 3425}}$ | 188.5 184.6 | ${ }_{3}^{3006}$ | ${ }_{189}^{189}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3050 \\ 4000 \\ 400 \end{gathered}$ | 184.5 | 3170 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{0.0} 80$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{101}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{160} 0$ | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & { }^{0.045} \\ & { }_{100}^{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1000 \\ & 1000 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {106. }}^{90.5}$ | ${ }^{0.0} 102.5$ | ${ }_{98}^{0.0} 9$ | 0.0 1004 | ${ }_{10}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{1006.5}^{0.0}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \\ & \hline 5.5 \\ & \hline 4.5 \\ & \hline 4.5 \\ & \hline 6.5 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ation o+1 } \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 .5 \\ & \text { an.5.5 } \\ & 49.5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 178,2 \\ 177 \\ 180.8 \\ 180 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 02.5 \\ & \text { ant.5 } \\ & 61.5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eono } 0 . \\ & \begin{array}{c} 43.5 \\ 39 \\ 37 \\ 97 \\ 92 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} { }^{4578.5} \\ \substack{177 \\ 1778.5 \\ 178} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & .{ }_{47}^{47.5} \\ & 58.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \text { a.8.5 } \\ & 177.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 49 \\ & 63 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \\ & 29 \\ & 49.5 \\ & 464.5 \\ & 66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.5 .9 \\ & .1779 .9 \\ & 179 \cdot 6 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & { }^{0.0} \\ & 32 \\ & 47 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 .0 \\ 179 \\ 1797 \\ 191 \\ 181 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.51 .5 \\ & \text { and.5 } \\ & 555 \end{aligned}$ |
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10yr






|  | (2) M M |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |






| 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1110 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1115 <br> 1120 <br> 1120 <br> 11200 <br> 11200 <br> 1120 <br> 1120 <br> 1120 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 11255 <br> 11255 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1125 <br> 1130 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1175 <br> 1175 <br> 1175 <br> 1175 <br> 1180 <br> 1180 <br> 1180 <br> 1180 <br> 1180 <br> 1180 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1185 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1190 <br> 1195 <br> 1195 <br> 1195 <br> 1195 <br> 1195 <br> 1195 |  |  |


|  |
| :---: |
|  <br>  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |

Upper Little River Model.
NoTe: The summary statistics displayed in this report are based on results found at every computat ional time step,
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Report rime step $\ldots \ldots \ldots$ oo: 00:05:00
vet Time step
Dry Time step $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots, \quad$ 00:05:00
Routing Time step $\ldots \ldots \ldots, ~ 30: 00$ sed
arring 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit warning 04: mininimum elevation drop used for conduit c10 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit C11 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c12 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c13 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C1

WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C14 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit Cl WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C17 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c1e warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c19 WaRNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit cz mapntag 04: minimum elevation drop wed for Conduit cer WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c2 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit C2 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ warving 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c4 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c5 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c6 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6025a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c6055a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c6060k warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c6135 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6180a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6220 warving 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c7 warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link c7025 Warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c7025 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c710

NARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c7105 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c710s NARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit ca warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c9 NARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit cJG warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit CJ66 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit CJ73 NaRNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit CJ76 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit cJ80 ARNing 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit CJ8 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit CJ84 warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link CJ87 waRning 03: negative offset ignored for Link cJs8 warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link or1180-1 WaRNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link or1205-1 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J10 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node 102 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J12 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J1 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J14 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J15 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J16 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node Jı

WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J18 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J19 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J2 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J 20 WARNTNG 02: maximum depth increased for Node T2l $^{2}$ WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J22 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J23 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J24 Warving 02: maximum depth increased for Node 32 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 3 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J33 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J37500 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J38 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J40 waRning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J40323 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J41 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J41106 WRRNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J48 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J49 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5015 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node 55025 Warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5030

WARving 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5045 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5065 VARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 55080 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J509 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5110 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5150 VARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 5518 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5190 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J56 waRNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J58 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node 558.5 warving 02: maximum depth increased for Node $J 67$ warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J6 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node $J 7$ WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node $J 71$ warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J72 TapNTNG 02: maximum depth increased for Node J7 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node JTS WRRNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 776 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node Ј8 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J80 VARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J8

WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 584
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J85
marntwg 02: maximum depth increased tor not
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J87
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J88
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J89
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node
WARvivg 02: maximum depth increased for Node J90
Rainfall File Summary

APR-02-1960

Total Precipitation
Evaporation Loss
Infiltration Loss
Infiltration Loss.
Surface Runoff
Finat
Final Surface estorage......
Continuity Error (8)

************************
Dry Weather Inflow $\ldots \ldots$
Dry Weather Inflo
Wet weather Intio
Groundwater Inflo
Inflow

External Inflow
External
Thtflow

| Volume hectare-m | ${ }_{\text {Volume }}^{\text {V }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 14.985 | 3149.884 |
| 0.000 | 0.000 |
| ${ }^{0.000}$ | ${ }^{0.0000}$ |
| 3. 62 | 3136.238 |


| Storage Losses | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial stored volume .... | 0.000 | ${ }^{0.001}$ |
|  | 0.648 0.228 | 6.479 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Highest Continuity Er |  |  |
| Node J5190 (20.788) |  |  |
| Node J102 (5.648) |  |  |
| Node J29 ${ }^{(4.818)}$ |  |  |
| Node J58.5 (-3.998) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ********** |  |  |
| Time-Step Critical Elements |  |  |
| Link C12 (38.458) |  |  |
| Link C18 (34.368) |  |  |
| Link C17 (9.098) |  |  |
| Link C20 (7.098) |  |  |
| Link C1 (3.128) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Highest Flow Instability Ind |  |  |
| Link CJ64 (8) |  |  |
| Link CJ66 (6) |  |  |
| Link C7025 (5) |  |  |
| Link CJ65 (4) |  |  |
| Link C8 (4) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ********************* |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {Rout ing }}^{\text {Time }}$ (textep Summary |  |  |
| Minimum Time step | 0.50 sec |  |
| Average Time Step | 2.64 sec |  |
| Maximum Time Step | 30.00 sec |  |
| Pexcent in Steady State | ${ }^{0.00}$ |  |
| Average Iterations per step | 2.28 |  |


| Subcatchment | $\substack{\text { Total } \\ \text { Precip } \\ \text { nin }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Rounon } \\ \text { Rn } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Evap } \\ \text { min } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \substack{\text { Tiffil } \\ \text { mm }} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Runof } \\ \text { mim } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Runoff } \\ 10^{\circ} 61 t r \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Peak } \\ \text { Runoff } \\ \text { CMS } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Runoff } \\ \text { Coeff }}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.02 | 97.43 | 93.95 | 14.22 | 0.901 |
| 1002 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.53 | 84.19 | 133.37 | 17.76 | 0.778 |
| 1005 1007 | 108.17 108.17 | 0.00 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | - $\begin{array}{r}9.05 \\ 21.36\end{array}$ | ${ }_{86.40}^{98.53}$ | 50.80 18.18 | 12.26 <br> $\substack{3.29 \\ \hline \\ \hline}$ | 0.911 |
| 1010 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }_{20.03}$ | 87.77 | 33.73 | 6.77 | ${ }_{0} .811$ |
| 1015 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 18.15 | 89.74 | 12.87 | 3.46 | 0.830 |
| 1020 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 45.09 | ${ }^{63.06}$ | 58.61 | 3.29 | 0.583 |
| 1025 1027 | 108.17 108.17 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 32.00 3.52 | 76.02 103.84 | 10.58 58.68 | - ${ }^{1.63} 1$ | 0.703 0.960 |
| 1030 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.94 | 198.67 <br>  <br> 93 | 32.97 | $\begin{array}{r}11.60 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }^{0.912}$ |
| 1035 | 108.17 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | $\begin{array}{r}44.53 \\ 4.50 \\ \hline 2.50\end{array}$ | 63.63 103 | ${ }^{66.96}$ | 3.80 5 5 | 0.588 |
| 1045 | ${ }_{108.17}$ | ${ }_{0} 0.00$ | ${ }_{0} 0.00$ | - 42.09 | 103.89 66.07 | 17.66 | 1.07 | ${ }_{0.611}^{0.960}$ |
| 1050 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 42.59 | 65.53 | 80.34 | 6.89 | 0.606 |
| 1055 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }^{43.66}$ | ${ }^{64.50}$ | 20.62 | 1.19 | 0.596 |
| 1060 1065 | 108.17 108.17 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 46.63 33.84 | ${ }_{74.23}^{61.52}$ | 70.96 21.55 | 3.88 3.02 | 0.569 0.686 |
| 1070 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 51.40 | 56.74 | ${ }_{49.92}^{21.95}$ | 2.60 | ${ }_{0}^{0.525}$ |
| 1072 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.56 | 103.76 | 55.59 | 9.55 | 0.959 |
| 1075 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.21 | 67.95 | 26.20 | 1.71 | 0.628 |
| ${ }_{1080}^{1085}$ | 108.17 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 48.27 <br> 4.05 | 59.84 |  | 13.28 4 4 123 | 0.553 |
| 1085 1090 | ${ }_{108.17}^{108.17}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | ${ }_{4}^{49.05}$ | 59.10 66.69 | 79.77 16.53 | ${ }_{1}^{4.23}$ | - |
| 1095 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 49.65 | 58.50 | 94.29 | 4.97 | 0.541 |
| 1100 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 49.01 | 59.14 | ${ }^{31.82}$ | 1.69 | 0.547 |
| 1105 1110 | 108.17 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 38.10 44.70 | 69.88 ${ }_{6}^{6.45}$ | -96.56 | 11.65 | -0.646 |
| 1115 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 38.26 | 69.87 | 79.47 | 7.49 | 0.646 |
| 1120 <br> 1125 <br> 1 | 108.17 10817 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 44.25 4.28 | 63.90 | 9.74 | 5.18 | 0.591 |
| 1125 1130 | 108.17 108.17 | O.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 44.48 50.61 |  | 55. 139 130.34 | 3.16 6.82 | 0.589 0.532 |
| ${ }_{1135}^{1135}$ | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.26 | 67.89 | 23.99 | ${ }^{1.56}$ | 0.628 |
| 1135 1140 | ${ }_{108.17}^{108.17}$ | - | - | 42.87 29.13 | ${ }_{78.93}^{65.28}$ | 15.94 20.36 | - | - ${ }^{0.604}$ |
| 1145 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 47.87 | 60.24 | 97.52 | 7.78 | 0.557 |
| 1150 1155 | 108.17 108.17 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 31.71 46.85 | 76.32 61.30 | 10.10 | ${ }_{1}^{1.57}$ | 0.7 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  | 00000000000000 :8:8:8:8:8:8:8:8: |
|  | 00000000000000 $: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8: 8:$ |
|  |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  |  <br>  |
|  | Oo. O0000000000 |

## $\underset{\substack{\text { Tode } \\ * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~ S u n ~}}{ }$

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Node \& Type \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Average } \\
\text { Depth } \\
\text { Meters }
\end{array}
$$ \& Maximum
Depth
Meters \& Maximum
HGL
Meters \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Time of Max Occurrence days hr:min} <br>
\hline Ј0.5 \& Junction \& 1.93 \& 2.80 \& 180.70 \& 0 \& 12 <br>
\hline J0.75 \& JUNCT T ON \& 1.84 \& 3.39 \& 181.79 \& 0 \& <br>
\hline J0. 8 \& JUNCTITON \& 2.05 \& 3.49 \& ${ }^{181.59}$ \& 0 \& 17:25 <br>
\hline J0.9 \& JUNCT ToN \& 1.61 \& 3.00
1.85 \& 181.60
186.85 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 17:25 <br>
\hline ${ }^{1}$ \& Junction \& 0.77 \& 1.85 \& 186.85 \& 0 \& 08:23 <br>
\hline ${ }^{310}$ \& JUNCT ToN \& 1.96 \& 3.34 \& 182.16 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 15:49 <br>
\hline ${ }^{3102}$ \& JUNCT ToN \& 0.88 \& 1.79 \& 182.52
183.61 \& 0 \& 14:07 <br>
\hline ${ }^{5105}$ \& JUNCTION \& 0.81
0.59 \& 1.67 1.45 \& ${ }_{183.65}^{183.61}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 10:03 <br>
\hline ${ }_{5106}$ \& JUNCTION \& 0.34 \& 1.12 \& 183.93 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 09:33 <br>
\hline J107 \& JUNCTITON \& 0.32 \& 1.19 \& 185.38 \& 0 \& 08:45 <br>
\hline ${ }^{111}$ \& Junction \& ${ }^{0.32}$ \& 1.23 \& 185.43 \& 0 \& 08:45 <br>
\hline ${ }^{312}$ \& Junction \& 1.91 \& 3.42 \& 182.52 \& 0 \& 15:33 <br>
\hline ${ }_{114} 12$ \& JUNCTION \& ${ }^{2.61}$ \& 3.69 \& 186.69 \& 0 \& 09:12 <br>
\hline J14

115 \& JUNCTION \& 1.80
1.81 \& 3.36
3.36

3. \& | 188.42 |
| :--- |
| 183.54 | \& $\bigcirc$ \& 14:56 <br>

\hline ${ }^{1} 16$ \& Juncrion \& 1.75 \& 3.24 \& 183.75 \& 0 \& 14:06 <br>
\hline 317 \& JUNCTION \& 2.28 \& 3.60 \& 180.81 \& 0 \& 18:08 <br>
\hline ${ }^{18}$ \& Juncrion \& 1.27 \& 2.67 \& 184.30 \& 0 \& 13:44 <br>
\hline ${ }_{51} 12$ \& JUNCT ToN \& ${ }^{0.83}$ \& ${ }_{3}^{1.59}$ \& -84.79 \& 0 \& 13:11 <br>
\hline \& JUNCTION \& 2.27 \& 3.73 \& 181.59 \& \& 25 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Flow Classification Summary

| Conduit | $\underset{\substack{\text { Adjusted } \\ \text { Actual } \\ \text { Length }}}{\substack{\text { ate }}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fract } \\ & \text { Or } \\ & \text { Ory } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on of } \\ & \text { Down } \\ & \text { Doy } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Time } \\ & \text { Simb } \\ & \text { Cub } \\ & \text { Crit } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Class } \\ & \text { Cp } \\ & \text { Crit } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Down } \\ & \text { Crit } \end{aligned}$ | Avg. ${ }^{\text {Froude }}$ Number | $\begin{gathered} -\cdots-1 .-1 \\ \text { AgG. } \\ \text { FIow } \end{gathered}$ $\begin{aligned} & \text { HRow } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | . 00 | 0.05 |  |
| c10 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {C11 }}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c12 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 |  |
| C13 C14 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | - 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| c14 | 1.00 | 0.00 0.10 | 0.01 |  | - | 0 | 0.00 | 0.42 0.07 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mong促 ㅇop00000000000000000000000000000000000000000 .



 앙․ㅇ․ㅇ․ㅇㅇㅇ․








Al11 slopes are assumed to be 0.158 (from Turkey Creek and Little River Subwatershed study -
Dillon Consulting Limited, June 1998).




| tsubca | Raingage | Out1et | Total Area | Pont. Imperv | Width | Pent. Slope | Curb <br> Length | Snow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ; 6 th Conc Road Drain North of 401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Drain, between | baseline and | ion Rd |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2005{ }^{24 \mathrm{hr}}{ }^{\text {j6 }}$ |  |  | 48.04 | 60 | 1300 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| $2007{ }^{2} 4 \mathrm{hrr}$, |  | j31 | 20. | 60 | 00 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{2010}^{j \text { East }}$ of 6 th Conc Drain, south |  | ${ }^{4} 31$ | 40.96 | 60 | 800 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {; Drains }}$ Doto 7 th Conc Road Drain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | J54 | 10.55 | 60 | 00 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
|  |  | s2020 | 66.13 | 67 | 1400 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Svincial Rd |  |  | 300 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2027} \times 7$ th Conc Drain | south of 401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 hhr | 8.7 | 59.42 | 60 | 900 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{i}^{28 \text { th }}$ Conc Drain, | ${ }_{24 \mathrm{hr}}{ }^{\text {a }}$ (ong Baseline | s2030 | 117.58 | 49 | 1000 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {; }}^{2030}$ Conc Drain, | north of 401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2035}$ | 2 hhr | s2035 | 81.42 | 63 | 1400 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{2040}^{88 \mathrm{th}}$ Conc Drain, | between 401 and | ${ }_{\text {J2 }}{ }^{\text {division Rd. }}$ | 25.6 | 60 | 500 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{2045}^{\text {i }}$ Hayes Drain at B | Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{24 \mathrm{hrx}}$ | s2045 | ${ }^{63.81}$ | ${ }^{43}$ | 900 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ;To Hayes Drain, | 24 hr | s2050 | 97.34 | 47 | 1200 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ${ }^{2} 9055$ Conc Drain, | ${ }_{24 \mathrm{hr}}^{\text {at Baseline }}$ | s2055 | 65.11 | 50 | 900 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
|  | north of 401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2060 ( 2000 | south of 401 |  |  | 57 | 700 | 0.15 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| ${ }_{2065}^{\text {joth Conc Drain so }}$ | ${ }^{24 \mathrm{hr}}$ | S2065 | 116.33 | 77 | 1000 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ;To Little River, | ${ }_{24 \mathrm{hr}}$ |  | 94.85 | 5 | 1300 | 0.15 | 0 |  |
| ;To Hurley Drain | 24 hr | ${ }^{54}$ | 42.27 | 60 | 700 | 0.15 | 0 |  |









| iRiver: Washbrook |
| :--- |
| RReach: Washbrook |

; Reach: Washbro
FTransect: 44
J80
Sransect: ${ }^{44} 1$ 180
; River: Washbrooke
Reach: Washbrook
iRiver: Washbrook
;Rean: Washbrook
;Transect:
81

Reach: Baseline to Wats
Junction: of upper reach of Little River and 6th Concession
thiope of 6 th Concession (c6055a-d)



| iReach: washbroo |
| :--- |
| $\substack{\text { i. Transect: } \\ \text { J88 } \\ 88}$ |

iTransect: : 88
J88
;River: Washbroo
;Reach: Washbroole
Reach: Washbrooke
Transect: 89

Reach: Watson River
TTransect: 9
River: Little River 17844
Reach: Baseline to wats
;Reach: Baselii

| County Road 42 |
| :--- |
| JJunction of catchments |
| T92 |
| 17110,1115 |

:River: Little River
Reach: Watson to Desjardein





| iReach: Watson to soulliere in C 6135 b | J95 | 85 | 0.045 | 178.15 | 178.1 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10th Concession Drain <br> Transect copied from Transect 102 from adjacent Watson Drain <br> Conduit copied to provide outlet for Catchment 1145 <br> ; Slope, Length, Manning's $n$ from SWMHYMO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow[\text { C6145 }]{\text { CRiver: Little }}$ |  | 1140 | 0.045 | 179 | 178.864 | 0 | 0 |
| ; Reach: watson to Desjardeins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | for tra | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{t} \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | 0.045 | 178.1 | 178 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;Reach: Dessardeins to Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Adjusted from hec-ras impor | Uton | d ju | delete | 1eng | d | rd |  |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { C6160a }}$ (River: Little River ${ }^{\text {J96 }}$ | J24 | 270 | 0.045 | 178 | 178 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C6160b J2 | ${ }^{546203}$ | 410 | 0.045 | 178 | 177.7 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{3} 46102$ | 426 | 0.045 | 177.7 | 177.1 | 0 | 0 |
| iRiver: Little River ${ }_{\text {R }}$ Reach: Lachance to Goui |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | J43501 | 194 | 0.045 | 177.1 | 176.9 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Reach: Lachance to goui |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | J41106 | 90 | 0.045 | 177.2 | 177.1 | 0 | 0 |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | J40323 | 78.2 | 0.045 | 177.1 | 177 | 0 |  |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;River: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | J5 | 150 | 0.045 | 176.9 | 176.8 | 0 |  |
| indiver: Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ;This is a Repeated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C6180e J37500 | J5205 | 150 | 0.045 | 176.8 | 176.7 | 0 | 0 |





| W2100 | Rectopen | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W2105 | ${ }_{\text {Rectoremen }}^{\text {Rect }}$ | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2115 | RECTIOPEN | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| ${ }_{\text {W2130 }}$ W2125 | ${ }_{\text {Rect }}^{\text {Rect }}$ OPEN | 1 | 5 | 5 <br> 5 | 5 |
| W2133 | Rectopen |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2135 | RECT-OPEN | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2140 | RECTOPEN | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| ${ }_{W} \mathbf{W} 2165$ | ${ }_{\text {RECT }}^{\text {RePE }}$ | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| W2175 | Rectoopen | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2185 | Rectopen | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2190 | RECT-OPEN | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| W2200 | RECT-OPEN | 1 | 5 | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | 5 |
| ${ }_{\text {W2215 }}$ W2210 | ${ }_{\text {RECCT }}^{\text {RePEN }}$ | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

[transects]
; Copy of desuardeins drain section 4
Nc 0.1
0.1
 ;High-chord transect for bridge 0.35 (River: Gouin; Reach: Gouin)
; COPY OF DESJARDETNS DRATN SECTITN

; copy of desuardetns drain section 4





| $\begin{array}{ll} \begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{x} 1 & 0.75 \\ \text { GR } \\ \text { GR } & 181.7 \end{array} \\ \hline 181.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2605 \\ & 3024.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{8}{181.3}_{\substack{181.6}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3005.457 \\ \text { 300. } 5777 \\ 3038.4977 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3024.75 \\ & 7178.6 \\ & 7182 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 3009.33 \\ & 3438 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{178.4}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{3014.085}^{0}$ | $\stackrel{0}{178.5}$ | ${ }_{3017.186}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; Copy of | SJardeins | DRAIN SECTION 4 - based on 1997 SWM report, dimensions of the drain are accurate; 3 m bottom, $2: 1$ side slope:0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nc $\times 10.1$ $\times 10.9$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 181.9$ | 2605 | 181.5 |  |  |  | 0.0178.6 | ${ }_{3014.085}^{0} 178.7$ |  | ${ }_{3017.186}^{0}$ |
| GR 181.7 | 3024.75 | 181.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | $22^{0.045}$ | 2993 | 3012.47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {CR }}{ }_{\text {K1 }} 1818$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2525}$ | ${ }^{0.0} 181.5$ | ${ }_{2700}$ | ${ }_{181.5}^{0}$ | ${ }_{2800}$ |
| GR 181.3 | 2850 | ${ }_{181.1}$ | 2925 | 181 | 2990.2 | 180.5 | 2991.5 | ${ }_{180.5}^{1815}$ | 2992 |
| GR ${ }_{\text {GR }} 1818.5$ | ${ }_{3002.54}^{2993}$ | 179.6 | ${ }_{\substack{2994.91 \\ 3012.47}}$ | 179.3 | 2995.65 | 178.5 | 2997.625 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 11818.7$ | ${ }_{3650}^{3002.54}$ |  |  | 181 | 3140 | 181.5 | 3250 | 181 | 345 |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; High-cho <br> NC 0.1 | transect <br> 0.1 | for bridge 1. |  | River: Little River; |  | Reach: | Desjar |  |  |
| x1 1.5_HC |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23300 \\ & 3140 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{0} 182.5$ | ${ }_{2991}^{0.0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 183.4 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{2991.1}^{0}$ | ${ }_{183.4}^{0}$ | 03009.1 |
|  | 2295 | 182.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 182.5 | 3009.2 | 182.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{X} 1} 1.6$ |  |  | 2993 | 3012.47 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2295 | 181.5 | ${ }_{290}^{2300}$ | 181.5 | 2525 | 181.5 | 2700 | 181.5 | 2800 |
| GR 181.3 | ${ }_{2850}^{2850}$ | ${ }^{181.1}$ | 2925 | 181 | ${ }_{2990.2}$ | 1880.5 | ${ }^{2991.5}$ |  |  |
| GR 178.6 | ${ }_{302}^{2993}$ | ${ }_{181.9}$ | 2994.91 3012.47 | ${ }_{181.4}^{179.3}$ | ${ }_{3140}^{295.65}$ | ${ }_{181.5}^{178.5}$ | ${ }_{3250}^{299.625}$ | 178.1 | 3000.09 |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 110$ |  | 21 |  | 3017. |  | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 184 | 1900 | 184 | 1940 | 184 | 2000 | 184 | 2300 | 184 |  |
| GR ${ }_{\text {GR }} 1789.8$ | ${ }_{3001.004}^{2800}$ | 184 179 |  |  | ${ }_{2949.9} \mathbf{3 0 1 0} 7$ |  |  | ${ }_{182}^{181.6}$ | 2994 |
| GR 184 | 3050.1 | 184 | 3150 | 184 | 3300 | 184 | 3500 | 184 | 3750 |
| GR 18 | 4300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[LE: 2950] [RE: 3050]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline nc 0.045 \& . 045 \& 0.03 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {K1 }}^{\text {K1 }} 180$ (orig) \& \& ${ }_{182}^{19}$ \& 2994

1940 \& ${ }_{3017} 18214$ \& \& ${ }^{0.0}$ \& ${ }_{2300}$ \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 18188$ \& 1900 \& ${ }_{182}^{182}$ \& ${ }_{2845}^{1940}$ \& ${ }_{182}^{182}$ \& ${ }_{2950}^{2000}$ \& 182 \& ${ }_{2909}^{2300}$ \& 182 \&  <br>
\hline \& 3005.344 \& 179 \& 3010.77 \& 181.6 \& 3017.014 \& 182 \& 3050 \& 182 \& <br>
\hline GR \& 3300 \& 182.5 \& 3500 \& 182 \& 375 \& 184 \& ${ }_{43}$ \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{; Proposed Channel Section with SWM} <br>
\hline nc 0. \& 0.1 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline X1 1001 \& \& 10 \& 78.5 \& 82. \& 0.0 \& 0. \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR \& 63. \& \& \& 97 \& 76 \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline GR 96.7 \& 81 \& 97 \& 82.5 \& 97 \& 85 \& 99. \& \& \& $$
100
$$ <br>

\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {K1 }}^{\text {X1 }} 1002$ \& \& 12 \& 86 \& 90 \& 0.0 \& 0.0 \& 0 \& 0 \& <br>
\hline GR 100 \& \& \& ${ }^{66}$ \& \& \& \& \& 96 \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 97.7}$ \& ${ }_{120}^{92.5}$ \& 95.7 \& 93.5 \& 96 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{opy of SEC 18 from littile river dratn}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& 299 \& ${ }^{3} 18.494$ \& \& ${ }^{0} 0$ \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 182.5}$ \& ${ }_{3002}^{253045}$ \& 185.2 \& ${ }_{3003.498}$ \& ${ }_{184.5}^{184.3}$ \& ${ }_{3300}^{2994}$ \& ${ }_{185}^{182.4}$ \& ${ }_{4000}^{2997.988}$ \& \& <br>

\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{| ; COPY OF | SEC 20 | FROM LITTLE | RIVER DRAIN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |}} <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 186.5 \& 2594 \& 186.1 \& 2994 \& 185.3 \& 2995.615 \& 184 \& 2997.731 \& \& 2999.748 <br>
\hline GR 186.3 \& 3001.563 \& 186.7 \& 3401 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{; COPY OF
NC 0.1
0.1
SEC
0.1
0.1
FROM
LITTTLE
0.045}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline x1 104 \& \& \& 2994 \& 3001.563 \& 0.0 \& 0.0 \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 186.5
GR 186.3 \& ${ }_{3001.563}^{2594}$ \& 186.1
186.7 \& 2994
3401 \& 185.3 \& 2995.615 \& \& 2997.731 \& \& 299 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline NC. 0.1
$\times 11$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 186.7 \& \& \& 2994 \& \& \& \& 3001.978 \& \& <br>
\hline GR 186.2 \& 3005.278 \& 186.3 \& 3006 \& 186.6 \& 3406 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Of Sec 23 from littie river drain} <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}



| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 185.2$ | 2900 | 185 | 3000 3000 | 3004.8 183.5 | 3001.9 | ${ }_{183.5}^{0.0}$ | 3002.9 | ${ }_{185}^{0}$ | ${ }_{3004.8}$ |
| GR 185.2 | 3105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; From Desjar | din Dra | n Plan | nd |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $6{ }^{0.045}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185.2 | 2900 | 185 | 3000 | 182 | 3004.5 | 182 | 3006 | 185 | 3010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; From Twin | Oaks Bui | sness Par | k SWM Repor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | .045 | 3000 | 3013 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 185.2 | 2900 | 185 | 3000 | 182 | 3006 | 182 | 3007 | 185 | 3013 |
| GR 185.2 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; From Profil |  |  | Lappan Dra | rain a | McGill out1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 1115$ |  |  | 3000 | 3007.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |
| GR ${ }_{\text {GR }} 1855.2$ | 2900 | 185 | 3000 | 183 | ${ }^{3003}$ | 185 | 3004.5 | 185 | 3007.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; From Profil |  |  | Lappan Dra | rain and M | McGi1 |  |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 $\times 11116$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185.2 |  | ${ }_{185}$ | 3000 | ${ }_{183.5}$ | 3002.2 | 183.5 | 3003.7 | 185 | 3005.9 |
| GR 185.2 | 3106 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ; From Plan, | Profile, | and Cro | ss Section | of the | Gouin Drain |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 1117$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR GR 185.2 | 2900 | 185 | 3000 | 183 | 3003 | 183 | 3004 | 185 | 3007 |
| GR 185.2 | 3107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 12$ |  | 20 | 2994 | 3023.947 |  | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 1884.3$ | 1900 | 183 | 1940 | 183 | 2000 | 183 | 2300 | 183 | 2630 |
| GR 183 | 2800 | 183 | 2875 | 183 | 2950 | 183 |  | 180.1 | 3003. |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 183}$ | ${ }_{3006.565}^{3005}$ | 179.1 | ${ }_{\substack{3099.925 \\ 3150}}$ | ${ }_{183}^{18.1}$ | 3014.217 3300 | 180. | 3015.716 3500 | 183.2 | 3023. 3750 |
| GR 183 | 3050 | 183 | 3150 | 183 | 3300 | 183 | 3500 | 183.2 |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 1.3$ |  | 18 | 2994 | 3017.137 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 183.9 | 2250 | 183.4 | 2350 | 183.7 | 2480 | 183.1 | 2620 | 183 | 2675 |


\% High-chord transect for bridge
NC 0.1
0.025
0.1

| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { NC } & 0.1 \\ \times 113.25\end{array}$ | 0.1 | ${ }_{10} 0$. | 0 | - |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR 183.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 2994 \end{array}$ | 183.9 | 2994. |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { GR } & 183.9\end{array}$ | ${ }_{3006}$ | ${ }_{183.1}^{183.1}$ | 3040 | 183.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 2950 \\ & 3270 \end{aligned}$ | 183.4 | 3350 | 184 | 4000 |







| GR 184 | 3210 | 184.8 | 3260 | 184.8 | 345 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | transect for bridge 16.5 (River: Little River; Reach: Baseline to Wats). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 185.2 \\ & 184.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \substack{2300 \\ 3170} \end{aligned}$ | 0.0 184.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 2710 \\ & 37250 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 184.6 \\ & 184.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 303.1 \\ & 3030 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1000 |  | 000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3006 | 184.6 | 3050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 117$ | .1 |  | 299 | 305 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 185 | 2000 | 184.7 | 2300 | 184.5 | 2550 |  | 2710 |  | 2880 |
| GR 183.7 | 2950 | 183.938 | 2993 | 180.916 |  | 180 | 29 | 180. | 3001 |
| GR 183.6 | 3050 | 183.9 | 3170 | 184.1 | 3225 | 184.3 |  |  |  |
| GR 185 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2999 | 3009.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 185.5 | 2990 | 185.2 |  | 184.3 | 3000 | 182.4 | 3004 | 181.6 | 3006.1 |
| GR 182.5 | 3008 | 185.2 | 3009.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 119$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008.988 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |
| GR 186.4 | 2899 | 186.2 | 2993 | 185.7 | 2994 |  | 2996.861 | 184 | 2999.958 |
| GR 185 | 3003.863 | 185.9 | 3008.988 | 8186.2 | 3009 | 186.4 | 3100 |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {K1 }}^{\text {C1 }} 184$ |  | ${ }_{181}^{181.5}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2925}$ | ${ }^{2944.65}$ | ${ }^{2} 25$ | ${ }_{181.5}^{0.0}$ |  | ${ }_{181.5}$ | 2800 |
| GR 181.3 | 2850 | ${ }_{181.1}$ | 2925 | 178.6 | 2928.98 | 178 | 2932.22 | 178.5 | 2935.995 |
| GR 181.6 | 2944.65 | 181.2 | 3075 | 181.4 | 3140 | 181.5 | 3250 |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {CR }}{ }_{\text {G1 }} 1806.5$ |  |  | ${ }_{2993}^{2994}$ | ${ }_{\substack{3001.563 \\ 186.1}}$ |  | ${ }_{185.3}^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{2} 995.615$ | ${ }_{184}^{0}$ | 2997.731 |
| GR 185 | 2999.748 | 186.3 | 3001.563 | ¢ 186.5 | 3101 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{12} 21$ |  |  | 2994 | ${ }^{3001.563}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 186.5 | 2594 | 186.1 | 2994 | 185.3 | 2995.615 |  | 2997.731 | 185 | 2999.748 |
| GR 186.3 | 3001.563 | 186.7 | 3401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 22 |  |  | 2994 | 3005.278 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 186.5 | 2894 | 186.3 | 2994 | 184.9 | 2998 |  | 3001. | 185.1 | 3004.914 |
| GR 186.2 | 3005.278 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NC } 0.1 \\ & \text { X1 } 23 \\ & \text { GR } 186.85 \\ & \text { GR } 186.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 2615 \\ & 3025.443 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7^{0.045} \\ & 1866.455 \\ & 186.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3015.126 \\ 3015.126 \\ 3425 \\ \hline 425 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3025.443 \\ & 6185.3 \end{aligned}$ | 3019.358 | ${ }^{0.0} 185.111$ | 3021.732 | 185.3 | 3023.129 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3005.566 1855 1855 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0. | ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{0}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { GR } & 186.75\end{array}$ | $3005.566$ | 186.88 187.15 | 2994 3405 | 185.555 | 2996.426 | 185.225 | 2998 | 85 | 300 |
| ; Upstream of desjardins junctionNC 0.10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185 | 2280 | 182 | 2290 | 181.2 | 2300 | 181.1 |  | 181 |  |
|  | 2850 | 181 | 2950 | 180.4 | 2950 |  | 2955.12 |  | 2964.396 |
|  | 2977. | 181.2 | 2981. | 181.3 | 325 | 181 |  | 181. |  |
| GR 182 | 4000 | 182.4 | 4650 | 182.9 | 550 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 132$ |  |  | 299 | 3010.776 | . 0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |
| 185.5 | 2893 | 185.3 | 2993 |  |  | 184.726 |  |  |  |
| GR 182.219 GR 185.209 | 3000.193 3010 | 183.425 | ${ }_{3011}^{3000.857}$ | ${ }_{185.5}^{184.746}$ | ${ }_{3111}^{3004.5}$ | 184.978 | 3005.949 |  | 3007.195 |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 133$ |  |  | 2994 | 3007.807 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 185.9$ |  | 185.7 |  | 184.69 |  | 184.46 |  |  |  |
| GR GR 1855.7 | 3000 3008 | 182.76 185.9 | ${ }_{3108}^{3001.067}$ |  | 3004.397 |  | 3005.992 |  | 3007.807 |
|  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 185. |  |  |  | 185.21 |  | 185 |  |  |  |
| GR 183.49 | 2998. | 183.76 | 2999. | 185.12 | 3001. |  | 3004.25 |  | 3005.229 |
| GR 185.54 | 3008.898 | 185.6 | 3009 | 185.8 | 3109 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 134001$ |  | 15 | 2990 | 3010 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 182 | 2590 | 181 | 2600 | 180.8 | 270 | 180. | 2830 | 180 |  |
| GR 179.9 | 2990 | 176. | 2998 | 176.7 | 3002 | 179.9 | 30 | 179. |  |
| GR 179.5 | 3065 | 180 | 3085 | 180.5 | 3145 | 180.7 | 327 | 181 | 34 |
|  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3008. | . 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2893 | 185.8 | 2993 | 185.54 | 2994 | 184.41 | 2996.028 | 183. | 2996.871 |


| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { GR } & 183.81 \\ \text { GR } & 185.72\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2997.366 \\ & 3005.411 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6184.08 \\ & 185.79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2997.881 \\ 30078 \\ 3089 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 184.35 \\ \hline 9 \\ \hline 9 \\ 185.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2998.831 \\ & 3009 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{186}^{185.41}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3000.964 \\ & 3109 \end{aligned}$ | 185.63 | 3003.071 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| we 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 135002$ |  | 19 | 2990 | 3010 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 200 |  | 0 |
| GR 183 | 2500 | 182 | 2590 |  | 2600 | 180.8 | 2700 | 180.6 | 2830 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{6 R} 1180$ | 2900 3018 | 179.9 | 2990 3065 | 176.7 180 | 2998 3085 | 176. | 3002 3145 | 179.9 180.7 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 181819$. | 3018 3430 | 179.5 181.5 | 3065 4000 | 180 182 | 3085 4750 | 180 182 18 |  |  |  |
| \% High-chord transect for bridge 35092.5 (River: Little River; Reach: Gouin to DS end).; This is a REPARED section. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 135092$. |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2500 | 180.6 | 2630 | 180.5 |  | 181 | 2950 | 181.4 | 83 |
| GR 181.4 | 2989.2 | 182 | 2989.3 | 182 | 3013.9 | 181.4 | 3014 | 181.4 |  |
| GR 181 | 3065 | 180.9 | 3085. | 180.6 | 3170. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 135183$ |  | 23 | 2992.7 | 3007.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 183 | 2500 | 180.6 | 2630 | 180.5 |  | 180 | 2900 | 179.4 |  |
| GR 179.9 | 2983 | 177.9 | 2989.2 | 177.9 | 2989.3 | 176.8 | 2992.7 | 177.4 | 2992.8 |
| GRGR1799.8 | 2994.6 | 176.8 | 3000 | 176.8 | 3007.4 | 176.8 | 3007.5 | 179.3 | 3013.9 |
|  | 3014 3145 | 179.9 180.6 | ${ }_{3170}^{3015.3}$ | 179.5 | ${ }_{3275}^{3018}$ | 179.5 | 3065 | 180 | 3085 |
| GR 180.5 | 3145 | 180.6 | 3170 | 180.7 | 3275 |  |  |  |  |
| NC$\times 1$$\times 1$$\frac{0.1}{35404}$ GR 181.9GR 176.8 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{180.4}^{11}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2991 \\ & 29654 \\ & 3004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3009 \\ 180.4 \\ 179.4 \\ 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 2800 \\ & 3009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 180.4 \\ & 179.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2920 \\ 3030 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 179.9 \\ 180.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2991 \\ 3177 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | ${ }_{2996}^{2640}$ | 176.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3370 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 300 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR } 186.5}$ | 2893 | 186.3 | 2993 | 185.85 | 299 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 1886.38$ | 2998.331 | 1185.76 | 3000. |  | 3002.265 |  | 3004.351 | 186. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{X} 136000}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{GR}^{182}$, | 2640 | 180.5 | ${ }_{2605}^{265}$ | 180.5 | 2800 | 180.5 | ${ }^{2920}$ | 180 | ${ }_{2991}$ |
| GR 176.9 GR 181 | 2996 3370 | 176.9 | 3004 | 179.5 | 3009 | 180 | 3035 | 180.5 | 3175 |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |













| $\begin{aligned} & \text { GR } 178.1 \\ & \text { GR } 177.2 \\ & \text { GR } 180.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993 \\ & 306.1 \\ & 3060 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 178.1 \\ 177.2 \\ 181 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993.1 \\ & 3906.2 \\ & 3220 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 178 \\ & 181 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993.9 \\ & 3007 \\ & 3300 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 178 \\ & 181.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2999 \\ & 3007.1 \\ & 340 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 177.2 \\ & 179.9 \end{aligned}$ | 3000 3009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ; High--hord transect for bridge 40573.5 (River: Little River; Reach: Gouin to DS end). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| is is |  | section. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 140573.5$ | нс | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| GR 182.5 | 2730 | 182.6 | 2750 | 183 | 2920 | 183 | 2993 | 183.8 | 2993 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 183}$ | 2994 3009 | 183 181 |  | 183.8 |  | 183.8 |  |  |  |
| ; This is a Repeated section. <br> $\begin{array}{lll}\text { NC } 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.045\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 140824$ |  |  | 2993. | 3006. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| 182.5 | 2730 | 180 | 2750 | 180 | 282 | 18 | 2920 | 179 |  |
| 178 | 2993 | 178. | 2993. | 177.2 | 2993 | 177 |  | 177 |  |
| GR 177 | 3006 | 177.2 | ${ }_{3006 .}$ | 178 | 3007 | 178 | 3007 | 179 |  |
| GR 180.5 | 3060 | 181 | 3220 | 181 | 330 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3001.712 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{GR}_{\text {GR }} 188.18$ | ${ }_{2}^{2893}$ | 186.9 | ${ }_{2}^{2993}$ | 186.575 | ${ }_{3094}$ | 185.38 | 2996 3102 | 184.838 |  |
| GR 185.18 | 2999.93 | 186.677 | 3001.7 | 86.9 | 3002 | 187 |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {X1 }}^{\text {C1 }} 181106$ |  | ${ }_{181.5}^{16}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2950.3}$ | ${ }^{2965.7}$ |  | ${ }_{181.3}^{0.0}$ |  | ${ }_{179} 17$ |  |
| GR 177 | 2954.36 | 177.3 | 2961.64 |  | 2965.7 |  |  |  | 3045.5 |
|  |  | 181.1 | ${ }^{3203}$ | 181.2 | 3308 | 181.5 | 3413 | 181.8 |  |
| 0. | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187. | 2893 | 186.9 | 2993 | 186.75 | 2994 | 185.322 | 2995.817 | 184.846 | 2997. |
| GR 185.1 | 2999 | 186.801 | 3002. | 186.9 | 3003 | 187. |  |  |  |
| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 142000$ |  | 16 | 2989 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {GR }} 183$ | 2860 | ${ }^{181.5}$ | 2880 | 180.7 | 295 | 181 | 2983 | 179 |  |
| GR 177.3 | 2994.8 | 177.3 |  | 179.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 182.181 .3$ | 3220 4700 | 181.1 | 3350 | 181.2 | 3500 | 181.5 | 3650 | 181.8 | 4000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 | ${ }^{8}$ | 8. | 2994 | 3001.12 |  | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| GR 187.2 GR 186.865 | $\begin{aligned} & 2893 \\ & 3001.123 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1877 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993 \\ & 3002 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 186.941 \\ & 187.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2994 \\ & 3102 \end{aligned}$ | 84.889 | 2995. | 185.528 | 998 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 44 |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }^{3003.375}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }_{20}{ }^{\circ}$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| $\mathrm{GR}_{\text {GR }} 1888.2$ | ${ }_{2999.884}^{2893}$ | 187.8 187.8 | ${ }_{3003.375}^{2993}$ | ${ }^{187.6} 188$ | 2994 3103 | 18 | 2997.03 | 185 | 998. |
| HLocation of TwinNc 0.10.10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 183$ | 26 | ${ }_{182}$ | ${ }_{2680}^{2989}$ | ${ }_{181} 18$ | 2790 | 180.5 | 2820 | 180 | 2840 |
| 1177 | ${ }_{3006}^{2800}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{3010}^{2989}$. |  | ${ }_{3060}^{2991.5}$ | 177 | ${ }_{3150}^{2993}$ |
| GR 181.2 | ${ }_{3250} 300$ | 181.2 | ${ }_{3350} 308$. | 181.4 | 3600. | 181.7 | 4000 | ${ }_{182.2}^{181}$ | 4600 |
| (loction of Twin oaks Drive Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 14432$ |  | 20 | 2989.8 | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| GR 183 | 2660 | 182 | 2680 | 181 180 | ${ }_{2989}^{2790}$ | ${ }_{178}^{180 .}$ | 2820 | 180 | ${ }_{2940}^{2893}$ |
| GR 177. | 3006.2 | 178.9 | 3008.5 | 180. |  | 178. | 2991. | 181 |  |
| GR 181.2 | 3250 | 181.2 | 3350 | 181.4 | 3600 | 181.7 | 4000 | 182.2 | 4600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 183.2 |  | ${ }^{20}$ | 2680 | 181.2 | 2790 | 180.7 | 2820 | 180 | 284 |
| GR 181.2 | 2860 | 181.2 | 2950 | 180.2 | 2989.8 | 179.1 | 2991.5 | 177 | 2993 |
| GR 177.7 | ${ }_{3}^{3006.2}$ | 179.1 |  | ${ }_{181.6}^{180.3}$ | 3010.4 3600 | 181.2 |  | 181.2 |  |
| GR 181.4 |  | 181.4 | 3350 | 181.6 |  | 181.9 | 4000 | 182.4 |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X1 <br> GR <br> 187 |  |  |  | 2999.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR ${ }_{\text {GR 187.5 }}$ | ${ }_{3000}^{2894}$ | 187.7 | ${ }_{3100}^{2994}$ | 185.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 145100$ |  | 20 | 2989.8 | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 183.4 | 2660 | 182.4 | 2680 | 181.4 | 2790 | 180.9 | 2820 | 180 |  |
| GR 181.4 | 2860 | 181.4 | 2950 | 180.4 | 2989. | 179.3 | 2991 | 177 | 2993. |
| GR 177.9 | 3006.2 | 179.3 | 3008.5 | 180.5 | 3010. | 181.4 | 3060 | 181 | 3150 |
| GR 181.6 | 3250 | 181.6 | 3350 | 181.8 | 3600 | 182.1 | 4000 | 182.6 | 4600 |


| NC | 0.1 | 20 |  | 3010.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR 183 | 2200 | ${ }_{182}$ | ${ }_{2250}^{2989}$ | ${ }_{181} 3010.4$ | 2300 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2825 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2840 |
| GR 181 | 2860 | 181 | 50 | 180 | 2989.8 | 178.9 | 2991.5 | 178.2 | 2993.6 |
| GR 178 | 3006 | 178.9 | 8.5 | 180.1 | 3010.4 | 181 |  | 181 | 3150 |
| GR 181.2 | 3250 | 181.2 | 3350 | 181.4 | 3600 | 181. | 4000 | 182. | 4600 |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 146$ |  |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | 3001.45 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| GR 187.8 | 3001.45 | ${ }_{188.1}^{188.1}$ | ${ }_{3008.62}^{2948}$ | 186 | ${ }_{3109}^{2996006}$ |  | 2996.766 |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {nc }} 0.1$ | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ ${ }_{\text {C1 }} 4848$ |  | ${ }_{181}^{18}$ | ${ }_{2250}^{2995}$ | ${ }^{3005.7} 181$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 181 | 2992 | ${ }_{181}^{181}$ | 2992.1 | 178.9 | 2995 | 178.9 | 2995.1 | 178.4 | 3000 |
| 178 | 3005 | 178.4 | 3005.7 | 181 | 3008 |  | 3008.1 |  | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 181 | 3600 | 182 | 425 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nc } & 0.1 \\ \text { X1 } & 46203\end{array}$ |  | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 184 |  | 18 | 2250 | ${ }_{181}$ | 2500 | ${ }^{181}$ | 2700 | ${ }_{181}^{01}$ |  |
| GR 181 | 2992 | 181 | 2992.1 | 178.9 | 2995 | 178.9 | 2995.1 | 178.4 | 3000 |
| GR 178. | 3005.6 | 178.4 | 3005. | 181 | 3008 | 181 | 3008.1 | 181 | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 18 | 360 | 182 | 425 |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X146304 |  | 18 | 2992.1 | 3008 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 181818$ | ${ }_{2}^{2240}$ | ${ }_{181}^{181}$ | ${ }_{29250}^{2250}$ | 181 178.9 | 2500 2995 | 181 188.9 | ${ }_{2995}^{2700}$ | ${ }_{1781}^{181}$ | 50 |
| GR 178 | 30 | 178. | 3005.7 | 181 | 3008 |  |  |  | 3025 |
| GR 181 | 3200 | 181 | 3600 | 182 | 4250 |  |  |  |  |
| ; Upstream | ttl | ver an | ine | junctio |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 184.79 | 2894 | ${ }_{184.59}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }_{\text {3011.01 }}^{384}$ | 0.0997 .573 | ${ }_{184.23}^{0.0}$ | 2998.34 | ${ }_{182.32}$ | 30 |
| GR 181.23 | 3003.576 | 181.24 | 3004.4 |  | 3005.132 | 182.32 | 3006.611 | 184.39 | 3011.01 |
| GR 184.59 | 3011.5 | 184.79 | 3111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 710 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2766.47 | 2771.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 6 GR 180.98 | ${ }_{2}^{22406.4}$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2245}^{2247}$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2768} 24$ | 180.9 | ${ }_{2762} 27$ | ${ }_{188.9}^{180.9}$ | ${ }_{2}^{2667}$ |


| GR 178. GR 180. | $\begin{aligned} & 2775.92 \\ & 2912 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178.3 \\ & 180.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2775.99 \\ & 3192 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180.9 \\ & 181.9 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{3647}^{2777 \cdot 6}$ | 180.9 | . 67 | 180.9 | 2789.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 148$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008.902 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 184.75 | 2894 | 184.55 | 2994 | 184.4 | 2995.178 | 182.28 | 2999.297 | 181.47 | 3001.13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & G \mathrm{GR} \\ & \mathrm{GR} 184.43 \\ & \mathrm{GR} 184.75 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 301.905 \\ & 3109 \end{aligned}$ | 5181.57 | 3002.728 | 8 184.31 | 3006.35 | 184.41 | 3008.902 | 4.55 |  |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48500 |  | 14 | 2992 | 3008 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2010 | 0 | 0 |
| 184.9 | 2300 | 181.4 | ${ }^{2310}$ | 181.4 | ${ }^{2650}$ | 181.4 | 2810 | 181.2 | 50 |
| GR 1880.9 GR 180.9 | 2980 3035 | ${ }_{181.1}^{180.7}$ | ${ }_{3150}^{2992}$ | 178.2 181.5 | ${ }_{3500}^{2997}$ | ${ }_{188.2}^{178 .}$ | 3003 4000 | 180 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{49}^{0.1}$ | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 185.26 | 2894 | 185.06 | 2994 | 184.94 | ${ }_{2997.328}$ | 184.76 | 2997.913 | 181.84 | ${ }^{0} 004.357$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{GR} & 181.69 \\ \mathrm{GR} & 185.26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3004.762 \\ & \mathbf{3} 117 \end{aligned}$ | 281.81 | 3005.941 | 1184.42 | 3008.955 |  |  | 185.06 |  |
| vc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 16 | 2991 | 3009 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 184 | 22 | 18 | 2300 | 181.5 | 2525 | 181.5 |  | 181.5 |  |
| 181.3 | 2850 |  | 2925 |  | 2991 | 178.2 | 2996.7 | 178.2 | 3003.3 |
|  | 3009 | 181.2 | 3075 | 181.4 | 3140 | 181.5 | 3250 | 181.6 | 3450 |
| 182 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 20 | 2952 | 2971.34 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 2280 2850 | ${ }_{182}^{182}$ | 2290 2950 295 | ${ }_{181.2}^{181.2}$ | ${ }_{295}^{2300}$ | 181.1 |  | 181 |  |
| 181 | ${ }_{2}^{2850} 0$ | 181 | 2950 | ${ }_{181}^{181.3}$ | ${ }_{3050}^{2952}$ | 180.1 | ${ }_{\substack{2959.032 \\ 3150}}$ |  | 2961.8 |
| 180.1 181.6 | ${ }_{3450}^{2964.914}$ | 181.2 181.9 | ${ }_{3750}^{2971.34}$ | 181 182 | 3050 4000 | 181.1 182.4 | 3150 4650 | 181.3 182.9 | 3250 5500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 50 \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | ${ }_{10}{ }_{10} .045$ | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 185.5 | 2894 | 185.3 | 2994 | 185.2 | 2997.059 | 184.9 | 2998.084 | 182.8 | 3003. |
| GR 182.3 | 3004.059 | 181.7 | 3007.922 | 184.8 | 3009.343 | 185.3 | 3010 | 185.5 |  |
| is is | EATED | section. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50350 |  |  | 2991 | 3009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 184 | 2295 | 181.5 | 2300 | 181.5 | 2525 | 181.5 | 2700 | 181.5 | 2800 |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR }} 1881.3$ | 2850 | ${ }^{181.1}$ | ${ }_{3}^{2925}$ | 181 | 2991 | 178.2 | 2996.7 | 178.2 | 3003.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3450 |



; High-chord transect for bridge 58.76 (River: 7th Concession D; Reach: 7th Concession).
;CORIED SECTION FROM SEC 58










| NC 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { X1 } \\ \text { GR } & 55 \\ 187\end{array}$ |  |  | 2994 2994 | ${ }_{\text {chen }}^{3001.572} 185.38$ | ${ }_{2995.71}$ | 0.0 185 | ${ }_{2996.6}^{0}$ | ${ }_{185.2}^{0}$ | ${ }_{2997.64}^{0}$ |
| GR 187.2 | 3001.572 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0. | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\times 1} 56$ |  |  | 2994 | 3001.675 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| 188. | 2893 | 8, | 2993 | 187.66 | 299 |  |  |  |  |
| 186.66 | 2999. | 187.999 | 3001. | 188.5 | 3002 |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 157$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008.541 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{68} 188$ | 2893 | 188.7 | 2993 | 187.8 | 299 | 187.088 | 2998. | 186. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3008.551 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | ${ }_{3008.551}^{2594}$ | ${ }_{188.555}^{188.96}$ | 2994 3408 | 187.7 | 2998.05 | 187.701 | 2999.828 | 187.8 | 3002.52 |
| GR 188.565 | 3008.551 | 188.96 | 3408 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}\text {; COPIED } & \text { SECTION } & \text { FROM SEC } 58 \\ \text { NC } & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.045\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 3008.551 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { GR } & 189.5 \\ \text { GR } & 188.3\end{array}$ | ${ }_{3002.522}^{2894}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 189.3 \\ & 189.065 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2993 \\ & { }_{3008.551} \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{1}^{189.05}$ | 2994 3009 | $\begin{aligned} & 188.2 \\ & 189 \end{aligned}$ | 2998.0 <br> 310 | 188.201 | 2999.828 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{X} 1} 58.7$ |  |  | 2994 | 3008. | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| GR 194.1 | 2894 | 193.905 | 2994 | 189 | 2998 | 193. | 2999.828 | 193.15 | 3002.522 |
| GR 193.915 | 3008.551 | 194.11 | 3108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2594 | ${ }^{3} 194.4$ | ${ }_{3347.324}$ | ${ }_{4}^{0} 194.46$ | ${ }_{3408}^{0.0}$ | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{array}{ccc}\text {; Copied } & \text { SECTION } & \text { FRoM SEC } \\ \text { NC } & 58 \\ \text { NC } & 0.1 & 0.1\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 194.45 |  |  |  |  | 2998 | -193.201 | \% |  | 3002.52 |
| GR 194.065 | ${ }_{3008.551}^{2504}$ | 194.46 | 3408 |  |  |  | 2999.828 | 193.3 | 3002.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |












| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 0 & 0 \\ 2500 & 181.7 \\ 3001.177 \\ 31790 & 179 \\ 3900 & 182 \\ 3900 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2700 \\ 3007.135 \\ 3105 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ${ }_{182}^{19}$ | $\begin{array}{r}2994 \\ 203 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | ${ }^{3015.8}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 181.9 | 2850 | 181.6 | 2950 | 181.6 | 2994 | 179.6 |  |  |  |
| GR 179.8 | 3009.548 | 181.4 | 3015.8 | 181.5 | 3050 | 181 |  |  |  |
| GR 182.3 | 3180 | 182.6 | 3370 | 182.7 | 3600 | 182.9 |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\times 180$ |  |  | 2994 | 3000.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }_{2996.175}^{0} \quad{ }_{186.5}^{0}$ |  | ${ }_{29} \mathbf{0} 97.781$ |
|  | 2893 |  |  | 188 | 29 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187.1 | 2998.638 | 188.1 | 3000 | 188. | 3001 | 189 |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{0}{096.891}{ }^{0} 187.6$ |  | $\stackrel{0}{2997}$. |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 2999.293 | . 0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 188.9 | 2594 | 188.5 |  | 187.7 | 2996.045 | 187. |  |  |  |
| GR 188.5 | 2999.293 | 188.9 | 3399 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0. | . 045 |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2995.925}^{0} \quad \stackrel{0}{187.6}$ |  | ${ }_{2996.651}$ |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 2998.552 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }} 1888.8$ |  |  |  |  | 2995.499 |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188.4 | 2998.552 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{2998.696}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {Cl }}^{\text {K1 }} 188.9$ | 2594 | 188.5 | 2994 2994 | ${ }_{3}^{3001.561} 18.6$ | ${ }_{2994.908}$ | ${ }_{187.1}^{0.0}$ | $\stackrel{0}{2997.794}$ | ${ }^{0} 8$. |  |
| ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR } 188.5}$ | ${ }_{3001.561}^{2594}$ | 188.9 18.9 | ${ }_{3401}^{294}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  | 2994.0343100310 |  | ${ }_{2994.987}$ |
|  |  |  | 2994 | 2999 | . 0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 189.5 |  | 189.3 | 2993 | 188.711 |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 188.45 | 2996.398 | 188.711 | 2999 | 189.3 | 3000 | 189.5 |  |  |  |
| Nc 0.1 | 0.1 | . 045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \begin{array}{c} 094.583 \\ 2997.54 .525 \\ 299746 \\ 18.58 .35 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2995.032 \\ 297.967 \end{gathered}$ |
| K1 81 |  |  | 2994 | 2997 | . 0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| GR 189.3 | 2893 | 相 | 2993 | 188.336 |  | 188.366 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{GR}_{\text {GR 189 }} 18.4$ | 2995. | 186.791 | 299 | 11 | 299 | 88.3 |  |  |  |
| GR 189 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nc 0.1 | 0.1 | 045 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0995.171 \\ 187.546 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | ${ }_{2996.074}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {K1 }} 1888$ |  |  | ${ }_{29}^{2993}$ | ${ }^{2998.364}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR 187.711 | 2996.87 | 535 | 2993 | 18988 | ${ }_{2999}$ | 187. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2893 |  | ${ }_{2}^{2994}$ | ${ }^{3000.356}$ | 2994 |  |  |  | 2996 |
|  |  |  | 2993 | 189.09 |  | 187.8 | 2995. |  | 2996. |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GR 184.6 GR 184.6 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3003 \\
& 3225
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 184.6
184.6 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3003.1 \\
& 3425
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 184.5
184.6 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3006 \\
& 3770
\end{aligned}
$$ \& ${ }_{185}^{184.6}$ \& 3050
4000 \& 184. \& 3170 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{$\begin{array}{lll}\text { i Little River at Twin Oaks } \\ \text { NC } & 0.015 & 0.015 \\ \text { O. } & 0.015\end{array}$} <br>
\hline GR 181 \& 0 \& 180.8 \& 60 \& 180.8 \& 80 \& 181 \& 160 \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 184 \& 2295 \& 182.5 \& 2300 \& 182.5 \& 2525 \& 182.5 \& 2700 \& 182.5 \& 2800 <br>
\hline GR 182.5 \& 2850 \& 182.5 \& 2925 \& ${ }^{182.5}$ \& 2990. 29 \& 182.5 \& ${ }_{3002}^{2991}$ \& 183.4
188.4

18. \& ${ }_{2}^{2991.1}$ <br>
\hline $\begin{array}{cc}\text { GR } & 183.4 \\ G R & 183.4\end{array}$ \& 2992.6
30074 \& $\begin{array}{ll}6 & 183.4 \\ 4 & 183.4\end{array}$ \& 2992.7

3007.5 \& 183.4 \& ${ }_{3}^{2996.6}$ \& \begin{tabular}{l}
183.4 <br>
183.4 <br>
\hline

 \& ${ }_{3}^{3002.1}$ \& 

183.4 <br>
182.5 <br>
\hline 18.5
\end{tabular} \& 3003.4

3009 <br>
\hline GR 182.5 \& 3075 \& 182.5 \& 3140 \& 182.5 \& 3250 \& 182.6 \& ${ }_{3450}$ \& 182.9 \& 3650 <br>
\hline GR 183 \& 4000 \& 183 \& 4650 \& 183 \& 5500 \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 181 \& 4 \& 181 \& 5.5 \& 179.4 \& 13.5 \& 179.4 \& 17.5 \& 178.2 \& 22. <br>
\hline GR 178. \& 25.5 \& 177.2 \& 30.5 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 177 \& 39.5 \& 177.2 \& ${ }^{41} .3$ \& 179 \& 49 \& 179 \& 51.5 \& 180 \& <br>
\hline GR 181 \& 67.5 \& 18 \& 69 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {X1 }}^{\text {X1 }}$ Twi \& 16 \& 17 \& 43.5 \& 45 \& 0.0 \& 0.0 \& 0 \& 0 \& <br>
\hline GR 181 \& ${ }^{6}$ \& 181 \& \& 178.5 \& \& 178. \& 29 \& 178.5 \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR 177.5 }} 17$ \& 35
53 \& 177.4 \& 39
57 \& 177.4
178.5 \& 43.5
58.5 \& 177 \& ${ }_{63}^{44}$ \& 177.4 \& ${ }_{75}^{45}$ <br>
\hline GR 181 \& ${ }_{85}$ \& 181 \& 92 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{$\underset{\substack{\text { Thwin Oak Buisiness } \\ \text { NC } 0.1 \\ 0.1}}{\text { Park Stat }}$}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline GR 181.6 \& 2.5 \& 181.6 \& \& 179.9 \& 12 \& 179.8 \& , \& 178.8 \& 21.5 <br>
\hline ${ }_{\text {GR }}^{\text {GR 177.7 }} 1$ \& ${ }_{36.8}^{24}$ \& 177.9
179.6 \& ${ }_{44.5}^{29}$ \& \& \& \& 32.5
54.5 \& 1771.9
181.1 \& - ${ }_{55}^{33.5}$ <br>
\hline GR 181.6 \& ${ }_{63}$ \& 181.6 \& 64.5 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ci \& \& 0.5 \& 1 \& 0 \& мо \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}






| 5060 5060 | Storage | ${ }_{2}^{0}$ | 37211 50360 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5065 5065 | Storage | ${ }_{2}^{0}$ | 51900 69569 |
| 5070 5070 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 33882 46007 |
| 5073 5073 | Storage | ${ }_{2}^{0}$ | ${ }_{392624}^{28724}$ |
| 5075 5075 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 32728 4498 |
| 5080 5080 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }_{1201} 12425$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 5085 \\ 5085 \\ \hline 0 \end{gathered}$ | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }_{31531}^{22812}$ |
| 5087 5087 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 50395 67601 |
| 5090 5090 | storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 15066 21402 |
| 5095 5095 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 32809 44604 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5100 \\ & 5100 \\ & 510 \end{aligned}$ | storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 16388 23130 |
| 5105 5105 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 17765 24931 |
| 5110 5110 | Storage | ${ }_{2}$ | 15140 21499 |
| 5115 5115 | Storage | $\stackrel{0}{2}$ | 26706 36623 |
| 5125 5125 | sto | ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }_{40351}^{2957}$ |


| 5130 5130 | storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37637 \\ & 50917 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5133 \\ & 5133 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35074 \\ & 47566 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5135 \\ & 5135 \\ & 515 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6656 \\ & 10403 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5140 \\ & 5140 \\ & 510 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17819 \\ & 25002 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5145 \\ & 5145 \\ & 515 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33029 \\ & 44892 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5155 \\ & 5155 \\ & 51 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22536 \\ & 31170 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5165 \\ & 5165 \\ & 5165 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54873 \\ & 73457 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5175 \\ & 5175 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17966 \\ & 25194 \end{aligned}$ |
| ; Control Twin <br> 5180 <br> 5180 | ks flows Storage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exis } \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | ates 20000 20000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5185 \\ & 5185 \\ & 5185 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20799 \\ & 28899 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5190 \\ & 51990 \\ & 5190 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26315 \\ & 36112 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5200 \\ & 5200 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{239329}^{181716}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5210 \\ & 5210 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21243 \\ & 29480 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5215 \\ & 5215 \end{aligned}$ | Storage | $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35210 \\ & 47744 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { [TTMESERIES] } \\ ; ; \text { Name } \end{gathered}$ | Date | Time | Value |



|  $\qquad$ |
| :---: |
|  |
|  <br>  |
| شَ |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | L |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | ㅇozozo |
|  | ONNN工NJ |
|  |  |
| ¢8:88:888:88:88:88:88:88:888:88:88:8 | \%\%\%\%\%\%\% |
| -0.0 |  |
|  | Migjomio |




| $100 \mathrm{yr}-24 \mathrm{hr}-\mathrm{chi+}$ | $12 / 14 / 2011$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 |  |




|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |


[tags]
[MAPI
DTMENS ToNS
UNITTS
[Coordinates]
 8.83084069503604-15.1842304473221
None 23.7571876936715 2.55315070351585
x-Coord .--Y-Coord
-9.575
-9.1 ---------

18.794
17.708
19.478
17.411
18.879
19.633

 | -6.167 |
| :--- |
| -6.049 |
| 0.607 |

| が <br>  |
| :---: |
|  <br>  |
|  |



o


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



Upper Little River Model.
A1 slopes are assumed to be 0.158 (from Turkey Creek and Little River subwatershed Study
Ald
A11 slopes are assumed to be 0.158 (fro
Dillon Consulting Limited, June 1998).
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
NoTE The summary statistictics displayed in this report are
based on results found at every computational time step,

Analysis options


| Flow Units ... | CMs |
| :---: | :---: |
| Process Models: |  |
| Rainfal1/Runo | yes |
| Snowmelt |  |
| Groundwat | No |
| Flow Routing | YES |
| Ponding Allowed | YES |
| Water Quality |  |
| Infiltration Method | GREEN AMPT |
| Flow Rout ing Method | DYNNA |
| Starting date | DEC-14-2011 00:00:00 |
| Ending Date | DEC-17-2011 00:00:0 |
| Antecedent Dry days | 0.0000 |
| Report Time step | 1:00 |
| wet Time step | 00:05: |
|  |  |
| Routing Time s | , |

NARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit a varning 03: negative offset ignored for Link clo Varning 03: negative offset ignored for Link c10 Warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c10 varning 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c12

WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C15 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C22 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C2 WARving 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c2 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c25 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c2 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c2 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit C 28 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C2 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C3 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C3 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c3 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit c3 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c34 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C34 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C 37 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C38 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit C WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c6 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6025a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6055a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c6120a WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6120b

WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6120 wARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link c61200 WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C61200 Warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6135 wARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6135a warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c6135a wARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6135b WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6135 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c6135b warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6150 warning 04: minimum elevation drop used for conduit c6160a wARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link C6180a warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link 66220 warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link C7025 WARNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit C7025 vaRNING 04: minimum elevation drop used for Conduit ca WARNING 03: negative offset ignored for Link pl warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link or2090-1 vaRning 03: negative offset ignored for Link or2100-1 warning 03: negative offset ignored for Link or2200-1 waRning 02: maximum depth increased for Node Ji warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J109 wARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J11

Warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J11 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J12 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J13 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J 14 Warnivg 02: maximum depth increased for Node J15 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J16 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J17 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J18 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node 119 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J2 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J20 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J21 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J22 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J23 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J24 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J25 WaRNING 02: maximum depth increased for Hode 38 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J27 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J28 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J29 wARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J3 WRRNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J30 Warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J31
warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J32 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J33 Warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J34 wARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J36

NARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J3750
warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J4032
VARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node $J 41$
wARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J4110
arning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J4
NARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J4
warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J4
warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5
warving 02: maximum depth increased for Node J54
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J5
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J57
VARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J6
warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J60 Meving 02: maximum depth increased for Node J6 WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node $J$ warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J80 Warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J81 warning 02: maximum depth increased for Node J 82 wARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J83

WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J88
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J89
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J9
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J92
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J98
WARNING 02: maximum depth increased for Node J99


Highest Continuity Error
Node ${ }^{2} 55(10.628)$
Node $J 55.5(4.638)$
Node J26 (2.088)

Node J110 (1.908)
Time-Step Critical B
Link C22
Link C32
(45.598)
Link
(45.68)

| Link C12 ${ }^{(11.648)}$ |
| :--- |
| Link $C 7025(1.058)$ |

$\underset{*+* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~}{\text { Highest }}$

| Link C6180e ( |
| :--- |
| fink $\mathrm{C1}$ |
| (2) |

Link OR2190-1
Lirnn or210-1
Lin
Link OR2215-1
(2)

Minimum Time Step
Average Time Step

0.96 se
1.58 se
30.00 se
0.00
2.01


| Subcatchment | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \substack{\text { Precip } \\ \text { min }} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Roton } \\ \text { Runon } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \substack{- \text { Totalal }_{\text {Eotap }}^{\text {Eap }} \\ \text { min }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Runoff } \\ \text { Run } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -\cdots-\boldsymbol{c}^{\text {Peak }} \\ \text { Runoff } \\ \text { CMM } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Runoff } \\ \text { coeff }}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00 | 108. | 0. | 0. | 17.22 | 90.41 | 82.62 | 12.52 | 0.8 |
| 2002 | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 17.91 | 89 | 140.28 | 19.13 |  |
| ${ }_{2007}^{2005}$ | 108.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 15.03 | 92.71 | ${ }^{44.54}$ | ${ }^{10.50}$ | 0.85 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN


S.



为


| Nod | pe | Average Depth | Maximum Meters | Maximum <br> HGL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Time } \\ & \text { Time } \\ & \text { ocuy } \\ & \text { days } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { of Max } \\ & \text { rurence } \\ & h x: m i n \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1}$ | Junction | 0.67 | 1.14 | 186.14 | 0 | 11：15 |
| ${ }^{310}$ | TIoN | 1.61 | 44 | 181.26 |  | 16：13 |
| J108 | JUNCT ToN | 1．53 | ${ }_{2}^{2.24}$ | 180 |  | 18：28 |
| T11 | Juncr Ton | 1．93 | ${ }_{1} 1.64$ | 180.28 |  | 44 |
| J110 | Juncrion | 1．83 | 2.73 | 180.83 | O |  |
| ${ }^{111}$ | JUNCTION | 1.66 | 2.53 | 180.83 | 0 |  |
| ${ }^{12}$ | Junction | 1.51 | 2.39 | 181.49 | 0 | 15：41 |
|  |  | 0.74 |  | 183.67 | 0 | 12：40 |
| J14 | Junction | 1.30 | 2.10 | 182.16 | 0 | 14：13 |
| 15 | Junction | 1.29 | 2.08 | 182.26 |  | 14：02 |
| 116 | Junction | 1.26 | 2.02 | 182.53 | 0 | 13：34 |
| J17 | Junction | 2.01 |  | 180.18 |  | 18：27 |
| J18 | Junction | 1.08 |  | 183.72 |  | 12：37 |
| 19 | Jonciron | 0.10 | 1.20 | 184.40 |  | 11：42 |
| J2 | Junction | 2.06 | 2.96 | 180.83 |  | ：29 |
| J21 | Jucrion | 5 | 析 |  |  |  |
| 521 | swirol | 9， | 析 |  |  |  |
| ， | －wicrov | 9， | 析 | 相 |  | （48 |
| T29 | Twiction | 1．09 | 2．48 | 181.15 |  | （29 |
| J25 | Juncrion | 0．22 | ${ }_{1}^{2.73}$ | 188.88 |  | 18：23 |
| J26 |  |  | 1.36 | 188.36 |  | 10：50 |
|  |  |  | 1.63 | 184.03 | 0 | 109：35 |
|  | JUNCTITON | 0.6 | 1.71 | 185.11 |  | 59 |
|  | JUNCTİN | 0.54 | 1.67 | 186.07 |  | 52 |
|  | JUNCTİN | 0.44 | 2.64 | 183.59 |  | 09：19 |
|  | Junction | 0.52 | 1.99 | 187.39 |  | 08：40 |
| J31 | Junction | 0.41 | 2.05 | 188.45 |  | 08：23 |
| J32 | Junction | 1.32 | 1.41 | 180.41 |  | 17：40 |
| J3 | Juncrion | 1.54 | 2.08 | 180.83 |  | 32 |
|  | Junction | 0．35 | 0.64 | 184.04 |  | 09：38 |
|  | Jonction | 0.55 | 1.19 | 180.99 |  | 02 |
| Ј36 | Junction | 1.18 | 1.92 | 182.83 |  | 13：08 |
|  | nction | ， | 3.15 |  |  | 08：53 |
| 5390 | Sucrion | 2．11 | 3.01 | 179.81 |  | 17：15 |
| J39 | Juncrion | ${ }_{2} .21$ | ${ }_{3.16}$ | 183.98 180.26 | 0 | 12：06 |




| Node | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maximum } \\ & \text { Materal } \\ & \text { Inflow } \\ & \text { Cows } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maximum } \\ \text { Tntal } 1 \text { Infle } \\ \text { CMS } \end{gathered}$ | Time of Max Occurrence days hr：min | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Lateral } \\ \text { Inflow } \\ \text { Volume } \\ 10 \wedge 6 \text { 1tr } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1}$ | junction | 0.000 | 6.882 | 11：02 |  | 503.522 |
| ${ }^{3} 10$ | Junction | 0.000 | 23.405 | 14：32 | 0.000 | 1947.849 |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{JJ} 108}$ | JUNCT I ON JUNCT T | 0.000 0.000 | 0.735 0.700 | 14：08 | 0.000 0.000 | 97.770 98.390 |
| ${ }^{11}$ | JUNCTION | 0.000 | 6.847 | 11：42 | ${ }_{0} 0.000$ | 502.731 |
| ${ }^{3110}$ | JUNCTITN | 0.000 | 2.260 | 13：12 | 0.000 | 114.924 |
| J111 | Junction | 0.000 | 1.806 |  | 0.000 | 94.580 |






.o.
 OO.

${ }_{1.00}$


| W2185 | WEIR | 0.000 | 0 | $00: 00$ | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WW290 | WERR | 0.000 | 0 | 00000 | 0.00 |
| W2200 | WER | 0.000 | 0 | 00000 | 0.00 |
| W2210 | 0.000 |  |  |  |  |
| W2215 | WER | 0.000 | 0 | 00000 | 0.00 |
| WEIR | 0.000 | 0 | $00: 00$ | 0.00 |  |

How Classification sumary

| Conduit | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { /Actual } \\ \text { Length } \end{array}$ | Dry | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fract } \\ & \text { Dry } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on of of } \\ & \text { Don } \\ & \text { Do } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Time i } \\ & \text { Sub } \\ & \text { Crit } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \begin{array}{l} \text { fup } \\ \text { sup } \\ \text { Crit } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Up lass } \\ & \text { Cr } \\ & \text { Cry } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Down } \\ & \text { Critit } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. } \begin{array}{c} \text { Froude } \\ \text { Numberer } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\text {Avg }}^{\text {Avow }}$ Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\text {c1 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.0000 |
| C10 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }^{\text {c11 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }^{\text {c12 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }^{\text {c13 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.00 |
| ${ }^{\text {c14 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }_{\text {C15 }}{ }_{\text {c15 }}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1.00}$ | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }^{0.02}$ | 0.0000 |
| ${ }_{\text {C17 }}^{\text {C17 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.0000 0.0000 |
| C18 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }_{\text {c12 }}{ }^{\text {c19 }}$ | 1.00 1.00 1.0 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 | - 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 0 | 0.00 | 0.15 0.03 | 0.0000 0.0000 |
| c20 | 1.00 | ${ }_{0} 0.02$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | ${ }_{0.07}^{0.07}$ | ${ }^{0} 0.00000$ |
| ${ }^{\text {c21 }}$ | 1.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }_{\text {c23 }}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1.00}$ | 0.00 1.00 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 0.00 0.0 | 1.00 0.00 | - | - | - | . 46 | 20000 |
| c24 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0000 |
| c25 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }^{2} 26$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0000 |
| ${ }^{2} 27$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| C29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | ${ }_{0} 0.00$ | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | ${ }_{0}$ | -0.0000 |
| c3 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0000 |
| с30 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.0001 |
| ${ }^{\text {c31 }}$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0000 |
| C32 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.0000 |
| C34 | 1.00 | ${ }_{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }_{0} .24$ | 0.0000 |
| C35 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0. | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## APPENDIX I

 Hydraulics1603-11265 Upper Little River
Flood Elevations
2017-09-01

| Road | ERCA Floodplain Mapping By MacLaren (1985) |  | Twin Oaks Business Park |  | Current PC-SWMM model |  |  |  |  |  | Survey Data |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | by Lafontaine, | etc. (1997) | Existing |  |  | Proposed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Change in WL relative to ERCA (m) | Flow ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Change in WL relative to ERCA (m) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flow } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ground } \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{s} \\ & \text { of road } \\ & \text { crossing }(\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | Road Spill (m) | Road at Crossing (m) | Proposed <br> Conditions <br> Flooding (m) |
| Baseline Road | 184.04 | 24.4 |  |  | 184.13 | 0.09 | 34.7 | 183.67 | -0.37 | 24.4 | 183.9 | 184.3 | 184.5 | -0.2 |
| Country Road 42 | 182.63 | 24.4 |  |  | 183.20 | 0.57 | 39.8 | 181.95 | -0.68 | 23.9 | 182.2 | 182.6 | 182.9 | -0.3 |
| Lauzon Parkway | 182.12 | 24.4 |  |  | 182.52 | 0.40 | 40.1 | 181.49 | -0.63 | 23.6 | 182.2 | 182.3 | 183.7 | -0.7 |
| Lauzon Road | 181.72 | 27.7 |  |  | 182.01 | 0.29 | 43.7 | 181.21 | -0.51 | 23.2 | 181.3 | 181.6 | 182.0 | -0.1 |
| Railway | 181.56 | 34.0 | 181.13 | 39.4 | 181.64 | 0.08 | 45.4 | 180.85 | -0.71 | 24.1 | 181.1 | 182.4 | 182.4 | -0.3 |
| Twin Oaks Drive | 180.91 | 39.5 | 180.86 | 39.6 | 180.97 | 0.06 | 49.5 | 180.28 | -0.63 | 25.8 | 180.5 |  |  | -0.2 |
| E.C. Row Expressway | 180.72 | 42.8 | 180.77 | 40.5 | 180.81 | 0.09 | 50.6 | 180.18 | -0.54 | 26.8 | 180.0 | 181.4 | 183.0 | 0.2 |
| Forest Glade Drive | 180.39 | 42.8 |  |  | 180.41 | 0.02 | 51.4 | 179.84 | -0.55 | 27.4 | 179.5 | 180.5 | 181.0 | 0.3 |


| Location | ERCA Floodplain Mapping <br> By MacLaren (1985) |  | Twin Oaks Business Park by Lafontaine, etc. (1997) |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Current Study } \\ \hline \text { By Stantec (2017) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | Elevation Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Windsor Airpor | t (1990) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Change in WL relative to ERCA (m) | Flow ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ground } \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{s} \\ & \text { of road } \\ & \text { crossing }(\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | Road Spill (m) | Road at Crossing (m) |
| Baseline Road | 184.04 | 24.4 |  |  | 184.13 | 0.09 | 34.7 | 183.9 | 184.3 | 184.5 |
| Country Road 42 | 182.63 | 24.4 |  |  | 183.20 | 0.57 | 39.8 | 182.2 | 182.6 | 182.9 |
| Lauzon Parkway | 182.12 | 24.4 |  |  | 182.52 | 0.40 | 40.1 | 182.2 | 182.3 | 183.7 |
| Lauzon Road | 181.72 | 27.7 |  |  | 182.01 | 0.29 | 43.7 | 181.3 | 181.6 | 182.0 |
| Railway | 181.56 | 34.0 | 181.13 | 39.4 | 181.64 | 0.08 | 45.4 | 181.1 | 182.4 | 182.4 |
| Twin Oaks Drive | 180.91 | 39.5 | 180.86 | 39.6 | 180.97 | 0.06 | 49.5 | 180.5 |  |  |
| E.C. Row Expressway | 180.72 | 42.8 | 180.77 | 40.5 | 180.81 | 0.09 | 50.6 | 180.0 | 181.4 | 183.0 |
| Forest Glade Drive | 180.39 | 42.8 |  |  | 180.41 | 0.02 | 51.4 | 179.5 | 180.5 | 181.0 |


| Proposed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road | Current PC-SWMM model |  |  |  | Survey Data |  |  |  |
|  | Existing |  | Proposed |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | 100 yr Water Level (m) | Flow (m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ground } \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{s} \\ & \text { of road } \\ & \text { crossing }(\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Road Spill } \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ | Road at Crossing (m) | Proposed <br> Conditions <br> Flooding (m) |
| Baseline Road (J5090/J82) | 184.13 | 34.7 | 183.67 | 24.4 | 183.9 | 184.3 | 184.5 | -0.2 |
| Country Road 42 (J5110/J92) | 183.20 | 39.8 | 181.95 | 23.9 | 182.2 | 182.6 | 182.9 | -0.3 |
| Lauzon Parkway (J12) | 182.52 | 40.1 | 181.49 | 23.6 | 182.2 | 182.3 | 183.7 | -0.7 |
| Lauzon Road (J9) | 182.01 | 43.7 | 181.21 | 23.2 | 181.3 | 181.6 | 182.0 | -0.1 |
| Railway (J24) | 181.64 | 45.4 | 180.85 | 24.1 | 181.1 | 182.4 | 182.4 | -0.3 |
| Twin Oaks Drive (J46102) | 180.97 | 49.5 | 180.28 | 25.8 | 180.5 |  |  | -0.2 |
| E.C. Row Expressway (J17) | 180.81 | 50.6 | 180.18 | 26.8 | 180.0 | 181.4 | 183.0 | 0.2 |
| Forest Glade Drive (J5) | 180.41 | 51.4 | 179.84 | 27.4 | 179.5 | 180.5 | 181.0 | 0.3 |

## APPENDIX J

Fluvial Geomorphology
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## 1. Introduction

Property is currently being developed for mixed land uses in Windsor between Highway 401, the E.C. Row Expressway, Walker Road, and Banwell Road. Due to the proposal for future development and the anticipated decrease of permeable surfaces in the watershed, a geomorphic assessment was required. This study builds upon a previous report from 2004, in which, a detailed desktop analysis of the study area was conducted and monitoring cross-sections were installed to establish a baseline of conditions in the area. This study entails:

- A field reconnaissance of the study area using rapid channel assessments to confirm the findings of the background review. The site reconnaissance also serves to identify and confirm any physical rates of channel adjustments;
- Establishment of meander belt widths;
- Detailed geomorphic field assessments including collection of cross-sectional and survey data and re-monitoring of the historic channel cross-sections established in 2004;
- Detailed geomorphic analyses to determine erosion threshold assessments;
- Restoration recommendations for the channels areas;


## 2. Background Review

In 2004/2005, a desktop analysis was initially conducted to determine the general characteristics of watercourses in the study area. The amount and size of sediment inputs, valley shape, land use or vegetation cover, and other parameters that influence channel form often change as you move downstream along a waterway. In order to account for these changes, channels are often separated into "reaches". Reaches can be defined as stretches of channel that flow through a nearly constant valley setting and incorporate similar physical characteristics along their lengths. Thus, reaches experience similar controlling and modifying influences, which are reflected in similar geomorphological form, function, and process. Watercourses within the subject area were divided into reaches, as illustrated in

Figure 2.1. Reach lengths were measured and are provided in Table 2.1.

The study area is located in the physiographic region known as the St. Clair Clay Plain which contains both the Essex and Lambton Clay Plains. Little River is located on the Essex Clay Plain which ranges in thickness from 30 to 60 meters (Chapman and Putnam, 1984). The till is described as clayey-silt and glaciolacustrine clay. The underlying bedrock surface consists of sedimentary rocks such as limestone and dolostone. Some small areas of glaciolacustrine sand are also found bordering Little River, but the Quaternary geology of the area is primarily till. Two tills have been identified in the area, Catfish Creek and the overlying Tavistock till.

A historic analysis was also conducted for each reach using aerial photographs from 1955 and 1978 as well as digital imagery from 2004 to document changes in land use and channel planform. It was noted that the surrounding land use was predominantly agriculture and most of the study reaches had been altered or straightened - most before 1955. A description of observed changes is outlined in Table 2.2. Seven monitoring cross-sections were installed following the desktop assessment in order to establish baseline conditions within the study area. An initial draft of the current document was prepared in 2007, but it did n not include meander belt information or erosion threshold values.

Table 2.1: Summary of delineated reaches and measured lengths.

| Watercourse Name | Reach | Length (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Little River | LR-2 | 1865.33 |
|  | LR-3 | 1208.62 |
|  | LR-4 | 1181.89 |
|  | LR-5 | 378 |
|  | LR-6 | 1383.74 |
| Little River Drain | LRD-1 | 754.38 |
|  | LRD-2 | 922.33 |
|  | LRD-3 | 407.62 |
|  | LRD-4 | 1282.56 |
| Rusette Drain | RD-1 | 1218.19 |
|  | RD-2 | 4010.88 |
| McGill Drain | MD-1 | 1249.44 |
|  | MD-2 | 645.53 |
|  | MD-3 | 1821.31 |
| Lappan Drain | LD-1 | 1979.61 |
|  | LD-2 | 870.43 |
| Rivard Drain | RID-1 | NA |
| Lachance Drain | LAD-1 | 1362.32 |
| Desjardein Drain | DD-1 | 2151.23 |
| Soulliere Drain | SD-1 | 1582.87 |
|  | SD-2 | 666.03 |
| Baseline Road Drain | BRD-1 | 682.37 |
| Ninth Concession Drain | NCD-1 | 2228.24 |
| Sixth Concession Drain | SCD-1 | 1053.01 |
|  | SCD-2 | 1027.2 |
|  | SCD-3 | 1516.11 |
| Hurley Relief Drain | HR-1 | 992.97 |



Figure 2.1: Delineated reaches and locations of monitoring cross-sections and detailed fieldwork.


Table 2.2: Historical Analysis Summary

| Watercourse Name | Reach Name | Land Use Change | Channel Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Little River | LR-1 | 1955-agricultural on both banks, some residential development on western side of channel | 1955 - straightened prior to this date, no observable bar formations or islands |
|  |  | 1978 - significant increase in residential development along western side of channel, also increase in residential development on eastern side of channel, nursery located on eastern side of channel has matured from 1954 | 1978 - channel still straight, no apparent changes in channel form or function, vegetation has matured along top of banks |
|  |  | 2004 - no coverage for this reach | 2004 - no coverage for this reach |
|  | LR-2 | 1955-agricultural on both banks with a little residential land use on the western bank | 1955 - straightened prior to 1954 with no bar formations or island apparent |
|  |  | 1978 - significant increase in residential development along the western bank, development of water treatment facility on eastern bank, lots of vegetation removed when development occurred | 1978 - no apparent change in channel form, still straight with no bars are islands, no additional road crossings constructed since 1954 |
|  |  | 2004 - no coverage | 2004 - no coverage |
|  | LR-3 | 1955-mainly agricultural with a few crossings and associated buildings | 1955 - appears to have been altered prior to 1954, engineered |
|  |  | 1978 - increase in the amount of industrial land use with associated parking lots and impermeable surface, some agricultural land use still being worked | 1978 - does not appear to be any significant changes in channel form since 1954, no increase in bar formations or islands of any kind |
|  |  | 2004 - incomplete mapping available, no apparent changes in land use except for a small increase in the amount of residential development present since 1978 | 2004 - because of the incomplete coverage it is hard to distinguish if channel changes have occurred |
|  |  |  |  |



| LR-4 | 1955 - land use appears to be a golf course with very little bank coverage | 1955 - channel appears in natural state with no straightening obvious |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1978 - land use remains a golf course, vegetation has grown in and was maintained, minor increase in residential development near upstream portion of reach break | 1978-no change in channel form, no new crossings added, vegetation more mature on banks |
|  | 2004 - remains a golf course, no apparent change in land use or increase in residential development past 1978 | 2004-no apparent change in channel form, no straightening or engineering obvious from photo |
| LR-5 | 1955 - mainly agricultural land use with associated out buildings | 1955 - no evidence of channel alterations prior to 1955 |
|  | 1978 - remains agricultural land use with a little more vegetative cover compared with 1954 | 1978 - channel does not appear to have been changes since 1955, no increase in crossings etc. |
|  | 2004 - change in land use from agricultural to parkland and residentia/commercial with a new crossing constructed prior to 2004 | 2004 - channel appears to have been straightened slightly since the installation of the new crossing and change to parkland |
| LR-6 | 1955 - mostly agricultural land use along both banks, some forested area on the western bank | 1955 - channel appears in natural state with only on road crossing in centre of reach |
|  | 1978 - land use changed to a golf course prior to 1978 aerial photograph with associated buildings and parking area, few new residential buildings as well | 1978 - channel does not appear to be altered however there were at least 6 new cart path crossings over the watercourse prior to 1978 |
|  | 2004 - land use changed again to industrial with associated large impervious areas (parking lots and buildings) with the removal of the road crossing in centre of reach, and removal of foot bridges installed for the golf course prior to 1978 | 2004 - channel appears to have been altered/engineered prior to 2004, cart path bridges have been removed, road crossing present in existing years has been removed, and the banks look to be armoured/altered throughout most of the reach |
|  |  |  |



| Little River Drain | LRD-1 | 1955 - agricultural land use through all of reach | 1955 - channel appears to be in natural state with no bar formations or islands, some erosion along outside of meander bends obvious |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1978 - mainly agricultural land use with a slight increase in the residential development along western portion of the watercourse | 1978 - does not appear to be any changes in channel form, erosion still evident on outside of meander bends, no bar formations or islands obvious |
|  |  | 2004 - agricultural remains the dominant land use with no increase in the residential development along watercourse | 2004 - no apparent change in channel form noted, no increase in erosion along bends, no obvious signs of bar formation or islands |
|  | LRD-2 | 1955-mainly agricultural land use with some scrub forest in upstream portion of reach | 1955 - channel appears to have been altered prior to 1955, more like a drain through agricultural fields |
|  |  | 1978 - mainly agricultural land use with an obvious increase in the maturity of the scrub forest in the upstream portion of the reach | 1978-no apparent change in channel form but most of reach obscured by vegetation and poor quality of aerial photograph |
|  |  | 2004 - mixture of agricultural land use and forested area with the construction of a new road along the forested area, also a slight increase in the residential land use along this reach | 2004 - no apparent change in channel form except for the installation of the new road crossing prior to 2004 |
|  | LRD-3 | 1955-mainly agricultural lands inter-mixed with some scrub forest to road crossing | 1955 - downstream portion of the reach appears to have been altered prior to 1955, upstream portion appears natural |
|  |  | 1978 - land use remained agricultural with a slight increase in the density of the scrub forest prior to 1978 | 1978 - no apparent change in the channel form from 1955, only addition of a new crossing in the downstream portion of reach |
|  |  | 2004 - no apparent change in the land use for this reach, the forest continued to increase in density | 2004 - no apparent change in channel form from 1978 |
|  | LRD-4 | 1955 - majority of the reach is surrounded by agricultural land use with some scrub forest | 1955 - channel appears in natural state but may be ephemeral with an undefined channel through the upstream portion of the reach |
|  |  | 1978 - remained agricultural | 1978 - channel appears to have been straightened and now flows along the roadway |
|  |  | 2004 - remained agricultural | 2004 - no apparent change in channel form since 1978 |
| Baseline RoadDrain | BRD-1 | 1955 - not apparent in aerial photograph | 1955 - if present it appears to flow along the roadside as a ditch |
|  |  | 1978 - not obvious in aerial photograph | 1978 - if present flows along roadside as a ditch |



|  |  | 2004 - agricultural land use for entire reach | 2004 - flows along the roadside as a ditch with no apparent changes in channel form |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9th ConcessionDrain | NCD-1 | 1955 - not apparent | 1955 - channel ditches prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978-not apparent | 1978-no apparent changes in channel form |
|  |  | 2004 - mainly agricultural land use with the roadside and residential land uses as well | 2004 - no apparent changes in channel form, a roadside ditch |
| 6th ConcessionDrain | SCD-1 | 1955 - mainly agricultural with roadside and residential development as well | 1955 - channel straightened into roadside ditch prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978-mainly agricultural with residential and infrastructure, no apparent change from 1955 | 1978 - no obvious change in channel form since 1955 |
|  |  | 2004 - no apparent change from 1955 | 2004 - no obvious change in channel form since 1955 |
|  | SCD-2 | 1955 - mainly agricultural land use with residential back yards fronting onto watercourse | 1955 - channel appears to have been altered prior to 1955, into a drainage channel along the backside of the residential properties |
|  |  | 1978 - no aerial photo coverage of this reach | 1978 - no aerial photo coverage of this reach |
|  |  | 2004 - remained agricultural for the most part with a slight increase in infrastructure (road crossing) prior to 2004 | 2004- no obvious changes in channel form except the road crossing |
|  | SCD-3 | 1955-no aerial photo coverage | 1955-no aerial photo coverage |
|  |  | 1978 - no aerial photo coverage | 1978 - no aerial photo coverage |
|  |  | 2004 - surrounding land use is agricultural | 2004 - ditched prior to 2004, straightened channel into ditch |
| Hurley Relief Drain | HR-1 | 1955- no aerial photo coverage | 1955- no aerial photo coverage |
|  |  | 1978-no aerial photo coverage | 1978 - no aerial photo coverage |
|  |  | 2004-mixture of agricultural, residential/parkland and water storage facilities | 2004 - nothing to compare the channel to, however it does appear to have been altered prior to 2004 into a drainage feature |
| Rusette Drain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RD-1 } \\ & \text { and RD- } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 1955 - mainly agricultural lands with a few road crossings and a nursery in the upstream end of the reach, airport was just being build so there was some clearing of the lands surrounding the channel for this development | 1955 - appears to have been a dug ditch prior to this aerial photograph |
|  |  | 1978 - surrounding land use remained agricultural with road crossings and the rail line, airport runway now fully developed, nursery in the upstream area of the reach was removed and | 1978 - channel appears as a well defined ditch with little vegetation around banks |



|  |  | scrubland now in its place, large reservoir was constructed on the north side of RD-2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 - only a small portion of the channel remains agricultural, now a lot of residential development built up along the ditch in the upstream portion of the channel on the northern bank and the airport on the southern bank with some scrub meadow | 2004 - not a lot of vegetation has grown in since the digging, development now right up to the top of bank of portions of the drain |
| Lappan Drain | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{LD}-1 \text { and } \\ & \text { LD-2 } \end{aligned}$ | 1955 - not well defined channel however land use is mainly agricultural in the area where the land looks wet | 1955 - no defined channel clear in aerial photograph |
|  |  | 1978 - well defined channel that has been dug, ditched, , land use is mainly agricultural with some scrub forest in the upstream portion of the channel, few road crossings | 1978 - well defined channel appears and dug prior to 1978 |
|  |  | 2004 - now all agricultural lands, forest has been removed and all land receives run off from the airport | 2004 - well defined channel, no apparent changes in channel planform from 1978 |
| McGill Drain | MD-1 | 1955 - agricultural lands, with some scrub forest in the downstream portion | 1955 - appears to have been ditched prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - agricultural lands, and a golf course in the downstream portion | 1978 - remains straightened without obvious changes to the planform |
|  |  | 2004 - remains agricultural with some urbanization in the form of industrial parklands in the downstream portion of the channel | 2004 - channel is still straight with a few extra crossings over it, otherwise unchanged |
|  | MD-2 | 1955-agricultural lands with little other vegetation present | 1955 - Channel appears to have been ditched prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - remains agricultural with some trees maturing on the banks | 1978-no apparent changes in channel planform, banks have become more defined |
|  |  | 2004 - continues to be agricultural land use with a few trees and scrubland immediately adjacent to channel | 2004 - very well defined drainage ditch but no apparent changes in channel planform |
|  | MD-3 | 1955-agriculture appears to be the dominant land use but the channel is hard to see, mainly looks like a drainage swale | 1955 - cannot make a lot of the channel out so it is assumed that the drainage was ditched after 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - agricultural land use dominates with a few scrub forest areas present along its length | 1978 - channel ditched prior to 1978, well established with vegetation on the banks |
|  |  | 2004 - remains agricultural for extent of the reach | 2004 - does not appear to be any channel changes from 1978 |
| Rivard Drain | RID-1 | 1955 - mainly agricultural with some scrub forest | 1955 - channel was ditches prior to 1955 |



|  |  | 1978 - mainly agricultural with some scrub forest and new crossings | 1978 - does not appear to be any channel changes since before 1955 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004-a mixture of agricultural and scrub forest | 2004 - channel remains straightened with no apparent changes in channel planform |
| Lachance Drain | LAD-1 | 1955 - mainly agricultural land use with a small portion of scrub forest at the confluence with Little River | 1955 - channel appears to have been dug prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - mainly agricultural land use with a small portion of the drain in the downstream end near the confluence located in a golf course | 1978-downstream portion of the channel was altered when the golf course was built, prior to 1978, appears to be straightened and foot bridges cross over it |
|  |  | 2004 - the upstream portion is all agricultural land use but the downstream portion near the confluence is surrounded by scrubland and industrial parkland | 2004 - upstream portion appears to not have been altered at all, however the downstream portion appears to have been moved prior to 2004 as there is now an industrial building where the channel used to be and the channel is no longer well defined in this area |
| Desjardein Drain | DD-1 | 1955 - agricultural land use dominated this reach with one road crossing | 1955 - channel appears to have been ditched prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - agricultural land use dominates with minor residential development and back yard, one road crossing | 1978 - no apparent change in channel planform since 1955 |
|  |  | 2004 -dominated by agricultural land use | 2004-no obvious channel changes since before 1955 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Soulliere Drain | SD-1 | 1955 - agricultural land use most dominant | 1955 - channel not well defined in the upstream portion of the channel, downstream looks natural |
|  |  | 1978 - agricultural land use remains most dominant | 1978 - channel more defined with clear banks in upstream portion and natural in the downstream portion |
|  |  | 2004 - remains agricultural throughout most of the channel | 2004 - channel does not appear to have changes since 1978 |
|  | SD-2 | 1955 - agricultural land use is dominant | 1955 - channel not well defined but portions that are visible appear to be ditched prior to 1955 |
|  |  | 1978 - agricultural land use remains dominant | 1978 - channel still not well defined in this photograph but portions of it remained ditched |
|  |  | 2004 - agricultural land use remains dominant | 2004 - channel was well defined with clear banks, ditched throughout whole reach |



## 3. Synoptic Surveys

### 3.1 Rapid Assessment

In order to provide insight regarding existing geomorphic conditions and document any evidence of active erosion, site visits were conducted in 2007. During the visit, channel conditions along the study reaches were evaluated using two established synoptic surveys: the Rapid Geomorphic Assessment and the Rapid Stream Assessment Technique.

## Rapid Geomorphic Assessment

The Rapid Geomorphic Assessment (RGA) was designed by the Ontario Ministry of Environment (1999) to assess urban stream channels. It is a qualitative technique based on the presence and (or) absence of key indicators of channel instability such as exposed tree roots, bank failure, excessive deposition, etc. The various indicators are grouped into four categories representing specific geomorphic process: 1) Aggradation, 2) Degradation, 3) Channel Widening, and 3) Planimetric Form Adjustment. Over the course of the survey, the existing geomorphic conditions of each reach are noted and the presence or absence of the specific geomorphic indicators is documented. Upon completion of the field inspection, the indicators are tallied within each category and the subsequent results are used to calculate an overall reach stability index. This index value corresponds to one of three stability classes representing the relative degree of channel adjustment and (or) sensitivity to altered sediment and flow regimes (Table 3.1).


Table 3.1: RGA Classification

| Index | Classification | Interpretation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\leq 0.20$ | In Regime or Stable <br> (Least Sensitive) | The channel morphology is within a range of variance for streams <br> of similar hydrographic characteristics - evidence of instability is <br> isolated or associated with normal river meander propagation <br> processes |
| $0.21-$ | Transitional/Stressed <br> (Moderately <br> Sensitive) | Channel morphology is within the range of variance for streams of <br> similar hydrographic characteristics but the evidence of instability <br> is frequent |
| $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | In Adjustment <br> (Most Sensitive) | Channel morphology is not within the range of variance and <br> evidence of instability is wide spread |

(Source: Ontario Ministry of Environment, 2003 - Appendix C3)

## Rapid Stream Assessment Technique

The Rapid Stream Assessment Technique (RSAT; Galli, 1996) provides a purely qualitative assessment of the overall health and function of a reach in order to provide a quick assessment of local stream conditions and to identify and prioritize restoration needs on a watershed scale. This system integrates visual estimates of channel conditions and numerical scoring of stream parameters using six categories:

- Channel Stability
- Erosion and Deposition
- Instream Habitat
- Water Quality
- Riparian Conditions
- Biological Indicators

Once each condition has been assigned a score, values are totaled to produce an overall stream stability score, or health rating, based on a 50 point total. The recommended value is then categorized into one of three classes: low (poor health), moderate (moderate health), and high (good health).


- $<20 \quad$ Low (Poor Health)
- 20-35 Moderate
- $\quad>35 \quad$ High (Good Health)

Although the RSAT grades streams from a more biological and water quality perspective than the RGA, this information is still relevant within a geomorphic context. In general, the types of physical features that generate good habitat for aquatic organisms tend to represent healthy geomorphic systems as well (e.g., native fish may prefer a well established riffle-pool sequence with little fine material on the riffles, quality riparian conditions provide food and shade to streams, woody debris and overhanging banks provide habitat structure, etc).

Along with the above mentioned stream assessment protocols, the Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features: Interim Guidelines were taken into consideration in identifying the headwater drainage features. Bank and bed substrates, channel stability, morphology and any discharge points were noted during the field survey.

The results (Table 3.1) classified all the reaches included in the rapid assessments as either 'transitional/stressed' or 'in adjustment'. The main mode of adjustment is widening, followed by aggradation. These processes were indicated by woody debris jams, bank erosion/slumping, and bar formation. Reaches were characterized by common elements of urban channels such as road crossings, stormwater outfalls, and bank protection/modification. Evidence of modification and straightening was also prevalent, such as the steel walls bordering the downstream Little River reaches (LR-1 and LR-2). Channel dimensions were largest for the main channel reaches ranging from $6-30 \mathrm{~m}$ in bankfull width and 1-2.5 m for bankfull depth. While the drain reaches were much narrower, 2-8 m bankfull width, they were somewhat comparable in depth with a range of 0.3-1.2 m . This is indicative of the entrenchment that can occur in straightened agricultural drains.


Table 3.1: Summary of RGA results

| Reach | Stability Index (RGA) | Condition (RGA) | Dominant Process (RGA) | Assessm ent Score (RSAT) | Stability Ranking (RSAT) | Bankiull Widith (m) | Bankiull Depth (m) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LR-3 | 0.41 | In Adjustment | Aggradation Widening | 22 | Moderate | 18-26 | 0.8-1.8 | road crossings, weir, storm drainage, woody debris, sandbag with concrete lining on right bank, concrete cinder blocks on left bank, metal retaining wall acting as weir, lateral bar formation, channel migration to right bank |
| LR-5 | 0.29 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 23 | Moderate | 6-12 | 0.8-1.6 | tile drain, man-made riffles, slumped banks, road crossings, turbid, culvert, stagnant water, densely vegetated |
| LAD-1 | 0.34 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 24.5 | Moderate | 3-6 | 0.6-1.2 | culvert, road crossing and surrounding concrete drainage outfalls, failing concrete walls, channel highly entrenched, "U" shaped agricultural drain, little riparian cover, soft unconsolidated bed, ducks and 2 dead turtles |
| SD-1 | 0.29 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening Aggradation | --- | --- | 2-4 | 0.3-0.6 | culvert, confluence, cinder blocks, very little water, upstream vegetation controlled |
| DD-1 | 0.34 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 24 | Moderate | 4-8 | 0.6-1.2 | woody debris jams, densely vegetated, stagnant water not connected to main flow, channel appeared natural but altered |
| MD-1 | 0.26 | Transitional/ Stressed | Aggradation Widening | 22 | Moderate | 2-5 | 0.4-0.8 | road crossings, rail line, riprap, woody debris jams, lined bed, very thin riparian corridor, channel flows as an altered drain through agricultural fields |
| LRD-4 | 0.3 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 31 | Moderate | 4-6 | 0.6-1.2 | road crossings, urban debris, tile drainage, right bank bridge abutment was exposed, wide straight reach with good riffle-pool delineation, majority of bed consisted of beach sands, ripples forming along bed, scour observed along rocks |
| LRD-1 | 0.3 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening Aggradation | 27 | Moderate | 4-8 | 0.6-1 | stormwater outfalls, urban debris, road crossings, gabions, man-made riffles, terra blocks, woody debris jams, two |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | retention ponds, thatch on banks, urban debris, terraced banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LR-6 | 0.31 | Transitional/ Stressed | Aggradation | 21 | Moderate | 6-15 | 0.8-1.2 | vegetation controlled, road crossings, terra blocks, thatch on banks, vegetation in channel |
| LRD-2 | 0.31 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 32 | Moderate | 4-6 | 0.6-1 | road crossings, riprap, urban debris, erosion on banks, densely vegetated, thalweg out of alignment, bridge |
| LRD-3 | 0.26 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 33 | Moderate | 4-7 | 0.6-1 | road crossings, woody debris, terraced banks, erosion on banks, exposed roots |
| 6th <br> Concession | 0.22 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 26 | Moderate | 2-6 | 0.8-1.2 | road crossings, urban debris, roadside ditch, basal scour on banks |
| Baseline Drain | 0.34 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | --- | --- | 2-6 | 0.4-1.2 | road crossings, bank slumping, islands in channel |
| LRD-5 | 0.32 | Transitional/ Stressed | Widening | 24 | Moderate | 2-4 | 0.4-0.8 | road crossings, woody debris jams, densely vegetated, narrow straight drain with little bar formation, exposed clay along bank, exposed tree roots, leaning trees, groundwater seepage from right bank at crossing |
| 9th <br> Concession | 0.26 | Transitional/ Stressed | Aggradation Widening | 22.5 | Moderate | 3-6 | 0.6-1.2 | road crossings, woody debris jams, bar formations, extensive basal scour, roadside ditch, good riffle-pool spacing, numerous freeway crossings |
| LR-1 | 0.25 | Transitional/ Stressed | Aggradation | 30 | Moderate | 18-30 | 1.0-2.5 | riprap, bridges, outfalls, steel wall, marine/docks, residential land uses, algae, overhanging vegetation |
| LR-2 | 0.22 | Transitional/ Stressed | Aggradation | 30 | Moderate | 17-25 | 1.0-2.0 | road \& rail crossings, urban debris, outfalls, riprap, steel wall, stagnant water, sediment accumulation mid-channel |

## 4. Meander Belt Width Assessment

### 4.1 Meander Belt Width Delineation

Streams and rivers are dynamic features on the landscape. Changes in configuration and position occur through the development and evolution of meanders, and migration processes. Erosion and deposition of sediment is a key component of channel migration, enabling changes in shape and shifts in the position of a watercourse. These changes may cause loss or damage to private property and/or structures located too close to the transitioning watercourse. It is for this reason that, when infrastructure, development or other activities are proposed near a watercourse, it is desirable to designate a corridor intended to contain all of the existing and expected meander development and migration processes. Outside of this corridor, it is assumed that private property and structures will be safe from the erosion potential of the watercourse. The space that a meandering watercourse occupies on its floodplain, and in which all of the natural channel processes occur, is commonly referred to as the meander belt. Due to the spatial variability of modifying and controlling influences on channel form, two reaches situated immediately up/downstream of each other could show marked differences in planform configuration. It is for this reason that meander belt width delineation occurs on a reach-by-reach basis.

### 4.2 Preliminary Meander Belt Width

A preliminary meander belt width was delineated for each reach in the study area (Table 4.2). Standard methods for delineating meander belt widths rely on air photo analysis. First, a meander belt axis was identified, following the general down-valley orientation of the meander pattern. The meander belt is essentially centered along the meander axis. Second, the preliminary meander belt is established by drawing lines parallel to the governing outermost meanders of the existing channel planform, following the meander axis. This methodology is not applicable when a channel has been altered or straightened, erasing any indication of natural planform configuration. Historical analysis of aerial photos revealed that most of the reaches within the study area have been altered and exhibit very little natural change in planform between 1955 and 2004. A small number of reaches retained planform characteristics which allowed the traditional methodology to be applied. These reaches are labeled 'planform' in Table 4.2.


In the event that a watercourse has been altered and/or necessary data is insufficient, a meander belt width can be derived by means of an empirical analysis based on channel parameters. This involves basic field data collection to quantify channel dimensions for use in calculating an appropriate belt width, such as channel width, depth, or cross-sectional area. The following selected equations (Table 4.1) provide an estimate of meander belt width dimensions. These empirical relations are based on measurements of real watercourses; however, their transferability to watercourses situated within southern Ontario maybe limited due to differences in hydrologic regime, drainage area, and general controlling factors compared to the areas where the formulas were developed. Reviewed collectively, they provide results that are typically comparable to results attained through use of the standard belt width delineation procedures. Because most of the channels in the study area are straight agricultural drains, the empirical method was used for the majority of the reaches. Where field data was not obtained, meander belt widths were estimated using similar, nearby reaches as references. Reaches that required this method are identified in Table 4.2 as 'reference’.

### 4.3 Erosion Setbacks

From a geomorphic perspective, the 100-year migration rate typically represents the erosion setback to be applied to either side of the meander belt width in order to account for bank erosion and channel migration over time (100 years). However, due to the high degree of planform alteration, 100-year migration rates could not be quantified for this channel. In lieu of applying the 100-year migration rate, an erosion setback representing $10 \%$ of the preliminary meander belt width was applied to either side of the channel. The preliminary and final belt width results are given in Table 4.2 and illustrated in Figure 4.1 - Figure 4.4.

Belt widths are the smallest for the agricultural drain reaches which are primarily draining headwater areas where small channel dimensions and relatively low gradients limit migration. These conditions results in belt widths between 24 to 35 m . Further downstream, some planform characteristics have been retained

(such as SD-3) and these channels have slightly larger belt widths to encompass a more sinuous pattern. The Little River drain reaches (LRD) have belt widths in the range of 40-80 m. The surrounding smaller drains converge with the LRD reaches providing more flow with which to alter channel dimensions resulting in the need for larger belt widths. The main channel reaches (LR) have belt width values that range from 100-200 m . These values result from the increased channel dimensions as well as some large meanders which have been preserved in the channel planform. While these meanders are unlikely to change significantly due to heavy alteration, they are indicative of the channels past migration based on its flow capacity.

Table 4.1: Empirical formulas for estimating meander belt width dimensions (Reach LAD-1 values provided as an example).

| Meander Belt Empirical Analysis |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | Equation |  | Meander Belt Widith (m) |
| Williams (1986) - channel area $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | $18 \mathrm{cc}^{0.65}$ | $=$ | 33.3 |
| Williams (1986) - width ( m ) | $4.3 \mathrm{~W}^{1.12}$ | $=$ | 22.0 |
| Ward (2002) - width (ft) - no factor of safety | $4.8 \mathrm{~W}^{1.08}$ | $=$ | 25.5 |
| Lorenz et al. (1985) - width (m) | $7.53 \mathrm{~W}^{1.01}$ | $=$ | 32.9 |
| AVERAGE | $=$ | 28.4 |  |
| STANDARD DEVIATION | $=$ | 5.56 |  |



Table 4.2: Summary of Meander Belt Width Results

| Reach | Preliminary MBW | Final MBW for adjusted (add 10\% seitback | Method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LR-1 | 128 | 154 | Reference |
| LR-2 | 128 | 154 | Field |
| LR-3 | 120 | 143 | Field |
| LR-4 | 85 | 102 | Reference |
| LR-5 | 85 | 102 | Field |
| LR-6 | 180 | 216 | Planform |
| LRD-1 | 41 | 50 | Field |
| LRD-2 | 50 | 60 | Planform |
| LRD-3 | 50 | 60 | Field |
| LRD-4 | 72 | 86 | Planform |
| LRD-5 | 30 | 36 | Planform |
| LAD-1 | 28 | 34 | Field |
| DD-1 | 36 | 42 | Field |
| SD-3 | 60 | 72 | Planform |
| SD-1 | 20 | 24 | Field |
| SD-2 | 20 | 24 | Reference |
| RD-1 | 60 | 72 | Planform |
| RD-2 | 23 | 30 | Reference |
| MD-1 | 23 | 28 | Field |
| MD-2 | 23 | 28 | Reference |
| MD-3 | 23 | 28 | Reference |
| LD-1 | 23 | 28 | Reference |
| LD-2 | 23 | 28 | Reference |
| RD-1 | 23 | 28 | Reference |
| BRD-1 | 28 | 32 | Field |
| NC-1 | 28 | 32 | Field |
| SC-1 | 28 | 32 | Field |
| SC-2 | 28 | 32 | Reference |
| SC-3 | 28 | 32 | Reference |



Figure 4.1: Meander Belt Width Map - North Reaches


Figure 4.2: Meander Belt Width Map - Central and Eastern Reaches


Figure 4.3: Meander Belt Width Map - Western Reaches


Figure 4.4: Meander Belt Width Map: Southern Reaches

## 5. Detailed Field Data Collection

### 5.1 Monitoring Cross-Section Sites (2004, 2007, 2011)

Once the desktop analysis of the study area was completed in 2004, a monitoring program was established to track changes in the channels over time. This activity involved the installation of seven cross sections throughout the study area so that historical data could be collected. By monitoring the cross sections over a period of time, historical trends and channel changes can be observed and inferences can be made pertaining to development impacts on the watercourses in the subject area. The locations of the detailed sites were determined to provide a representative coverage of the study area, both from a spatial and morphologic perspective. Monitoring provides frequent, "low-tech" observations which enhance our understanding of a river system. It also enables direct measurements of a channel changes, such as bank erosion and bed scour, which can be linked to the historic assessment and provide a clearer picture of channel dynamics. The seven sites were located in Reaches LR-3, LRD-4, LAD-1, DD-1, BRD1, NC-1, and SC-1 (Figure 2.1). The cross-sections were benchmarked by installing monuments on the top of both banks such that topographic detail between the pins could be accurately measured on a recurring basis. The cross-sections were again measured in May 2007, but not all cross-sections could be relocated, in some cases, because maintenance along the drain had stripped or buried the monitoring pins. An attempt was also made in September 2011 to update the monitoring, but the field crew was only able to relocate one of the sites (NC-1). Below are brief descriptions of the general characteristics at each site and the results of the cross-section monitoring. If monitoring is planned for the future, new monitoring locations will need to be established at the sites.

## Reach LR-3

Reach LR - 3 is situated in an urban parkland area surrounded by residential development and associated infrastructure. The banks were covered by reeds, trees, an understory of shrubs, and groundcover of grasses and herbaceous vegetation. Reeds extended into the channel along the right bank. There appeared to be a high flow channel along the right bank below the bankfull elevation that was dry during the site visit in December 2004. The estimated bankfull width was 18.20 m with a bankfull depth of 1.06 m .


The average water depth for this monitoring cross section was measured at 0.15 m with a wetted width of approximately 6.80 m . Channel substrate consisted of a mixture of gravel and pebble sized particles. During the 2004 site visit a medial bar was observed upstream of the monitoring cross section that was also composed of a gravel and pebble mixture. One erosion pin was installed in the right bank of the monitoring cross section to measure changes in bank stability and mobility over the course of the monitoring program. A wetland was also noted along the right bank of the cross section. Below, are some monumented photographs that were taken at this monitoring location (Figure 5.2). Comparison of the cross sections from 2004 and 2007 show only a minor change in shape (Figure 5.3). The right bank shows slight aggradation.


Figure 5.2: Example photographs for monitoring location at LR-3 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.3: Monitoring cross section overlay for Reach LR-3.

## Reach LRD-4

Reach LRD-4 is located in a residential parkland area with some commercial/industrial land use. This portion of Little River Drain appears to have been previously straightened as the channel has a wide ' $U$ 'shape. The banks appeared to be eroding evidenced by exposed tree roots. Sparse vegetation was present on the banks during the site visit with little evidence of growth in the summer. The bank vegetation consisted of mature trees and shrubs growing out of a sand-silt soil. The soil appears to have been deposited during high flows. Channel substrate consisted of a pebble-sand-silt mixture with little-to-no channel vegetation present. Bankfull width was estimated to be 6.15 m with a depth of 0.67 m , and a wetted width of 4.04 m and depth of 0.20 m . There were no erosion pins installed at this monitoring cross section during the site visit. Below are the monumented photographs taken for this monitoring site (Figure 5.4). The channel bed has been elevated due to aggradation between the monitoring in December 2004 and May 2007 (Figure 5.5). Minor changes in bank shape support the contention that bank soil is being deposited during high flows.


Figure 5.4: Example photographs for monitoring location at LRD-4 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.5: Monitoring cross section overlay for Reach LRD-4.


## Reach LAD-1

Reach LAD-1 is a tributary of Little River known as Lachance Drain. It appears to be a straight, dug drainage ditch flowing through mainly agricultural land with some commercial/industrial land uses in the downstream portion. The downstream portion of the reach is also located near the rail line servicing the northern portion of Windsor. The channel appeared to be highly entrenched with a distinctive ' $v$ '-shape to the valley. There was no noticeable bank erosion and the channel appears to convey low flows only. The bankfull width calculated for this site was 8.5 m with a bankfull depth of 0.78 m . The channel was at low flow during the site visit. The wetted width was 2.56 m with an average depth of 0.035 m . Bed substrate consisted of a mixture of silt and fine sands with a lot of vegetation (cattails) growing throughout most of the reach. Below are the monumented photographs taken for this monitoring cross section (Figure 5.6). Field crews were unable to relocate the monitoring cross section in 2007; therefore comparative cross section overlays cannot be shown (

Figure 5.7).


Figure 5.6: Example photographs for monitoring location at LAD-1 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.7: Monitoring cross section overlay for Reach LAD-1.

## Reach DD-1

This reach flows as an agricultural drain into the eastern edge of Little River upstream of Lachance Drain. The surrounding land use is dominated by agricultural fields and scrub lands. Bank vegetation consisted of trees, shrubs (raspberry bushes), and tall and short herbaceous vegetation. During the site inspection, there was sufficient woody debris in the channel to create barriers to flow and backwater. Bank erosion that extended to the top of bank in some areas was also noted along a portion of the reach. There did not appear to be a lot of under-story vegetation present near the monitoring cross section and the trees located along the bank did not appear to be leaning, suggesting that the bank erosion is slow. Channel substrate consisted of sandy silt to sand mixture. Estimated bankfull width for this monumented site was 5.1 m and the bankfull depth was 0.88 m . The wetted width observed for this site was 1.21 m with an average wetted depth of 0.07 m . One erosion pin was installed at this cross section in the left bank approximately 5 m downstream of the monitoring cross section. Monumented photographs for this reach can be found below (Figure 5.8). Field crews were unable to relocate the monitoring cross section in 2007; therefore comparative cross section overlays cannot be shown (Figure 5.9).


Figure 5.8: Example photographs for monitoring location at DD-1 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.9: Monitoring cross section overlay for Reach DD-1.


## Reach BRD-1

Baseline Road Drain (BRD-1) joins the Little River Drain near 6th Concession Road. The entire reach is surrounded by agricultural land and appears to flow as a drainage ditch along $6^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road. Bank vegetation consisted of a mix of shrubs with tall and short herbaceous vegetation. Channel substrate consisted of a mixture of fine sand and silt. There did not appear to be woody debris in the channel during this site visit. Bankfull was estimated to be 4.6 m width, with a depth of 0.59 m , a wetted width of 1.42 m and an average wetted depth of 0.19 m . Two erosion pins were installed at this monitoring cross section. The first was installed in the left bank approximately 2.0 m upstream of the monitoring cross section, and the other one was installed approximately 8.5 m downstream of the cross section. The photographs below illustrate the site characteristics (Figure 5.10). The site was re-measured in May 2007 (Figure 5.11). The changes in channel shape suggest that the ditch was cleaned out with the help of a backhoe. This is a standard practice in rural areas when municipal drains become overgrown with channel and bank vegetation.


Figure 5.10: Example photographs for monitoring location at LRD-4 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.11: Monitoring cross section overlay for the Baseline Road Drain Reach 1.

## Reach SC-1

This reach is the terminal section of the $6^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road drain before it becomes the Baseline Road Drain which ultimately flows into the Little River Drain. The surrounding land use for this portion of the $6^{\text {th }}$ Concession drain consisted mainly of residential development and associated infrastructure, with some agricultural land use still visible. The left bank of the channel abuts $6^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road. Bank vegetation consisted of a mixture of tall and short grasses and herbaceous vegetation with some trees and shrubs along the residential side of the channel. The left bank appeared to be slumping with some scars visible along the bank. Channel substrate consisted of a mixture of silt and fines. Observed bankfull width was 3.7 m with a bankfull depth of 0.43 m . The wetted width was not that deep during the site visit with a wetted width of 1.32 m and an average wetted depth of 0.12 m . Two erosion pins were installed at this monitoring cross section, one in the right bank and the other in the left bank, both immediately at the cross section. The monumented photographs taken for this reach are below (Figure 5.12). Cross-section measurement was repeated in May 2007 (Figure 5.13). Change in cross-sectional shape indicates slumping of the left bank and toe erosion of the right bank.


Figure 5.12: Example photographs for monitoring location at SC-1 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.13: Monitoring cross section overlay for the Sixth Concession Drain Reach 1.


## Reach NC-1

This reach flows along the $9^{\text {th }}$ Concession Roadway as a roadside ditch, before joining with $6^{\text {th }}$ Concession Drain (SC-1) and becoming the Little River Drain (LRD). Surrounding land use consists mainly of agricultural fields with some residential development and associated infrastructure. Bank vegetation consisted of a mixture of tall and short grasses and herbaceous vegetation. Channel substrate consisted of a pebble-sand mixture with some large boulders in the channel near the cross section. Bankfull width was estimated to be 4.3 m with a bankfull depth of 0.57 m . The wetted width from this cross section was observed to be 1.34 m width with an average depth of 0.12 m . There were no erosion pins installed at this monitoring cross section. The monumented photographs below highlight the findings for this reach (Figure 5.14). The cross section for Reach NC-1 was the only monitoring site that could be re-located in both 2007 and 2011 (Figure 5.15). Between December 2004 and May 2007 the channel appears to have been cleaned out creating more of a " U -shape". There also appears to have been some slumping along the left bank during that time period. The shape does not seem to have changed significantly between May 2007 and September 2011. The left bank has eroded to create a gentler bank profile, while the right bank has remained relatively stable.


Figure 5.14: Example photographs for monitoring location at ND-1 (Dec 2004).


Figure 5.15: Monitoring cross section overlay for the Ninth Concession Drain Reach 1.

### 5.2 Detailed Sites (2007)

Detailed work was carried out in May 2007 at five sites selected to provide representative coverage of the study area, both from a spatial and morphologic perspective. The selected reaches included Reach LR-2, LR-5, LAD-1, SD-1 and LRD-4 (Figure 2.1). Three of these sites were new to the study and two were already included as part of the monitoring program (LRD-4 and LAD-1). Detailed field assessments involved standard protocols and known field indicators used to quantify bankfull cross-sectional dimensions (e.g. bankfull depth and width) at five representative locations. A modified pebble count based on Wolman (1954) was used to characterize the surficial channel bed materials, whereby approximately 40 particles were randomly sampled and the length of the median axis was recorded. Sub-pavement materials were also characterized by separating a sub-surface sample qualitatively by particle size, and evaluating each fraction as a percentage of the overall sample. Note that the channel bed surface is defined
in thickness as two diameters of the largest sediments. In addition to noting bank characteristics, an in situ shear stress test was performed on bank materials. Finally, a level survey of the channel bottom and bankfull elevations provided a measure of the local energy gradient.

A description of each reach is provided below including general characteristics and bankfull geometry. Channel form is thought to be a response to the water and sediment supplied to the system, coupled with valley constraints, such as bedrock and vegetation. The bankfull channel dimensions (Table 5.1) likely formed to carry a certain discharge. Therefore, bankfull discharge and other important flow characteristics, including the main driver of sediment entrainment, shear stress (Table 5.2), can be estimated using channel gradient and bankfull channel cross-sections measured in the field.

## Reach LR-2

Reach LR-2 is a straight, dug canal that leads into Lake St. Clair. There are berms that are built on both sides of the channel with retaining walls sporadically found throughout the reach. A storm outlet and floodgate contribute to flows in the channel during high flow periods. The bankfull width ranged from 18.47 m to 19.16 m with an average bankfull depth of 1.08 m . The banks were uniform in height at 4 m , composed of silt and clay supported by riprap or retaining walls. The water was relatively deep at time of measurement, with no defined pool-riffle sequences observed. The bed substrate varied from clay to riprap material, believed to have come from the riprap lining of the banks. The median grain size $\left(\mathrm{D}_{50}\right)$ was 5.30 mm and the $\mathrm{D}_{84}$ (ie., size where $84 \%$ of the samples are finer) was 49.28 mm . This indicates that while the substrate spans the range of clay to riprap most of the bed material is classified as pebbles/fine gravel with the largest material being mostly very coarse gravel. Average bankfull discharge is estimated to be $21.92 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ which moves at an average rate of $0.88 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, producing an average shear stress of $8.42 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.


Table 5.1: Average bankfull geometry results from the 5 detailed study sites

| Cross-section Name: | SD-1 | LAD-1 | $L R D-4$ | $L R-5$ | $L R-2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bankfull Width $(\mathrm{m})$ | 2.59 | 4.34 | 5.39 | 7.72 | 18.84 |
| Average Bankfull Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.34 | 0.59 | 0.57 | 0.85 | 1.08 |
| Maximum Bankfull Depth $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.51 | 0.89 | 0.78 | 1.05 | 1.51 |
| Bankfull Width:Depth | 7.71 | 7.31 | 9.52 | 9.23 | 17.52 |
| Cross-sectional Area $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 0.89 | 2.55 | 3.12 | 6.60 | 20.96 |
| Wetted Perimeter $(\mathrm{m})$ | 2.92 | 4.82 | 5.85 | 8.74 | 19.53 |
| Hydraulic Radius $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.30 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.76 | 1.07 |
| Left Bank Angle $\left(^{\circ}\right)$ | 36.98 | 34.77 | 31.77 | 45.69 | 19.31 |
| Right Bank Angle $\left(^{\circ}\right)$ | 31.43 | 29.57 | 30.25 | 54.24 | 22.81 |
| Gradient | $0.43 \%$ | $0.11 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.06 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ |

Table 5.2: Average bankfull hydraulics results from the 5 detailed study sites

| Cross-section Name: | $S D-1$ | $L A D-1$ | $L R D-4$ | $L R-5$ | $L R-2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bankfull Discharge $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ | 0.87 | 1.84 | 1.76 | 4.31 | 20.02 |
| Average Bankfull Velocity $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ | 0.83 | 0.61 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 0.80 |
| Maximum Bankfull Velocity $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ | 1.17 | 0.86 | 0.63 | 0.72 | 1.07 |
| Average Shear Velocity $\left[\mathrm{u}^{\star}\right](\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s})$ | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.09 |
| Stream Power $(\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{m})$ | 36.87 | 19.89 | 12.06 | 25.36 | 157.15 |
| Stream Power per unit Width $\left(\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 14.20 | 4.55 | 2.22 | 3.33 | 8.34 |
| Average Shear Stress $\left(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 12.82 | 5.66 | 3.64 | 4.46 | 8.42 |
| Maximum Shear Stress $\left(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 21.00 | 9.48 | 5.32 | 6.14 | 11.76 |
| Left Bank Shear Stress $\left(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 8.61 | 4.03 | 2.43 | 3.08 | 6.15 |
| Right Bank Shear Stress $\left(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | 8.14 | 4.05 | 2.52 | 3.14 | 6.28 |
| Critical Particle Diameter for Analysis $(\mathrm{m})$ | clay | clay | 0.0032 | 0.0057 | 0.0049 |
| Hydraulic Roughness | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.035 |

## Reach LR-5

Reach LR-5 was located in a parkland area behind residential buildings south of Forest Glade Drive and east of Lauzen Parkway. It is a straight reach with no natural pool-riffle sequences; however, there were some man-made riffle features at an outlet of a storm drain. The bankfull width ranged from 6.89 m to 9.90 m with an average bankfull depth of 0.85 m . The water was turbid at the time of the field investigation with nearly stagnant flow. The bed substrate was composed of clay to cobble within this range most

sediment was classified as very coarse sand as the median grain size was 4.0 mm . The larger material $\left(D_{84}\right)$ was classified as coarse gravel. The banks consisted of steep berms varying in height from 1 m to 4 m and were composed of clay, silt and very fine sand. The banks were heavily vegetated, but were experiencing basal scour (slumping) the length of the reach. There was urban debris found in the middle of the reach. The reach was heavily influenced by widening processes undermining the banks with basal scour leaving leaning/fallen trees and exposed roots. Average bankfull discharge is estimated to be 4.31 $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ which moves at an average rate of $0.59 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, producing an average shear stress of $4.46 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

## Reach LAD-1

Reach LAD-1 was a man-made ditch draining the surrounding agricultural fields. The straight channel lacks natural features including riffle-pool sequencing and a meandering planform. The channel was very entrenched with a distinctive "U"-shape. The bank heights were fairly uniform averaging 2.8 m and were composed of silt and very fine sands. The bankfull width ranged from 3.56 m to 4.76 m with an average bankfull depth of 0.59 m . The bed composition varied from clay to very coarse sand. The bulk of the material is silt with a median grain size of 0.0068 mm and the largest particles are classified as coarse sand with a $\mathrm{D}_{84}$ of 0.098 mm . The banks support a thin grass cover while the channel is nearly free of vegetation. Several relatively new culverts drained into the reach. A concrete wall surrounding the culvert road crossing at the upstream end of the reach had failed and fallen into the channel. Significant evidence of basal scour, siltation and scour pools downstream of culverts suggest a reach that is heavily stressed. Average bankfull discharge based on channel dimensions is estimated to be $1.84 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ which moves at an average rate of $0.61 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, producing an average shear stress of $5.66 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

## Reach SD-1

Reach SD-1 was a man-made drainage ditch located amidst fallow agricultural fields. The channel was straight, turned only at right angles and was very entrenched. It lacked natural features like riffle-pool sequencing and a meander planform. The bankfull width ranged from 2.40 m to 2.97 m with an average bankfull depth of 0.34 m . The bank heights were fairly uniform averaging 1.8 m and were composed of
clay and silt. The bed composition varied from clay to gravel with a median grain size of 0.003 mm (clay) and a $D_{84}$ of 0.326 (very fine sand). The upstream end of the reach was controlled by the abundant channel vegetation, which thinned out towards the downstream end. Water was located in isolated depressions in the bed. Average bankfull discharge based on channel dimensions is estimated to be 0.87 $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ which moves at an average rate of $0.83 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, producing an average shear stress of $12.82 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

## Reach LRD-4

Reach LRD-4 was a relatively wide, straight drainage ditch. The bankfull width ranged from 4.47 m to 5.98 m with an average bankfull depth of 0.55 m . The banks varied in height from 1 m to 3 m and were composed of clay, silt and very fine sand. The bed composition varied from clay to gravel with sand dominant and sporadic cobble bars. The grain size distribution indicated that most material was classified as coarse sand with a median grain size of 0.56 mm . The larger fraction $\left(\mathrm{D}_{84}\right)$ consisted mostly of very coarse sand. The bed also had a well defined riffle-pool sequence. The channel was littered with urban debris. Based on cross-sectional dimensions, average bankfull discharge was estimated to be $1.62 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ which moves at an average rate of $0.47 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, producing an average shear stress of $3.52 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.


### 5.3 Erosion Threshold Analysis

In essence, an erosion threshold analysis determines the hydraulics, such as discharge, channel depth, or average channel velocity, at which the channel produces enough shear stress to initiate the mobilization of sediment of a give size, usually the $D_{50}$. The analysis also helps to evaluate a reach's erosion sensitivity by comparing the boundary shear stress associated with modeled flows to the critical shear stress required to entrain sediment. Nine different models were used to perform erosion threshold analysis for the Sandwich South Employment Lands, including models based on critical shear stress and permissible velocity, in order to consider a range of results. The model results were examined for convergence and compatibility with field observations. Selection of appropriate thresholds was also based on an understanding of site conditions and the assumptions and ranges of conditions under which the models are applicable.

The watercourses within the study area are mostly straightened constructed channels with relatively low gradients and finer bed materials. Providing erosion thresholds under these conditions is generally difficult, as most flows will move sand and finer materials, and there generally aren't enough true gravels to justify using the $\mathrm{D}_{65}$ or $\mathrm{D}_{84}$ ( $65^{\text {th }}$ or $84^{\text {th }}$ percentile grain size) as often done with bimodal sediment distributions. In this case, the median grain sizes for the entire sediment distribution in each reach $\left(\mathrm{D}_{50}\right)$ were used to estimate the erosion thresholds, including the cohesive clays at LAD-1 and SD-1. The Fischenich 2001 entrainment relationships provide reasonable results when dealing with the fine gravels found at the non-clay sites, but for the clays, the Shields equation was used, albeit modified by setting the critical shear to a given number based on estimates of cohesiveness and strength of the clay (Chow 1959, $4-9 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ). The calculated erosion threshold discharge values varied between $16 \%$ and $55 \%$ of estimated bankfull flows, with an average of $33 \%$. Sediment generally begins moving at flows around $1 / 3$ to $1 / 2$ of bankfull, so the estimated values suggest that the entrenched channels with fine grained beds and banks might be relatively sensitive to increases in flows. LR-5 and LAD-1 appear to be less sensitive, whereas SD-1, which is steeper and flows through sandy clay, is expected to be the most sensitive.


In addition, it appears that many of the drains within the study site are maintained. Channel widening, bank steepening, and further entrenchment, which may or may not be associated with in-channel maintenance work, could alter the erosion threshold values, channel sensitivity, and the morphology in general (e.g., over steepened banks tend to fail, wider channel tend to have higher threshold discharges.) The current values are based on conditions over the last 5 years, and although we tried to be conservative, sites may have been altered more recently.

Table 5.3: Erosion Threshold Analysis Values

| Parameter | LR-2 | LR-5 | LAD-1 | SD-1 | LRD-4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Bankfull Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Bankfull Width (m) | 18.84 | 7.72 | 4.34 | 2.59 | 5.20 |
| Average Bankfull Depth (m) | 1.08 | 0.85 | 0.59 | 0.34 | 0.55 |
| Bankfull Gradient (\%) | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.43 | 0.07 |
| Bed Material |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{D}_{50}$ (mm) | 5.30 | 4.0 | 0.0068 | 0.003 | 0.56 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{84}$ (mm) | 49.28 | 23.90 | 0.098 | 0.326 | 2.72 |
| Bankfull Hydraulics |  |  |  |  | 0.035 |
| Manning's n (estimate) | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.035 | 0.035 |  |
| Average Bankfull Velocity (m/s) | 0.88 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.47 |
| Average Bankfull Discharge (m$\left.{ }^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$ | 20.02 | 4.31 | 1.84 | 0.87 | 1.76 |
| Thresholds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Particle Size | 5 mm | 4 mm | Clay | Clay | 4 mm |
| Method of analysis | Fischenich | Fischenich | Shields/Chow | Shields/Chow | Fischenich |
| $(2001)$ | $(2001)$ | $(1959)$ | $(1959)$ | $(2001)$ |  |
| Critical Discharge (m$\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ | 5.46 | 2.35 | 0.85 | 0.14 | 0.4 |
| Average Critical Velocity (ms ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 0.54 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.31 |
| Critical/Bankfull Discharge | $28 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $23 \%$ |

## 6. Restoration/Remediation Opportunities

1. Restoration of altered channels

Previously altered channel sections could be restored and rehabilitated to channels that exhibit natural functions. The majority of the study areas are drains where natural channel design principals can be implemented. A lot of these channels are deep with high steep banks that are exhibiting erosion. Bank restructuring and floodplain terracing is an option for these entrenched watercourses, as the channels currently cannot access their floodplains due to the high banks. The result of the existing condition is greater stress being exerted on the bed during higher flows. The work should include re-grading the banks to create benches or terraces, which would help dissipate energy and re-connect the bankfull channel to a floodplain area. The re-graded banks should be re-vegetated to help stabilize the banks and create floodplain habitat.
2. Re-establish riparian vegetation

Re-establishing a healthy riparian vegetation community will not only increase bank stability, but will also provide shading to the creek, contributing to aquatic habitat through the contribution of organic debris. It also contributes to the overall aesthetic impact of the system.
3. Construct channel bed morphology for fish habitat

Many of the channels in the study area lack bed morphology to support any fish habitat due to over-widened channel widths and sediment accumulation. By constructing structures to narrow cross-sectional area (i.e. wood deflectors sticking out of the banks) to promote bed morphology and re-grade the banks to create benches or terraces to help dissipate energy and help sediment transport, fish may have a healthy habitat.
4. Removal of hard structures - bed and banks


There are reaches and portions of reaches in the Windsor Annex Lands that have hardened banks (e.g. LR-2, LRD-1 and MD-1). The conditions of the hard structures (concrete and retaining walls) vary with some failing and others being undermined and may eventually fail. By replacing these structures with a 'softer' bio-engineered approach such as vegetated riprap or brush layering, it offers the stability and erosion protection of an engineered structure with the aesthetic and ecological benefits of incorporated plantings. These techniques are ideal for the treatment of localized scour issues where lateral expansion or channel migration is undesirable.
5. Local bank stabilization area

The majority of the reaches in the study area are experiencing bank erosion. In these areas, localized bank treatment could be considered to dissipate the expected increase in flow regime. Bio-engineering techniques such as brush layering and crib walls effectively increase the shear strength of the banks, allowing them to withstand higher flows than those tolerated by existing bare soils.


## 7. Conclusions

This report presents the findings of geomorphological reach characterization, meander belt width assessment, erosion threshold analysis at selected fieldwork sites, and cross-sectional monitoring. The report is intended to provide a characterization of existing conditions for Upper Little River and its associated drains contained within the Sandwich South Employment lands. Based on the report findings the following key conclusions can be drawn:

## - Meander belt widths

Meander belt widths were delineated for all reaches based on either current channel planform or current channel dimensions. Due to a history of alteration and straightening traditional methods of meander belt width delineation could not be used in which case channel dimensions (from field data) were used in conjunction with empirical relationships to calculate an appropriate belt width. Erosion setbacks were calculated as $10 \%$ of the preliminary belt width as historical migration rates could not be determined. Final belt widths ranged from a minimum of 28 m to a maximum of 216 m . Larger belt widths were determined for reaches with a more sinuous planform and larger channel dimensions. Any future development of the study area should occur outside of the meander belt widths to ensure channel stability.

## - Reach characterization

Within the study area, reaches can be grouped into three different categories: the main Little River channel (LR-1 to LR-6), the Little River drain (LRD-1 to LRD-5), and the agricultural drains (all remaining reaches). While the reaches differ widely in channel dimensions, characteristics are similar. The majority of the reaches have been straightened or altered in some way. Banks are protected by various structures ranging from gabions and terra blocks, to large steel retaining walls on the main Little River reaches. The agricultural drains appear to be mostly man-made straight ditches, lacking any natural geomorphic features. Bank erosion is prevalent in the entrenched, agricultural drains as well as in some of the larger reaches where bank protection is slightly undermined. Based on these characteristics noted during rapid assessments, all reaches were classified as in transition or adjustment. Most channels were widening with a secondary process of aggradation. As the channels widen and erode the banks, trees lean and fall into the channel creating woody debris which traps sediment leading to the secondary process of aggradation. Cross section monitoring results support this characterization as well. Both LR-3 and LRD-4 showed slight aggradation between the two times of measurement. Reaches BRD-1, NC-1, and SC-1 had evidence of bank slumping and erosion over the monitoring period.

## - Erosion thresholds

Erosion thresholds were done for five reaches: two on the Little River main channel, one on the Little River drain, and two on agricultural drains. This selection gave a representative sample of the reaches within the study area. The critical discharge was on average $33 \%$ of the bankfull discharge which is

relatively low. This is attributed to the entrenched nature of the majority of the reaches, resulting in a high bankfull discharge relative to grain size within the channel.
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## Appendix A: Photographic Record of Reaches



## Sixth Concession (SCD-1)

Looking downstream at right bank toe erosion


## Sixth Concession (SCD-2)

Looking downstream at reach break and bank


Ninth Concession Drain (NCD-1)
Looking upstream from near middle of reach


## Baseline Road Drain (BRD-1)

Looking downstream from end of reach at bank erosion


Lachance Drain Reach (LAD-1)
Cross section 6 looking upstream


## Little River Reach (LR-1)

Looking downstream at retaining walls


## Little River Reach (LR-2)

Cross section 2 looking downstream


## Little River Reach (LR-3)

Looking at downstream end of reach at toe erosion of right bank


## Little River Reach (LR-4)

Looking downstream from road crossing
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## APPENDIX K

Preliminary Opinion of Probable Costs

Upper Little River Watershed Master Drainage and Stormwater Management Plan
Preliminary Opinion of Probable Costs

| Description | Alternative 1 |  | Alternative 2 |  | Alternative 3 |  |  | rnative 4 | Alternative 5 |  | Alternative 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Do-Nothing |  | Off-Line Water Quality and no Water Quantity Control |  | On-line Water Quality and Quantity Controls Communal OnLine SWM |  | On-line Water Quantity and Off-line Water Quality Controls |  | Distributed Offline Water Quality and Quantity Controls |  | Grouped Off-line Water Quality and Quantity Controls |  |
| Channel Improvements (\$/m) | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 1,000 |
| Pond (\$/ha of drainage area) | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | 7,000 | \$ | 11,000 | \$ | 11,000 | \$ | 10,000 |
| Improved Channel length (m) |  | - |  | 28,000 |  | 28,000 |  | 28,000 |  | 28,000 |  | 28,000 |
| Proposed area requiring SWM Facilities (ha) |  | - |  | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |  | 3,000 |
| Channel Improvements | \$ | - | \$ | 28,000,000 | \$ | 28,000,000 | \$ | 28,000,000 | \$ | 28,000,000 | \$ | 28,000,000 |
| SWM Facilities | \$ | - | \$ | 15,000,000 | \$ | 21,000,000 | \$ | 33,000,000 | \$ | 33,000,000 | \$ | 30,000,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ | - | \$ | 43,000,000 | \$ | 49,000,000 | \$ | 61,000,000 | \$ | 61,000,000 | \$ | 58,000,000 |
| Allowance/Contingency (15\%) | \$ | - | \$ | 6,450,000 | \$ | 7,350,000 | \$ | 9,150,000 | \$ | 9,150,000 | \$ | 8,700,000 |
| Design/Construction Administration (10\%) | \$ | - | \$ | 4,300,000 | \$ | 4,900,000 | \$ | 6,100,000 | \$ | 6,100,000 | \$ | 5,800,000 |
| Grand Total | \$ | - | \$ | 53,750,000 | \$ | 61,250,000 | \$ | 76,250,000 | \$ | 76,250,000 | \$ | 72,500,000 |

Notes Alternatives 3 to 5 assume proposed flows are attenuated to the capacity of the existing municipal drain network
Alternatives 2 to 5 assume the existing municipal drain network is abandoned and offsetting measures are required Costs include excavation, fine grading, hard servicing (headwalls, pipes, rip-rap, etc.), and landscaping Costs do not include property or pump stations
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## Stage 1 Archaeology Assessment

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Archaeology Programs Unit
Programs and Services Branch
Culture Division
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto ON M7A 0A7
Tel.: (416) 212-8442
Email: kaye.boucher@ontario.ca

Ministère du Tourisme, de la Culture et du Sport
Unité des programmes d'archéologie
Direction des programmes et des services
Division de culture
401, rue Bay, bureau 1700
Toronto ON M7A OA7
Tél. : (416) 212-8442
Email: kaye.boucher@ontario.ca

May 16, 2016
Walter Frank McCall (P389)
Stantec Consulting
48 Charles Brantford ON N3T 1B3

## RE: Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report Entitled, "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: Upper Little River Watershed Master Plan and Stormwater Management Plan Various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Townships of Sandwich East and South, now City of Windsor and Town of Tecumseh, Essex County, Ontario ", Dated Apr 8, 2015, Filed with MTCS Toronto Office on Apr 22, 2015, MTCS Project Information Form Number P389-0040-2014

Dear Dr. McCall:

This office has reviewed the above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. ${ }^{1}$ This review has been carried out in order to determine whether the licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their licence, that the licensee assessed the property and documented archaeological resources using a process that accords with the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists set by the ministry, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations are consistent with the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario.

The report documents the assessment of the study area as depicted in Figure 4 of the above titled report and recommends the following:

Stantec was retained by the City of Windsor to complete a Stage 1 archaeological assessment for a study area, measuring approximately 225 hectares in size, located on various Lots and Concessions, Townships of Sandwich East and South, now City of Windsor and Town of Tecumseh, Essex County, Ontario (Figure 1).

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment, involving background research and a property inspection, resulted in the determination that portions of the study area exhibit a moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources. As such, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be required for portions of the study area (Figure 4).

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment will include the systematic walking of open ploughed fields at five metre intervals as outlined in Section 2.1.1 of the MTCS; 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). The MTCS standards further require that all agricultural
land, both active and inactive, be recently ploughed and sufficiently weathered to improve the visibility of archaeological resources. Ploughing must be deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing, and must be able to ensure at least $80 \%$ ground surface visibility.

Moreover, the Stage 2 archaeological assessment will include a test pit survey at five metre intervals in areas inaccessible for ploughing as outlined in Section 2.1.2 of the MTCS; 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). The MTCS standards require that each test pit be approximately 30 centimetres in diameter, excavated to at least five centimetres in to subsoil, and have all soil screened through six millimetre hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of any cultural material that may be present. Prior to backfilling, each test pit will be examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill.

Should any areas of disturbance or features indicating that archaeological potential have been removed, including permanently wet areas, not previously identified during the Stage 1 property inspection be encountered during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment, they will be documented as outlined in Section 2.1.8 of the MTCS; 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011).

Additional archaeological assessment is required; hence the study area remains subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

Based on the information contained in the report, the ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences. This report has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.

Should you require any further information regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
Kaye Boucher
Archaeology Review Officer

cc. Archaeology Licensing Officer<br>Anna Godo,City of Windsor<br>Craig Newton,a. Environmental Approvals Branch Ministry of the Environment

[^0]
# Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Upper Little River Watershed Master Plan and Stormwater Management Plan 

Various Lots and Concessions,
Geographic Townshipsof
Sandwich East and South, now
City of Windsor and Town of
Tecumseh, Essex County, Onta rio

## Stantec

Prepared for:
Ms. Anna Godo, P. Eng.
City of Windsor 350 City Hall Square West, Windsor, ON N9A 6S1

Prepared by:
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
200-835 Paramount Drive
Stoney Creek, ON L8J OB4
Tel: (905) 385-3234
Fax: (905) 385-3534
Lic ensee: Walter Mc Call, Ph.D.
License \#: P389
PIF \#: P389-0040-2014
Project \#: 160311265

## ORIG INAL REPORT

```
STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOG ICALASSESSMENT: UPPER LTILE RIVER WATERSHED
MASTER PLAN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENTPLAN
```


## Project Context

April 8, 2015

## Table of Contents

PROJ ECTPERSONNEL ..... I
EXECUIIVE SUMMARY ..... II
1.0 PROJ ECTCONIEXT. ..... 1.1
1.1 DEVELO PMENTC ONTEXT ..... 1.1
1.2 HISTORICALCONTEXT. ..... 1.2
1.2.1 Post-Contact Aboriginal Resources ..... 1.2
1.2.2 Euro-Canadian Resources ..... 1.3
1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICALCONTEXT. ..... 1.6
1.3.1 The Natural Environment ..... 1.6
1.3.2 Pre-contact Aboriginal Archaeological Resources ..... 1.7
1.3.3 Previously Known Archaeologic al Sites and Surveys ..... 1.7
2.0 FELD MEIHODS ..... 2.1
3.0 ANALYSIS AND CONC USIONS ..... 3.1
4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 4.1
5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLANC W WIH LEG ISLATION ..... 5.1
6.0 BIBLOGRAPHY AND SOURCES. .....  6.1
7.0 IMAGES ..... 7.1
7.1 PHOTOS ..... 7.1
8.0 MAPS ..... 8.1
9.0 CLOSURE. ..... 9.1
USTOF TABLES
Table 1: Landowner Information from the 1881 Illustrated Historic al Atlas of Essex County ..... 1.4
Table 2: Cultural Chronology of Essex County ..... 1.7
Table 3: Archaeologic al Sites Registered within One-Kilometre of Study Area ..... 1.8
Table 4: Archaeological Assessments Completed Within 50 metres of Study Area ..... 1.8
USTOF RGURES
Figure 1: Location of Study Area ..... 8.2
Figure 2: Treaties and Purchases, adapted from Moris 1943. ..... 8.3

STAG E 1 ARC HAEOLOG IC ALASSESSMENT:
UPPER UTILE RVER WATERSHED
MASTER PLAN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENTPLAN
Project Context
April 8, 2015
Figure 3: Portion of the 1881 Map of the Geographic Townships of Sandwich East and South
8.4

Figure 4: Areas of Archa eologic al Potential.......................................................................... 8.5

Project Context
April 8, 2015

## Project Personnel

| Archaeology Lead: | Walter McCall, Ph.D. (P389) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Licensed Archaeologis:: | Walter McCall, Ph.D. (P389) |
| Lic ensed Field Director: | Da ren Kipping, MA (422) |
| Report Writer: | Gemma Calgie, B.Sc. (R472) |
| Technical Review: | Jeffrey Muir, BA (R304) |
| Lic ensee Review: | Walter McCall, Ph.D. (P389) |
| Senior Review: | Jim Wilson, MA (P001) |

## Acknowledgements

Proponent Contact:
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport: Robert von Bitter

## Executive Summary

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by the City of Windsor to conduct a Stage 1 archaeologic al assessment on va rious Lots a nd Concessions, Geographic Townships of Sandwich East and South, now City of Windsor and Town of Tec umseh, Essex County, Onta rio prior to the construction of the stormwater management system within the study area.

This a ssessment serves to meet the requirements of the Master Plan Munic ipal Class Environmental Assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act (Govemment of Ontario 1990a: Schedule 6.1). These guidelines require that an archaeological assessment be conducted priorto any infrastructure projects. The Stage 1 archaeologic al assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's (MTCS) 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Archaeologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011).

The objectives of the Stage 1 assessment were to compile all a vailable information about the known and potential archaeologic al heritage resources within the study area and to provide specific direction for the protection, management and/or recovery of these resources. This Stage 1 archaeological assessment wasconducted under archaeological consulting license P389 issued to Walter McCall, Ph.D., of Stantec by the MTCS. A site visit was undertaken on April 17, 2014 as per Section 1.2 of the Standa rds a nd Guidelines for Consultant Archa eologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011)

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment, involving background research and a property inspection, resulted in the determination that portions of the study area exhibit a moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources. As such, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be required for portions of the study area.

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment will include the systematic walking of open ploughed fields at five metre intervals as outlined in Section 2.1.1 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Arc ha eologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011). All a gric ultural land, both active and inactive, should be recently ploughed and suffic iently weathered to improve the visibility of archaeologic al resources. Ploughing must be deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing, with at least $80 \%$ ground surface visibility.

Moreover, the Stage 2 archaeologic al assessment will include a test pit survey at five metre intervals in a reas ina c cessible for ploughing as outlined in Section 2.1.2 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards a nd Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologits (Govemment of Onta rio 2011). The MTC S standards require that each test pit be approximately 30 centimetres in dia meter, excavated to at least five centimetres in to subsoil, a nd have all soil screened through six
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millimetre hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of a ny cultural material that may be present. Prior to backfilling, each test pit will be examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, orevidence of fill.

The MTCS is a sked to review the results presented and to accept this report into the Onta rio Public Register of Archa eological Reports. Additional archaeological assessment is required; hence the study a rea remains subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Herita ge Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

The Exec utive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, the reader should exa mine the complete report.

### 1.0 PROJ ECTCONIEXT

### 1.1 DEVELOPMENTCONTEXT

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by the City of Windsor to conduct a Stage 1 archaeological assessment on various Lots and Concessions, Geographic Townships of Sandwich East and South, now City of Windsor and Town of Tecumseh, Essex County, Ontario prior to the construction of the stormwater management system within the study area.

This a ssessment serves to meet the requirements of the Master Plan Munic ipal Class Environmental Assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act (Govemment of Onta rio 1990a: Schedule 6.1). These guidelines require that an archa eological assessment be conducted prior to any infrastructure projects. The Sta ge 1 archaeological assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's (MTCS) 2011 Sta nd ards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Archaeologists (G ovemment of Onta rio 2011).

The objectives of the Stage 1 assessment were to compile all a vailable information about the known and potential archaeological hentage resources within the study a rea a nd to provide specific direction for the protection, management and/or recovery of these resources. In compliance with the provincial standards and guidelines set out in the MTCS' Sta ndards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Archa eologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011), the objectives of the Stage 1 Archaeological Overview/Background Study are as follows:

- To provide information about the study area's geogra phy, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land conditions;
- To evaluate in detail the study area's archaeological potential which will support rec ommendations for Stage 2 survey for all or parts of the property; and
- To recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 survey.

To meet these objectives Sta ntec archaeologists employed the following research strategies:

- A review of relevant archaeological, historic and environmental literature perta ining to the study area;
- A review of the land use history, including pertinent historic maps;
- An examination of the Onta rio Archaeological Sites Data base (ASDB) to determine the presence of known archaeological sites in and a round the project area; and
- Documentation of the study area during a property inspection.

Permission to enter and document the study area was provided by Ms. Anna Godo, P.Eng.
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### 1.2 HISTORICALCONTEXT

### 1.2.1 Post-Contact Aboriginal Resources

The post-contact Aboriginal occupation of Southem Ontario washeavily influenced by the dispersal of va rious Iroquoia n-speaking communities by the New York State Iroquois and the subsequent arrival of Algonkian-speaking groups from northem Ontario at the end of the $17^{\text {th }}$ century and beginning of the $18^{\text {th }}$ century (Konrad 1981; Schmalz 1991). By 1690, Algonkian speakers from the north appear to have begun to repopulate Bruce County (Rogers 1978:761). This is the period in which the Mississaugas are known to have moved into southem Ontario and the lower Great Lakes watersheds (Konrad 1981). In southwestem Ontario, however, members of the Three Fires Confederacy (Chippewa, Ottawa, and Pota watomi) were immigrating from Ohio and Michigan in the late 1700s (Feest and Feest 1978:778-779).

The nature of Aborig inal settlement size, population distribution, and material culture shifted as European settlers encroached upon their tenitory. Despite this shift, however, "written accounts of material life and livelihood, the correlation of historic ally recorded villages to their archaeologic al manifestations, and the similarities of those sites to more ancient sites have revealed an antiquity to documented cultural expressions that confirms a deep historical continuity to Iroquoian systems of ideology and thought" (Femis 2009:114). As a result, First Nations peoples of Southem Ontario have left behind archaeologic ally signific a nt resources throughout Southem Ontario which show continuity with past peoples, even if they have not been recorded in historic al Euro-C anadian doc umentation.

The study area first enters the Euro-Canadian historic record on May 19, 1790 as part of Treaty Number 2, which details the surrender of land to the Crown by the Odawa, Chippewa, Potta watomi, and Huron. Treaty Number 2:
... was made with the O[da wa ], Chippew[a], Potta watom[i] and Huro[n] May 19th, 1790, portions of which nations had established themselves on the Detroit River all of whom had been driven by the Iroquois from the northem and eastem parts of the Province, from the Detroit River easterly to Catfish Creek and south of the river La Tranche [Thames River] and Chenail Ecarte, and contains Essex County except Anderdon Township and Part of West Sandwich; Kent County except Zone Township, and Gores of Camden and Chatham; Elgin County except Bayham Township and parts of South Dorchester and Malahide. In Middlesex County, Del[a ]ware and Westminster Townships and part of North Dorchester [are included].

Moris 1943:17
While it is diffic ult to exactly delineate treaty boundaries today, Figure 2 providesan approximate outline of Treaty Number 2.
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### 1.2.2 Euro-Canadian Resources

The study a rea falls within the Geographic Townships of Sandwich East and South, Essex C ounty, Ontario. Present day Essex County was originally part of the District of Hesse, one of four districts founded in 1788 after the British came into possession of most of North America. The District of Hesse comprised all British teritories west of Long Point, which makes up most of Westem Onta rio. In 1792, Upper Canada re-orga nized into 19 counties. The District of Hesse was renamed the Westem District and conta ined two counties, Kent and Essex. The original Township of Sandwich was first constituted in 1788, but was subdivided into munic ipalities a longside the growth of regional towns, until in 1861 the area comprised the Town of Sandwich, City of Windsor, Town of Walkerville, and Sa ndwich West, East, a nd South (Neal 1909: 12).

In 1615, the French merchant and na vigator Sa muel De Champlain conducted an expedition from Quebec to the Detroit River, where he launched an attack on an Iroquoian village, believed to have stood at the location of present day Detroit. However, his forces were repelled, and Euro-Canadian settlement in the region did not take hold until after 1701, when M. de la Mottee Cadillac, commissioned by the French Govemor of Canada, established a military and trading post at the site. This initial outpost became known as Fort Pontc hartrain, and attracted further domestic settlement for several miles along both banks of the Detroit River.

Settlement on the eastem bank of the river, from the southem shore of Lake St. Cla ir to the Canard River in what would later bec ome the Township of Sa nd wich, intensified after 1750 when the French began to a ssign land near frontier posts to milita ry veterans. The region, known as the parish of L'Assomption (associated with a Jesuit mission built in 1748), was la id out into long, na rrow lots of 180 acres. These ran perpendic ular to the waterfront, extending several miles inla nd (Neal 1909: 6), a nd a re still visible in present day street plans.

Fort Pontchartrain wascaptured by Major Robert Rodgers for the British in 1760. Even though Detroit was offic ially surrendered to the newly-formed United Sta tes in 1783, the British maintained effective control until 1796, when the regional seat of govemment wastransferred to the new county town of Sandwich. During this interval Loyalists who wished to rema in under the British Crown began to settle the Canadian side of the Detroit River (Neal 1909: 12). In order to assist with new settlement and distribution of land in the District of Hesse, the La nd Board of the Westem District wascreated in 1788 to facilitate a survey of the region. British land surveyor Patrick McNiff was charged with the task in Sandwich Township, a nd completed his survey in 1793.

The study area lies in the vic inity of two major historic communities, Sa ndwich a nd Windsor. Planning work on the village of Sandwich began in 1788, when a one square mile block of la nd was acquired by the British from the Chiefs of the Wya ndottes/Huron, the Chippewa, and Ottawa for the price of three hundred pounds worth of supplies. It was laid out into one acre sections and 24 a cre residential lots, and named for the English borough of Sandwich in Kent. Sandwich wasestablished as the new county town by the Honourable Peter Russell in 1796, and
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its administrative function stimulated rapid growth. Industries included fur, salt, brick manufacturing, and fish hatcheries. The village was the first to see action during the War of 1812, when General Hull crossed from Detroit with a force of over 2,000 men, and played an important role in the Underground Railroad after the abolition of sla very by the British in 1833. Sa ndwich was incomorated as a town in 1858 (Neal 1909: 133-134).

Although the village of Sandwich was chosen asthe location of Essex County offices, the town of Windsor eventually outstripped the former in size and industry. Windsor was origina lly founded as South Detroit by J ames Dougall of Paisley, Scotland, who bought the land, laid it out as a village plot, and opened a store in 1830 . In 1846 , Windsor had a population of only 300 . In 1853, the Great Westem Railway had reached the village, and chose to terminate the line there rather than at Sandwich, as originally planned. Windsor was incorporated as a town in 1854 and by 1866, its population had increased to 4,500 (Neal 1909:136). The a mival of the railway marked the beginning of signific ant industrial development in Windsor. Several a reas that are now within the city limits, such as Walkerville and Ford City, were developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s as industrial and commercial companies set up operations in the region (Archaeologic al Services Inc. 2008).

The Windsor Subdivision of the Canadian Pacific Railway runseast - west across the northem portion of the study area. This railway is present on McPhillips' 1898 Plan of the Township of Sandwich (McPhillips 1898). Part of the Trans-Canada railway commissioned by the govemment in 1880, it reached Windsor in 1890, a nd the line is still in operation today. (Andreae 1997).

The 1881 Illustrated Historic al Atlas of Essex County, Ont.'s (Belden \& Co. 1881) map of the Townships of East and South Sandwich (Figure 3) identifieslandowners for ten of the 66 lots within the Stage 1 assessment area, as listed in Table 1. Within the boundary of the study a rea there are three homesteads and one schoolhouse visible on the map. The road system asdepicted on the map still exists today.

Table 1: Landowner Infomation from the 1881 Illustrated Historical Atas of Essex County

| Lot | Concession | Owner | Comment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 142 | 2 | H. Morand | O wner of 50 acres. A small structure visible at the <br> northem end of the lot, fronting Tecumseh Rd. |
| 143 | 2 | none | No structures visible. |
| $115-125$ | 3 | none | No structures visible. |
| $126-127$ | 3 | none | Schoolhouse depicted stradd ling the northem end of <br> both lots. |
| $134-140$ | 3 | none | No structures visible. |
| 141 | 3 | James Ross | Owner of 75 ac res. No structures visible. |
| $142-149$ | 3 | none | No structures visible. |
| 16 | 6 | none | No structures visible. |
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| Lot | Concession | Owner | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14-17 | 7 | none | No structures visible. |
| 10-14 | 8 | none | No structures visible. |
| 15 | 8 | Willia m Lyons | Owner of entire 200 acre lot. A small structure is visible in the northwest comer of the lot. |
| 16 | 8 | Jonathan Plant | O wner of 55 acres. A small structure is visible in the southeast comer of the lot, within the study area boundary. |
| 17 | 8 | none | Schoolhouse depicted in the southeast comer of the lot, within the study area boundary. |
| 18 | 8 | none | No structures visible. |
| 10 | 9 | none | No structures visible. |
| 11 | 9 | Robert Watson | Owner of 125 ac res. A small structure is visible at the eastem end of the lot, nearPike Creek, a nd within the study area boundary. |
| 12-14 | 9 | none | No structures visible. |
| 15 | 9 | George Hurst | O wner of 75 acres. Two small structures are visible in the southwest comer of the lot, within the study area boundary. |
| 16-18 | 9 | none | No structures visible. |
| 11-15 | 10 | none | No structures visible. |
| 16 | 10 | Samuel Mc Kenzie | Owner of entire 158 acre lot. A small structure is visible at the eastem end of the lot. During Stage 1 fieldwork, a herita ge bam was noticed in the northwest comer of the lot. |
| 17 | 10 | none | No structures visible. |
| 18 | 10 | George Little | Owner of 115 ac res. A small structure is visible in the northwestem comer of the lot. |
| 19 | 10 | none | No structures visible. |
| 300 | N/A | Alfred Renshaw | Owner of 50 acres. A small structure is visible on the eastem side of the lot. |
| 301 | N/A | Jeremiah McCarthy and James McCarthy | J eremiah Mc Carthy is listed as the owner of 110 acres on the eastem side of the lot, and J a mes McCarthy, 75 a cres on the westem side. A small struc ture is visible foreach, both at the southem end of the lot. |
| 302 | N/A | none | A small struc ture labeled "Old castle P.O. Toll Gate" is depicted in the southwest comer of the lot, at a Talbot Road intersection. |

Historic al county atlases were produced primarily to identify factories, offices, residences and landholdings of subscribers and were funded by subscription fees. La ndowners who did not
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subscribe were not always listed on the maps (Caston 1997:100). As such, all structures were not necessarily depic ted or placed accurately (Gentilc ore and Head 1984).

The majority of the region surrounding the study area has been subject to European-style agric ultural practic es for over 100 years, with Euro-Canadian fa mers in the area by the mid-19th century. Much of the region today continues to be used for agric ultural puposes, despite the urban spread of Windsor to the north and west of the study area.

### 1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICALCONTEXT

The study area occupies all or part of Lots 10 to 19, Concessions 6 to 10 , and singular Lots 300302, Geographic Township of Sandwich South, and Lots 115 to 149, Concessions 2 to 3, Township of Sandwich East, Essex County, Ontario. It comprises a pproximately 225 hectares of active and inactive agric ultural lands, woodlots, manic ured la wns, commercial and residential properties, paved roads and highways, industrial installations, a railway, and land incomorated within the boundaries of Windsor Airport.

### 1.3.1 The Natural Environment

The study area is situated within the St. Clair Clay Plain (Chapman \& Putnam 1986:146-147).
Adjoining Lake St. Clair in Essex and Kent County Counties and the St. Clair River in Lambton County are extensive clay plains covering 2,270 square miles. The region is one of little relief, lying between 575 and 700 feet a.s.l., except for the moraine at Ridgetown and Blenheim which rises 50 to 500 feet higher....Glacial Lake Whittlesey, which deeply covered all of these lands, and Lake Waren which subsequently covered nearly the whole area, failed to leave deep stratified beds of sediment on the underlying clay till except around Chatham, between Blenheim and the Rondeau marshes, and in a few other smaller areas. Most of Lambton and Essex Counties, therefore, are essentially till plains smoothed by shallow deposits of lacustrine clay which settled in the depressions while the knolls were being lowered by wave action.

Chapman \& Putnam 1986:147
Two soil series are present within the Study Area. The primary soil series is Brookston Clay, a shaley and imperfectly drained clay till with medium lime content. Present also are small pockets of Brookston Clay Sand, a mixture of sand and Brookston Clay, which appears intermittently in a reas of shallow sand knolls. Although not ideal, Brookston Clay and Brookston Clay Sand are suita ble for pre-contact Aboriginal a griculture.

The closest extant sources of potable water are Little River, Pike Creek, and Canard River. These rivers and their sources bound the edges of the study a rea; Little River to the north, Pike Creek to the east, and Canard River to the southwest. The source of Little River lies within the study area itself. Further to these, the Detroit River runs 6.3 kilometres to the north and west of the study area, while the southem shore of Lake St. Clair is located 2.6 kilometres northeast.
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### 1.3.2 Pre-c ontact Aboriginal Archaeological Resources

This portion of southwestem Onta rio has been demonstrated to have been occupied by people as farback as 11,000 years ago as the glaciers retreated. For the majority of this time, people were practicing hunter gatherer lifestyles with a gradual move towards more extensive farming practices. Given the length of occupation of the study area prior to the arival of Euro-Canadian settlers, the pre-contact Aboriginal archaeological potential of the study a rea is judged to be moderate to high. Table 2 provides a general outline of the cultural chronology of Essex County, based on Ellis and Femis (1990).

## Table 2: Cultural Chronology of Essex County

| Period | Characteristics | Time Period | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Early Paleo-Indian | Fluted Projectiles | 9000-8400 B.C. | spruce parkland/caribou hunters |
| Late Paleo-Indian | Hi-Lo Projectiles | 8400-8000B.C. | smaller but more numerous sites |
| Early Archaic | Kirk and Bifurcate Base Points | 8000-6000 B.C. | slow population growth |
| Middle Archaic | Brewerton-like points | 6000-2500 B.C. | environment similar to present |
| Late Archaic | Lamoka (narrow points) | 2000-1800 B.C. | inc reasing site size |
|  | Broad Points | 1800-1500 B.C. | large chipped lithic tools |
|  | Small Points | 1500-1100B.C. | introduction of bow hunting |
| Terminal Arc haic | Hind Points | 1100-950 B.C . | emergence of true cemeteries |
| Early Woodland | Meadowood Points | 950-400 B.C. | introduction of pottery |
| Middle Woodland | Dentate/Pseudo-Scallop Pottery | 400 B.C. - A.D. 500 | increased sedentism |
|  | Princ ess Point | A.D. 550-900 | introduction of com |
| Late Woodland | Early Ontario Iroquoian | A.D. 900-1300 | emergence of agricultural villages |
|  | Middle Ontario Iroquoian | A.D. 1300-1400 | long longhouses ( $100 \mathrm{~m}+$ ) |
|  | Late Ontario Iroquoian | A.D. 1400-1650 | tribal warfare and displacement |
| Contact <br> Aboriginal | Various Algonkian Groups | A.D. 1700-1875 | early written records a nd treaties |
| Late Historic | Euro-Canadian | A.D. 1796present | European settlement |

### 1.3.3 Previously Known Archaeological Sites and Surveys

In order to compile an inventory of archaeological resources, the registered archaeological site recordskept by the MTCS were consulted. In Onta rio, information conceming archaeological sites stored in the ASDB (Govemment of Onta rio n.d.) is ma inta ined by the MTCS. This database
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conta ins a rchaeological sites registered a c cording to the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada is divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden Block is approximately 13 kilometres east to west and approximately 18.5 kilometres north to south. Each Borden Block is referenced by a four-letter designator and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The study area under review is within Borden Block AbHr.

Information conceming specific site locations is protected by provincial policy, and is not fully subject to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. The release of such information in the past has led to looting or various forms of illegally conducted site destruction. Confidentiality extends to all media capable of conveying location, including maps, drawings, ortextual descriptions of a site location. The MTCS will provide information conceming site location to the party or an agent of the party holding title to a property, or to a licensed archaeologist with relevant cultural resource management interests.

An exa mination of the ASDB has shown that there are three a rchaeologic al sites registered within a one-kilometre radius of the study area (Table 3): one is multi - component and two are Euro - Canadian (Govemment of Ontario n.d.). The multi - component site, AbHr-4, is located within the curent study area on Lot 145, Concession 3 . It comprised a 30 metre scatter of Euro Canadian artifactsand one side notched point, and was observed and recorded by Mr. Frank Dieterman in 1991.

Table 3: Archaeological Sites Registered within One-Kilometre of Study Area

| Borden Number | Site Name | Site Type | Cultural Affiliation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AbHr-17 | - | Findspot | Euro-Canadian |
| AbHr-18 | - | Homestead | Euro-Canadian |
| AbHr-4 | - | Findspot | Multi - component |

A total of six a rc haeologic al studies have been conducted within 50 metres of the study a rea (personal communic ation, Robert von Bitter, April 16, 2014; G ovemment of Onta rio n.d.), as summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Archaeological Assessments Completed Within 50 metres of Study Area

| Year | Title | Author |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2010 | Archaeological Assessment (Stages 1 and 2), <br> Windsor Annex Sanitary Sewer Servic ing, City of <br> Windsor, Essex County, Onta rio | Mayer Heritage C onsulta nts <br> Inc. |
| 2011 | Stage 1 Archaeologic al Assessment County <br> Road 43/Ba nwell Road Improvements Cla ss EA <br> and Preliminary Design, County Road 42 <br> northerly to CP Rail Line, County of Essex, | Archaeological Servic es Inc. |
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| Year | Tite | Author |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ontario |  |
| 2012 | Stage 2 Archaeologic al Assessment (AA): Windsor Railway Spur Extension within Part of Lots 136-140, Concession 3, Mc Niff's Survey, Geographic Township of Sandwich East, City of Windsor, Ontario | Archaeoworks |
| 2013 | Stage 1 Assessment of the La uzon Parkway, County Road 17, County Road 42, Future EastWest Arterial Road From Walker Road to County Road 17 Comidors, and the Sandwich South Secondary Plan, City of Wind sor, County of Essex. | Woodley |
| 2013 | Stage 1: Background Study Tecumseh Hamlet Servicing Plan Between County Roads 22 \& 42 (Geographic Township of Sandwich East), Town of Tec umseh, Essex County, Ontario | Woodley |
| 2014a | Stage 1 Archaeologic al Assessment: Windsor Solar Project, Part of Lots 105 to 123, C oncession 3 Petite Cote, Geographic Township of Sandwich, Now City of Windsor, Ontario | Stantec |

The Stage 1-2 assessment above, conducted by Mayer Herita ge Consulta nts Inc. (MHC) in 2010, and the Stage 2 assessment conducted by Archaeoworks in 2012, were undertaken within the limits of the current study area (see Figure 4).

MHC determined that the Stage 1-2 assessment area had cultural heritage value for both Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites. However, no artifacts or other archaeologic al resources were recovered during the Stage 2 fieldwork, and no further archaeologic al assessment was recommended (Mayer Herita ge Consultants Inc. 2010).

The Stage 2 assessment conducted by Archaeoworks in 2012 revealed one small Euro-Canadian artifact scatter consisting of eight artifacts. However, this scatter was determined to have low cultural herita ge value, and no further work was recommended (Archaeoworks 2012).

The Stage 1 assessment conducted by Stantec in 2014 on behalf of Windsor Solar Ltd. overlaps the current study a rea on Lots 116 to 123, Concession 3. The Stage 1 report is still forthcoming, but concludes that the area had cultural heritage value forboth Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites and Stage 2 assessment was recommended.

In addition to the assessments disc ussed above, the City of Windsor's Archaeologic al Master Plan Study Report (CRM Group Limited et al. 2005) disc usses the City of Windsor's archaeological context in general. As of 2005, a rc ha eologists had registered only 23 archaeologic al sites within the city limits or within the immediate vicinity. However, the a uthors of the a rchaeologic al
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mana gement plan recognized that a number of poorly documented sitesexist and there are many sites still to be documented especially since the majority of the archaeological studies discussed in the archaeological management plan mapsare concentrated along the Detroit River or in southwest Windsor (CRM Group Limited et al. 2005:3-1 to 3-23).

In addition, the northem portion of the Study Area is depicted in the archaeological mana gement plan's archa eological potential mapping. Those portions identified as having archaeological potential are noted assuch due to the present of existing water sources, presuma bly the municipal drains (CRM Group Limited et al. 2005:Figure 1). Ultimately, approximately half of the Study Area retains high archaeological potential according to the 2005 mapping (CRM Group Limited et al. 2005:Figure 4). The archaeological ma na gement plan's evaluation of a rcha eological potential is further disc ussed in Section 3.0.
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### 2.0 RED MEIHODS

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment compiled the available information conceming any known and/or potential archaeological heritage resources within the study area. A property inspection was conducted under PIF P389-0040-2014 issued to Walter Mc Call, Ph.D., of Stantec by the MTCS. The property inspection was completed on April 17, 2014. In accordance with Section 1.2 of the MTCS' Sta ndards and Guidelines for C onsultant Archaeologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011), the property inspection involved random spot-checking of the entire property and its periphery to identify the presence or absence of any features of a rchaeologic al potential (Figure 4). During the property inspection the weatherwas wam and sunny, and visibility of land features was exc ellent. At no time were field or weather conditions detrimental to the identific ation of features of a rchaeologic al potential.

The study a rea occupies all or part of Lots 10 to 19, Concessions 6 to 10 , and singular Lots 300302, Geographic Township of Sandwich South, and Lots 115 to 149, Concessions 2 to 3, Township of Sandwich East, Essex County, Ontario. It comprises a pproximately 225 hectares of active and ina ctive agric ultural lands, woodlots, manic ured lawns, commercial and residential properties, paved roads and highways, industrial installations, a railway, and land incomorated within the boundaries of Windsor Aiport.

The majority of the study area ( $80 \%$ ) consists of active and inactive agric ultural land accessible for ploughing. A smaller portion of the Study Area comprises woodlots ( $10 \%$ ) and manic ured lawns (5\%) that are unable to be ploughed. The remaining 5 percent of the Study Area consists of roads and highway, a railway line, and private laneways. These a reas are previously disturbed and are unable to be assessed.

The photography from the property inspection is presented in Section 7.1 and confirm that the requirement for a Stage 1 property inspection were met, as per Section 1.2 and Section 7.7.2 Standard 1 of the MTCS' 2011 Sta ndards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Archaeologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011).

Photos 1 to 8 demonstrate that the study area is primarily composed of relatively flat agric ultural fields. In accordance with Section 2.1.1 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011), these a reas will require Sta ge 2 physic al inspection using the pedestrian survey method at a five metre interval. Photos 9 to 11 depict areas of wood lot within the study area and Photos 12 and 13, exa mples of manic ured lawns. Both are inaccessible for ploughing and, in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Arc haeologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011), will require Stage 2 physical inspection using the test pit survey method at a five metre interval.
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A possible heritage property, a wooden bam, was noticed during fieldwork at the intersection of Concession Road 10 and Baseline Road. It is located in the northwest comer of Lot 16, Concession 10 (Table 1).

Photos 14-16 depict the Windsor Subdivision of the Canadian Pacific Railway running east west across the northem portion of the study area. Although this railway is a historic transportation route, having been completed in 1890, and appearing on McPhillips' 1898 Plan of the Township of Sandwich (McPhillips 1898), previous disturbance due to maintenance and expansion designates it an area of low archaeological potential.

Photos 17-19 provide examples of the various paved roads that cross the Study Area as well as their associated right-of-ways a nd culvert systems. As per Section 2.1, Standard $2 b$ of the Standa rds and Guidelines for Consulta nt Archa eologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011) these areashave also been evaluated ashaving low potential due to deep land alteration that has severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources and assuch, Sta ge 2 survey is not required.

### 3.0 ANALYSSSAND CONCLUSONS

Archaeological potential is established by determining the likelihood that archaeological resources may be present on a subject property. Stantec applied archaeologic al potential criteria commonly used by MTCS (Govemment of Ontario 2011) to determine a reas of archaeologic al potential within the region under study. These variables include proximity to previously identified archaeologic al sites, distance to varioustypes of water sources, soil texture and drainage, glacial geomorphology, elevated topography and the general topographic varia bility of the area.

Potable water is the single most important resource for any extended human occupation or settlement and since water sources in southwestem Ontario have remained relatively stable overtime, proximity to drinkable water is regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeologic al site potential. In fact, distance to water is one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of archaeological site location in Ontario. Distance to modem or ancient water sources is generally accepted as the most important determinant of past human settlement pattems and, considered alone, may result in a determination of archaeologic al potential. However, any combination of two or more other criteria, such as welldrained soils or topographic variability, may also indic ate archaeologic al potential. Finally, extensive land disturbance can eradicate archaeologic al potential (Wilson and Home 1995).

As disc ussed above, distance to water is an essential factor in archaeologic al potential modeling. When evaluating distance to water it is important to distinguish between water and shoreline, as well as natural and a rtific ial water sources, as these features affect sites loc ations and types to varying degrees. The MTCScategorizes water sourcesin the following manner.

- Prima ry water sourc es: lakes, rivers, streams, creeks;
- Secondary water sources: intermittent streams and creeks, springs, ma rshes a nd swa mps;
- Past water sourc es: glacial lake shorelines, relic river or stream channels, cobble beaches, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes; and
- Accessible or inaccessible shorelines: high bluffs, swa mp or marshy lake edges, sa ndbars stretching into marsh.

The closest extant sources of potable water are Little River, Pike Creek, and Canard River. These rivers and their sources bound the edges of the study area; Little River to the north, Pike Creek to the east, and Canard River to the southwest. The Little River originates in the northem portion of the study area. Further to these, the Detroit River runs 6.3 kilometres to the north and west of the study area, while the southem shore of Lake St. Clair is loc ated 2.6 kilometres northeast of the latter. Moreover, additional ancient and/or relic tributa ries of the Little River may have existed but are not identifiable today and are not indicated on historic mapping. These watercourses are also reflected in the archaeological potential mapping produced for the City of Windsor's archaeological management plan (CRM Group Limited et al. 2005).Furthermore, as
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indicated previously, although not ideal, Brookston Clay and Brookston Clay Sand are suitable for pre-contact and post-contact Aboriginal agriculture. Add to these observations the presence of one registered multi - component site within one kilometre of the study area, and the pre-contact Aboriginal archaeological potential of the study area is judged to be high.

For Euro-Canadian sites, archaeological potential can be extended to areas of early EuroCanadian settlement, including places of military or pioneer settlements; early transportation routes; and properties listed on the munic ipal register or designated under the Onta rio Hentage Act or property that local histories or informants have identified with possible historic al events. The 1881 Illustrated Historic al Atlas of Essex County, Ont. (Belden \& Co. 1881) demonstrates that the study area and its environs were densely occupied by Euro-Canadian farmers by the later $19^{\text {th }}$ century. Much of the established road system and agric ultural settlement from that time is still visible today. Moreover, the ASDB recognizes two registered historic Euro-Ca na dian sites within one kilometre of the study area (G ovemment of Ontario n.d.). Therefore, the EuroCanadian archaeologic al potential of the study area is judged to be moderate to high.

The archaeologic al management plan for the City of Windsor (CRM Group et al. 2005) differs slightly from the archaeological potential determination here in that some portions of the Study Area are determined to have low archaeologic al potential. Examining the plan's mapping, it appears that the presence of watercourses is the factorthat takesprecedence in the weighting used to score archaeologic al potential in this area. However, the discussions in Section 1.2 and 1.3 above demonstrate the presence of First Nations groups in the area and a lack of documentation conceming possibly present Euro-Canadian structures in the historic mapping. These additional factors lend reason to believe that the majority of the Study Area could retain archaeologic al potential. Otherwise, some areas of low archaeologic al potential do exist within the Study Area, to include modem paved roads and railways, and various modem buidings and laneways, which exhibit disturbance from their construction. The municipal drains are natural watercourses that have been modified within the last century and reta in low archaeologic al either due to the low, wet nature of the area ordue to modem ditching and culvert construction.

When the above listed criteria are applied to the study area, the archaeological potential for pre-contact Aboriginal, post-contact Aboriginal, and historic Euro-Canadian sites is deemed to be moderate to high. Thus, in accordance with Section 1.3.1 of the Standards and Guidelinesfor Consultant Arc ha eologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011), the Sta ge 1 archa eologic al a ssessment of the Upper Little River Watershed Master Plan and Stormwater Ma na gement Plan has determined that the study area exhibits moderate to high potential for the identific ation and rec overy of archaeologic al resources (Figure 4).
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### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Stantec was retained by the City of Wind sor to complete a Stage 1 archaeologic al assessment for a study a rea, measuring approximately 225 hectares in size, located on various Lots and Concessions, Townships of Sandwich East and South, now City of Windsor a nd Town of Tecumseh, Essex County, Ontario (Figure 1).


#### Abstract

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment, involving background research and a property inspection, resulted in the determination that portions of the study area exhibit a moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources. As such, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be required for portions of the study area (Figure 4).


The Stage 2 archaeological assessment will include the systematic walking of open ploughed fields at five metre intervals as outlined in Section 2.1.1 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consulta nt Arc ha eologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011). The MTCS standa rds further require that all a gric ultural land, both active and inactive, be recently ploughed and suffic iently weathered to improve the visibility of a rchaeologic al resources. Ploughing must be deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing, and must be able to ensure at least $80 \%$ ground surface visibility.

Moreover, the Stage 2 archaeologic al assessment will include a test pit survey at five metre intervals in areas ina c cessible for ploughing as outlined in Section 2.1.2 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Govemment of Onta rio 2011). The MTCS standards require that each test pit be approximately 30 centimetres in dia meter, excavated to at least five centimetres in to subsoil, a nd have all soil screened through six millimetre hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of a ny cultural material that may be present. Prior to backfilling, each test pit will be examined forstratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill.

Should any areas of disturbance orfeatures indic ating that archaeological potential have been removed, including permanently wet areas, not previously identified during the Stage 1 property inspection be enc ountered during the Stage 2 archaeologic al assessment, they will be documented as outlined in Section 2.1.8 of the MTCS' 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Arc ha eologists (Govemment of Ontario 2011).

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is asked to review the results presented and to accept this report into the Onta rio Public Register of Archaeological Reports. Additional archaeologic al assessment is required; hence the study a rea remains subject to Section 48(1) of the Onta rio Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.
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### 5.0 ADVICE ON COMPLANCE WTH LEGISLATION

This report is submitted to the Onta rio Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Onta rio Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeologic al fieldwork a nd report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeologic al sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concems with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the Ontario Hentage Act for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the Onta rio Hertage Act.

Should previously undocumented archaeologic al resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeologic al site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a lic ensed consultant archaeologist to camy out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the Onta rio Henitage Act.

The Cemeteries Act, R.S.O. 1990 c. C. 4 and the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Servic es Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c. 33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person disc overing human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Onta rio Ministry of Consumer Services.

Archaeologic al sites recommended for further archaeologic al fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological lic ense.
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### 7.0 IMAGES

### 7.1 PHOTOS

Photo 1: Agric ultural Field, facing west


Photo 3: Agric ultural Field with Road and Municipal ROW in foreground, facing north west


Photo 2: Agric ultural Field, facing east


Photo 4: Agric ultural Feld with Road and Municipal ROW in foreground, fac ing east
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Photo 6: Agric ultural Field with Munic ipal ROW in the foreground, facing west


Photo 7: Agric ultural Field, facing northeast
Photo 8: Fallow Inactive Agric ultural Field, facing north west
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Photo 9: Woodlot, facing north

Photo 11: Woodlot with Little River flowing through, facing north east


Photo 10: Inactive Agric ultural Field with Woodlot in the background, facing south west


Photo 12: Manic ured Lawn, facing south
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Photo 13: Manic ured Lawn, facing south
Photo 14: Intersection of Lauzon Parkway and the railway, facing north


Photo 15: Railway and transmission lines, showing location of Union Gas pipeline, facing east



Photo 16: Railway, facing north west
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Photo 17: Concession Road 9 and Highway 401 with Municipal ROW in the background, facing north


Photo 18: Intersection of Concession Road 9 and Baseline Road with Municipal ROW, facing north


Photo 19: Lauzon Road with Municipal ROW, showing c ulvert over Little River, facing south east
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### 8.0 MAPS

All maps will follow on succeeding pages.





O Stantec
I._. Archaeology Study Area

- J Archaeology Study Area --- Previously Assessed, Mayer Heritage $\square$
$\square$ Previously Assessed, Archaeoworks 2012
$\square$ Previously Disturbed
ZIII Provincially Signific ant Wetland
- Watercourse
- Railway, Active
- Transmission Line
-ut-- Unknown Pipeline

|  |
| :---: |

Notes

1. Coordinate system. NAD 1983 UTM Zone ITN

Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry
Othimagen © SWOOP Imager 2006.

City City of Windso
Upper Little River Stormwate
and Drainage Master Plan
Figure No.
4
Archaeological Potential

STAG E 1 ARC HAEOLOG ICALASSESSMENT:

## UPPER UTILE RIVER WATERSHED

MASTER PLAN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENTPLAN
Closure
April 8, 2015

### 9.0 CLOSURE

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit of the City of Windsor and may not be used by any third party without the express written consent of Stantec Consulting Ltd. and the City of Windsor. Any use which a third party makes of this report is the responsibility of such third party.

We trust this report meets your current requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information or have additional questions about any facet of this report.

## STANIEC CONSULIING LTD.



Licensee Review

> (signature)

Walter McCall, Ph.D., Director of Archaeological Field Operations


Jim Wilson, MA, Princ ipal, Regional Disc ipline Lead, Archaeology
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| From: | Katie Stammler [KStammler@erca.org](mailto:KStammler@erca.org) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 2017-12-07 5:06 PM |
| To: | Innes, Jayson |
| Cc: | John Henderson |
| Subject: | RE: Source water protection in Essex Region |
| Attachments: | A Guide to Using the ERCA Online Interactive Mapping Tool.pdf |

Hi Jason,
Thanks for your call. I've attached a document that our Risk Management Official prepared to help with the use of our online mapping tool. Please feel free to share it with your colleagues. Our Source Water Protection Plan can be accessed here: http://essexregionsourcewater.org/resources/source water protection.cfm and the two policies that apply to the area in question are policy 31 and 32 - these are the policies that apply to the Event Based Area that the MOECC specifically asked about. You would address these policies by ensuring that any existing storage of fuel above the threshold limit $(15,000 \mathrm{~L})$ has a Risk Management Plan and that ERCA is informed of the installation of any future fuel storage that exceeds these limits.

I noticed that their letter also asks that your EA consider other sources of drinking water that aren't covered by the Source Protection Plan. Our SPP only includes policies for municipal intakes, so this would be referring to any private source of drinking water in the area, which would be well water. I believe this could be addressed with the mapping of the Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas that I showed you. While we have no policies that apply to these areas, you may need to show that you are at least aware of whether your study area is within these boundaries.

Provided that your project does not include installing or altering a municipal drinking water intake, no new technical work nor amendments to the SPP will be required.

Katie


KATIE STAMMLER, PHD
Water Quality Scientist/Source Water Protection Project Manager Essex Region Conservation Authority 360 Fairview Avenue West, Suite 311 • Essex, Ontario • N8M 1 Y6
P. 519-776-5209 x 342 • F. 519-776-8688
kstammler@erca.org www.essexregionconservation.ca

Follow us on Twitter: @essexregionca

From: Innes, Jayson [mailto:jayson.innes@stantec.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2017 4:42 PM
To: Katie Stammler [KStammler@erca.org](mailto:KStammler@erca.org)
Cc: John Henderson [JHenderson@erca.org](mailto:JHenderson@erca.org)
Subject: Source water protection in Essex Region
As a follow up to our phone call I have included a map of the study area and the letter from the MOECC discussing source water protection.

I will use the web sites you directed me to show that the site is in IPZ-3
The $3^{\text {rd }}$ paragraph on page 3 of the MOECC letter says
For assistance in determining whether the proposed project will require new technical work and potentially require amendments to the source protection plan for this area please contact the Project Manager for Drinking Water Source

Protection at the local source protection authority which coincidently in this case, is the Essex Region Conservation Authority itself.

Can you please confirm that no new technical work or potential amendments to the source water protection plan are required from this study. I can provide additional project details if required.

Thanks

Jayson Innes, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
Senior Water Resources Engineer
Direct: (519) 585-7282
Mobile: (519) 569-0518
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
100-300 Hagey Boulevard
Waterloo ON N2L OA4 CA
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 intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

John Henderson [JHenderson@erca.org](mailto:JHenderson@erca.org)
2017-12-19 4:09 PM
Katie Stammler; Innes, Jayson
ULR - Source Protection

Thanks Katie.
Jayson - Please include the additional information included in Katie's e-mail below regarding the need to update the IPZ-3 and Event Based Area when drains are altered in the future. If you have any questions, please provide them directly to Katie with a copy to me.

Thank you,


John Henderson, P. Eng.
Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA)
360 Fairview Avenue West, Suite 311
Essex, Ontario N8M 1Y6
519-776-5209 ext. 246
Fax: 519-776-8688

Please consider the environment before printing this email
This e-mail transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the express use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us by telephone at the number above and arrange to return this transmission to us or destroy it.

From: Katie Stammler
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 4:03 PM
To: John Henderson [JHenderson@erca.org](mailto:JHenderson@erca.org)
Subject: RE: ULR - Next Steps
Hi John,
Just got a chance to read this over. Given the statement below, I would like to add some additional information via email for their records. Sorry for the jargon, but the references should make sense to any ministry reviewer focussed on Source Water. Please let me know if you require anything further.
"Discussions with the Project Manager for Drinking Water Source Protection for Essex Region identified policies and vulnerable areas within the study limits (refer to attached email from Katie Stammler). Since the project does not include installing or altering a municipal drinking water intake no new technical work nor amendments to the source protection plan are required."

Upon further discussion with John Henderson, it has come to my attention that the proposal includes changes to the drainage network. This will eventually lead to the need for an update to the IPZ-3 and Event Based Area. Some portions of these vulnerable areas may be removed through a s. 51 amendment to the SPP and AR if drains are removed. If new drains are installed or are relocated, the vulnerable areas will need to be extended, which will require either a s. 34 amendment to the SPP and AR or would be included in the Essex Region SPA s. 36 work plan. We would ask that the proponent provide mapping of the final changes to the drainage network to ERCA so that the changes to vulnerable areas can be made appropriately.

Follow us on Twitter: @essexregionca

From: John Henderson
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 11:28 AM
To: Katie Stammler [KStammler@erca.org](mailto:KStammler@erca.org)
Subject: FW: ULR - Next Steps

Hi Katie,
Please look at Jayson response to the Source Protection section in attached Table B and provide your comments.
Thank you,

|  | John Henderson, P. Eng. <br> Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA) <br> 360 Fairview Avenue West, Suite 311 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Essex Region | Essex, Ontario N8M 1Y6 |
| Conservation Authority | $519-776-5209$ ext. 246 |
| Fax: 519-776-8688 |  |

[^1]From: Innes, Jayson [mailto:jayson.innes@stantec.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2017 9:32 AM
To: John Henderson [JHenderson@erca.org](mailto:JHenderson@erca.org)
Cc: Godo, Anna [agodo@citywindsor.ca](mailto:agodo@citywindsor.ca); Phil Bartnik [pbartnik@tecumseh.ca](mailto:pbartnik@tecumseh.ca); Vendrasco, Wira H.D. [wvendrasco@citywindsor.ca](mailto:wvendrasco@citywindsor.ca); Winterton, Mark [mwinterton@citywindsor.ca](mailto:mwinterton@citywindsor.ca); Richard Wyma [RWyma@erca.org](mailto:RWyma@erca.org); Tim Byrne [TByrne@erca.org](mailto:TByrne@erca.org)
Subject: RE: ULR - Next Steps
Attached is a draft version of MOECC Table B for internal review.
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## Executive Summary

Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) was retained by Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA), in conjunction with the City of Windsor and the Town of Tecumseh, to prepare a Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment (CHRA) report as part of the Upper Little Watershed Environmental Assessment (EA) (the Project). The purpose of the Project is to determine a preferred approach to providing stormwater management control measures for the developing lands upstream of the E.C. Row Expressway and contributing to Upper Little River. The Study Area is contained partially within the City of Windsor and partially within the Town of Tecumseh, Ontario. It extends roughly from west to east from Concession Road 6, in the City of Windsor to Lesperance Road in the Town of Tecumseh, and north to south from the E.C. Row Expressway to the South Talbot Road.

As part of the Upper Little Watershed EA a CHRA has been completed to identify heritage resources, including built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes, present within, and adjacent to, the Study Area. Potential heritage resources were identified through consultation and a windshield survey, inventoried, and evaluated according to Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06, the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) (Government of Ontario 2006a). Where CHVI was identified, the resource was mapped, and recommendations made for further study.

In order to identify protected properties, the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI), the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT), City of Windsor, and Town of Tecumseh were consulted. As a result of the consultation, eight previously recognized properties were identified in relation to the Study Area. Four of these properties were determined to be situated within the CHRA Study Area.

A windshield survey was undertaken to identify potential heritage resources within, and adjacent to, the Study Area and confirm the presence of previously identified potential heritage properties. Where identified, the potential heritage properties were photographed from the public right-of-way. A total of 72 properties were identified as potential heritage properties. In each case evaluation of the CHVI of the property was undertaken according to O. Reg. 9/06. Each potential heritage resource was considered both as an individual structure and as a landscape. Following evaluation, 14 cultural heritage resources (CHRs) were identified within the Study Area.

This CHRA provides general measures to avoid potential impacts to the CHRs. The preferred alternative should be designed to avoid the identified CHRs. Project components should be planned and undertaken in a manner to avoid the built heritage and cultural heritage landscape attributes of the identified CHRs. Site plan controls are recommended to be put in place prior to construction activities. This includes mapping of CHRs on construction maps, communication to the construction team leads on their locations, and physical protective measures such as temporary fencing. If Project work occurs within 50 metres of CHRs, it is recommended that a qualified building conditions specialist or geotechnical engineer with previous experience working with heritage structures be consulted to identify appropriate vibration mitigation measures in advance of construction. Mitigation measures for vibration may include developing
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an appropriate vibration setback distance, a vibration attenuation study, and/or a construction monitoring program.

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, the reader should examine the complete report.

## Project Personnel

Project Manager:

Task Manager:

Report Writers:

GIS Specialist:

Administrative Assistant:

Quality Reviewer:

Independent Reviewer:

## Acknowledgments

Proponent Contact:
John Henderson, Essex Region Conservation Authority

| Abbreviations |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| BHR | Built Heritage Resource |
| CHL | Cultural Heritage Landscape |
| CHR | Cultural Heritage Resource |
| CHRA | Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment |
| CHVI | Cultural Heritage Value or Interest |
| EA | Environmental Assessment |
| ERCA | Essex Region Conservation Authority |
| MTCS | Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport |
| OHA | Ontario Heritage Act |
| OHT | Ontario Heritage Trust |
| O. Reg. | Ontario Regulation |
| PPS | Provincial Policy Statement |
| RoW | Right-of-Way |
| SWM | Stormwater Management |
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## Glossary

| Built Heritage Resource | (BHR) Refers to a single building, structure, monument, installation <br> or remains determined to be of cultural heritage value or interest <br> (CHVI) following evaluation according to Ontario Regulation |
| :--- | :--- |
| (O. Reg.) 9/O6. In addition, this includes properties protected under |  |
| the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) or listed by local, provincial, or |  |
| federal jurisdictions. This may include residences, barns, bridges, |  |
| and similar features (based on definition provided in the 2020 |  |
| Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (Government of Ontario 2020)). |  |
| Cultural Heritage Landscape |  |
|  | (CHL) Refers to a defined geographical area modified by human <br> activities and determined to be of CHVI following evaluation <br> according to O. Reg. 9/06. In addition, this includes properties <br> protected under the OHA or listed by local, provincial, or federal <br> jurisdictions. This may include grouping(s) of individual heritage |
| features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites, and |  |
| natural elements, which together form an important type of heritage |  |
| form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts (based |  |
| on definition provided in the PPS) (Government of Ontario 2020). |  |
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Project Location
Protected Heritage Property

Study Area

Refers to the stormwater management (SWM) corridor boundary.
Refers to properties which are designated under, or subject to an easement made under, the OHA, as well as properties identified by provincial authorities and prescribed public bodies as a provincial heritage property. In addition, protected heritage property includes those identified by federal or international authorities as such including, but not limited to, Parks Canada or UNESCO (based on definition provided in the PPS) (Government of Ontario 2020).

Refers to all properties through which the Project Location is proposed to pass through plus a 50 -metre area surrounding the SWM corridor boundary. This area was used to define the limit of site investigations and is based on an understanding of property parcel boundaries.
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 STUDY PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

As part of the Upper Little Watershed Environmental Assessment (EA) (the Project), a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) has been completed to identify heritage resources, including built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes, present within, and adjacent to, the Study Area. The purpose of the project is to determine a preferred approach to providing stormwater management (SWM) control measures for the developing lands upstream of the E.C. Row Expressway and contributing to Upper Little River. The objective of the Project is to ensure that urbanization of the watershed can occur in a fashion that will not lead to negative impacts on the receiving systems including increased flood risk and the impairment of natural watercourse features. The Project would allow for future enhancement of the watercourse, stream margins, and wetlands. The SWM system should minimize the impact of urban development on the natural environment and be integrated as an amenity within the existing drain system and the open space system. It should also be capable of meeting applicable water quality and quantity requirements while minimizing any potential impacts on waterfowl within the vicinity of the Windsor International Airport related to waterfowl.

The Study Area is contained partially within the City of Windsor and partially within the Town of Tecumseh, Ontario (Figure 1 and Figure 2). It extends roughly from west to east from Concession Road 6, in the City of Windsor to Lesperance Road in the Town of Tecumseh, and north to south from the E.C. Row Expressway to the South Talbot Road. The main branch of Little River originates south of Highway 401 and generally flows north through a well-defined system of municipal drains and channels towards the Detroit River and Lake St. Clair. The drainage area contributing to Upper Little River upstream of the E.C. Row Expressway is approximately 45 square kilometres.

As part of the CHRA report, potential heritage resources were identified through consultation and a windshield survey, inventoried, and evaluated according to Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06, the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) (Government of Ontario 2006a). A land use history was completed to provide a cultural context for the Study Area and to provide a background upon which to base evaluations. Where CHVI was identified, the resource was mapped and recommendations made for further study. The objectives of the CHRA are summarized below:

- Prepare a land use history of the Study Area for use in the identification and evaluation of heritage resources;
- Identify potential heritage resources within the Study Area through a preliminary property inspection from the public right-of-way (RoW);
- Evaluate the CHVI of the potential heritage resources to determine the number of heritage resources present; and
- Prepare recommendations for future work where heritage resources were identified.
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### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

The requirement to consider cultural heritage in Municipal Class EAs is discussed in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Manual (MCEA Manual) (Municipal Engineers Association 2015) and the revised 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (Government of Ontario 2020). The MCEA Manual considers cultural environment heritage, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes as well as archaeological resources, as one in a series of environmental factors to be considered when undertaking an MCEA, particularly when describing existing and future conditions, development alternatives, and determination of the preferred alternative.

The MCEA Manual further suggests that cultural heritage resources that retain heritage attributes should be identified early in the EA process and avoided where possible. Where avoidance is not possible, potential effects to these attributes should be identified and minimized. Adverse impacts should be mitigated according to provincial and municipal guidelines. It is suggested that this happen early in the process so that potential impacts to significant features can be included in an understanding of project impacts and plans established to mitigate these impacts.

In addition to requirements outlined in the MCEA Manual, provisions made under the PPS were also considered in the preparation of the study. Section 2.6 of the PPS addresses cultural heritage in the land use planning process and as such was considered. The applicable provisions include:
> 2.6.1 - Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.
> 2.6.3 - Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

(Government of Ontario 2020: 31)

### 2.1 BACKGROUND HISTORY

The CHRA was composed of a program of archival research focused on the Study Area. To familiarise the study team with the Study Area, local historical resources were consulted, archival documents were reviewed, and a summary of the historical background of the local area was prepared. Specifically, historical mapping from 1877, 1881, 1912, 1913, 1920, 1931, 1936, 1940, 1961, 1962, and 1975 was consulted to identify the presence of structures, settlements, and other potential heritage resources in advance of the field program.
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### 2.2 MUNICIPAL AND AGENCY CONSULTATION

Listings of provincially and locally designated properties, districts, and easements for each municipality were collected from the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT), the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI), the City of Windsor, and the Town of Tecumseh. Consultation with these interested agencies and municipalities within which the project is proposed was undertaken to determine the presence of designated, listed, or registered heritage properties within the Study Area.

Recognition of protected properties varies greatly and is dependent on the level of CHVI identified or, in some cases, the level of investigation undertaken. For the purpose of this study, any property previously identified by municipal staff or provincial agencies as containing, or having the potential to contain, CHVI was determined to be a protected property.

### 2.3 FIELD PROGRAM

A vehicular windshield survey was conducted on April 19, 2018 and May 11, 2018 from the RoW. At this time, the Study Area was surveyed for potential heritage resources, including both potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Where identified, these were photographed, and their locations recorded. Characteristics of each potential heritage resource were noted while in the field and recorded.

In general, heritage resources of more than 40 years of age were evaluated during the survey for their potential to satisfy O. Reg. 9/06 criteria. The use of the 40-year threshold is generally accepted by both the federal and provincial authorities as a preliminary screening measure for CHVI. This practice does not imply that all properties more than 40 years of age are inherently of significant heritage value, nor does it exclude exceptional examples constructed within the past 40 years of being of significant cultural heritage value.

### 2.4 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

The criteria for determining CHVI is defined by O . Reg. 9/06. Each potential heritage resource was considered both as an individual structure and as cultural landscape. Where CHVI was identified, a structure or landscape was assigned a cultural heritage resource (CHR) number and the property was determined to contain a heritage resource. Evaluations for each property are contained in Appendix A.

### 2.4.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06

In order to identify CHVI at least one of the following criteria must be met:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
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iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it,
i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
iii. is a landmark.
(Government of Ontario 2006a).
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### 3.0 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The Study Area is located within the City of Windsor and the Town of Tecumseh, Ontario. It extends roughly from west to east from Concession Road 6, in the City of Windsor to Lesperance Road in the Town of Tecumseh, and north to south from the E.C. Row Expressway to the South Talbot Road.

Specifically, the Study Area spans across the following historical lots and concessions of the former Township of Sandwich, within the County of Essex, Ontario.

- Lots 141 to 150, Concession 1, Petit Cote
- Lots 98 to 150, Concession 3, Petit Cote
- Lots 12 to 16 , Concession 6
- Lots 11 to 17, Concession 7
- Lots 10 to 18, Concession 8
- Lots 10 to 18, Concession 9
- Lots 13 to 19, Concession 10
- Lots 300 to 304, Talbot Road North Side
- Lots 300 to 302, Talbot Road South Side

The following sections outline the historical development of the Study Area from the period of settlement to the $20^{\text {th }}$ century.

### 3.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY

The Study Area is situated within the St. Clair Clay Plains physiographic region of southwestern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 113). The physiography of the region highly influenced the late settlement and farming in the County of Essex, until more advanced artificial drainage was implemented in the late $19^{\text {th }}$ and early $20^{\text {th }}$ centuries.

The St. Clair Clay Plains is an extensive area of clay plains covering 5,880 square kilometres in Counties of Essex, Kent, and Lambton. The region is fairly flat with little relief, lying between approximately 175 to 215 metres above sea level. The area during the glacial period was covered by Glacial Lake Whittlesey and Lake Warren, which failed to leave deep stratified beds of sediment on the underlying clay. The majority of Essex County is till plains smoothed by shallow deposits of lacustrine clay which settled in the depressions while the knolls were being lowered by wave action. Within Essex County, the underlying rock is limestone (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 147).
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The majority of the region has a history of poor drainage, which required the installation of dredged ditches and tile underdrains to have satisfactory conditions for crop growth and tillage (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 149). The issue of drainage was addressed beginning in 1869 with the first Ontario Drainage Act. The act provided municipal and provincial funding to land owners for the construction of drains in southwestern Ontario (Burr 2014: 22). Throughout the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century new innovations established effective drainage throughout the county to facilitate improved agriculture. Still seen on the landscape today within the Study Area are deep ditches, with large culverts as part of driveways (Plate 1). There are also several different drains within the Study Area, including for example the Little River Drain which crosses Baseline Road (Plate 2).


Plate 1: Deep ditch and culvert driveway example on EC Row Avenue East
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Plate 2: Little River Drain

### 3.3 SURVEY AND SETTLEMENT

On January 1, 1800, in the Act for the Better Division of the Province, the Townships of Rochester, Mersea, Gosfield, Maidstone, Sandwich, and Malden were created as part of the County of Essex. The townships of Essex County were surveyed by Patrick McNiff, Abraham Iredell, and Thomas Smith (Clarke 2001: 60, 70).

Among the counties in Ontario, Essex County was the first to be settled (Corporation of the County of Essex 1992: 1). Euro-Canadian settlement in the area of Essex County began as early as 1747 as French settlers began living along the banks of the Detroit River (County of Essex 2019). Following the American War of Independence (1775-1783), settlers began to settle further east of the Detroit River along the north shore of Lake Erie (Corporation of the County of Essex 1992: 2).

The Township of Sandwich was surveyed between 1792 and 1793 by Patrick McNiff. McNiff did not complete the full survey of the township, with additional surveys undertaken by Abraham Iredell in 17961797, and Mahlon Burwell in 1824 (Clarke 2001: 67). Due to the township's location bordered on the north by Lake St. Clair and the west by the Detroit River, its French settlers prior to survey, and swamp areas, the township lots are irregularly laid out. Adjacent to the watercourses, in Concessions 1 to 3
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Petite Cote, the township has long narrow lots, while the remaining south and east portions of the township utilize the double-front survey system. This survey system created a rectangular pattern of 100acre lot allowances surrounded by road allowances (Plate 3).


## Plate 3: Double-Front Survey System (Dean 1969)

The village of Sandwich began to develop in 1788 to the northwest of the Study Area when a one square mile block of land was acquired by the British from the Chiefs of the Wyandottes/Huron, the Chippewa, and Ottawa for the price of three hundred pounds worth of supplies. It was laid out into one-acre sections and 24-acre residential lots. It was named for the English borough of Sandwich in Kent. Sandwich was established as the new county town by the Honourable Peter Russell in 1796 and its administrative function stimulated rapid growth. Industries included fur, salt, brick manufacturing, and fish hatcheries (Neal 1909: 133-134).

### 3.4 19TH CENTURY DEVELOPMENT

In the early $19^{\text {th }}$ century, road development helped to increase accessibility in the Study Area and the spread of settlers throughout the township. In 1811, Colonel Talbot commissioned Mahlon Burwell to survey the Talbot Road along the north shore of Lake Erie. The construction of the roadway was interrupted by the War of 1812, before reaching Essex County in 1818 (County of Essex 2019). The Talbot Road was completed through the Study Area between the hamlet of Maidstone and the Village of Sandwich.
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Northwest of the Study Area, in July 1812, the village of Sandwich was the first community in Upper Canada to be attacked by American forces. That month, under General Hull, 2,000 men crossed the Detroit River, forcing residents and British army in Sandwich to abandon the community. The following month, under the command of General Isaac Brock, the British army, and First Nations warriors, retaliated and the American forces were overtaken. Sandwich was attacked again in September 1813, by the American Forces under General William Henry Harrison. When peace came in 1814, the Crown compensated Sandwich for their losses during the conflict (City of Windsor 2021a).

In 1817, Sandwich was formally incorporated as a police village (County of Essex 2019). In the 1830s, the town became an important terminal on the Underground Railroad following the Emancipation Act in 1833. Refugees numbering between 30,000 and 100,000 made their journey into Upper Canada by way of Sandwich, with many settling in the town (City of Windsor 2021a). North of the Study Area, the Tecumseh Road was constructed in 1838, running parallel to Lake St. Clair and Detroit River between the community of Ryegate (now Tecumseh) and Sandwich (Tecumseh 2019).

Sandwich was incorporated as a town in 1858, with Charles Baby as the first mayor (Neal 1909: 133134). By the mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century Sandwich was a well-established town, with a grist and carding mill, two tanneries, a door and blind factory, a saw mill, a foundry, a brick yard, a shingle factory, two wagon shops, a bakery, a gunsmith, seven general stores, four groceries, five hotels, five saloons, a boot and shoe factory, two potash factories, and a brewery (Sutherland \& Co. 1866: 93).

Although the village of Sandwich was chosen as the location of Essex County offices, the Town of Windsor eventually outstripped the former in size and industry. Windsor, situated on the banks of the Detroit River, northwest of the Study Area, was originally founded as South Detroit by James Dougall of Paisley, Scotland, who bought the land, laid it out as a village plot, and opened a store in 1830. Early settlers in Windsor included a number of families: Baby, Dumouchelle, Goyeau, Jannesse, Langlois, Marentette, Meloche, and Oullette (Belden 1881: 7). In 1846, Windsor had a population of only 300 (Smith 1846: 221).

In 1844, the township population was 3,624 , outside of the towns on the Detroit River. Agriculture remained the main industry in the township in the mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century, with residents supplying products such as poultry to Windsor and the City of Detroit. By 1846, the township had 10,797 acres under cultivation out of a total of 51,476 acres (Smith 1846: 104).

After the Municipal Corporations Act of 1850, which provided a means of government for towns and counties, Essex was united with the Counties of Kent and Lambton. In June 1853, Essex became an independent county (County of Essex 2019). In 1853, the Great Western Railway was constructed through the township, with the line running through Ryegate and terminating at Windsor. Windsor was incorporated as a town in 1854, with S.S. Macdonnell as the first reeve (Belden 1881: 7). By 1866, its population had increased to 4,500 (Neal 1909:136). The arrival of the railway and the development of a port marked the beginning of significant industrial development in Windsor. Several areas that are now within the city limits, such as Walkerville and Ford City, were developed in the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century (Archaeological Services Inc. 2008). In 1892, Windsor was incorporated as a City (County of Essex 2019).
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By the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century, the Town of Sandwich had become a suburb of Windsor, with a population in 1881 of 1,054 (Belden 1881: 9). Outside the town, in 1861, the township had been divided into two distinct east and west municipalities. The Study Area fell within the Township of Sandwich East (County of Essex 2019). By 1881, the Township of Sandwich East was well settled with a population of 3,837 (Belden 1881: 9). The 1881 township map within the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties Essex and Kent, shows the rural Study Area (Figure 3). The majority of development in the Study Area is along the Talbot Road, with a few farmsteads north of the main roadway. In 1893, the Township of Sandwich East was further subdivided, with the creation of the Township of Sandwich South, with the Study Area within both boundaries (Town of Tecumseh 2019).

The Windsor Subdivision of the Canadian Pacific Railway runs east - west across the northern portion of the Study Area. This railway is present on McPhillips' 1898 Plan of the Township of Sandwich (McPhillips 1898). Part of the Trans-Canada railway commissioned by the government in 1880, it reached Windsor in 1890, and the line is still in operation today (Andreae 1997).

## $3.5 \quad 20^{\text {TH }}$ CENTURY DEVELOPMENT

In the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century, the Study Area remained within a rural part of the Townships of Sandwich East and Sandwich South, until the development of better roadways and an airport in the 1920s. In 1920, the Department of Public Highways (DPHO) assumed ownership of roadways between Windsor and Niagara Falls for the creation of Highway 3. Within the County of Essex, the highway remained under municipal authority. The Highway was designated as Provincial Highway 3 in 1925, and re-designated as King's Highway in 1930 (Bevers 2020).

Major development occurred adjacent to the Study Area with the opening of the Walker Airport on September 8, 1928. Following the Great Depression in the 1930s, the airport was purchased in 1940 by the City of Windsor. The City also purchased surrounding lands for the construction of three permanent runways, administration buildings, and a control tower (Weeks 2015).

North of the Study Area, the former community of Ryegate had been incorporated in 1921 as the Town of Tecumseh, a municipality separate from the Township of Sandwich East. That year, the town had a population of 978 . The town grew in the 1930s with the establishment of the Green Giant Factory (Town of Tecumseh 2019). Northwest of the Study Area, the Ambassador Bridge was opened in 1929 between Canada and the United States and became a vital trade link between the two nations. The high trade aspirations were short lived with the onset of the Great Depression. Windsor and Sandwich were hit hard by the depression and it resulted in the loss of thousands of heavy industry and manufacturing jobs. The provincial government, in an effort to save tax dollars, passed a bill to streamline municipal governments. As a result, Sandwich, East Windsor, and Walkerville, were annexed by the City of Windsor in 1935 (City of Windsor 2021a).

In the late 1950s, properties within and adjacent to the Study Area were purchased for the construction of a new highway into the City of Windsor. Construction of the E.C. Row Expressway, named for the President of Chrysler Canada, began in 1970. Construction and expansion contracts to the highway continued into the late $20^{\text {th }}$ century (Oiamo et al 2016:189).
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In the 1960s, the City of Windsor continued to expand through annexations of surrounding towns and townships. In 1966, the City of Windsor annexed the Townships of Sandwich East and Sandwich South (Town of Tecumseh 2019). The City of Windsor had a stable population between 1966 and 1996, with an average population of about 195,000 (City of Windsor 2021b).

In 1999, the east portion of the Study Area was annexed by the Town of Tecumseh as part of the reorganization of Essex County (Town of Tecumseh 2019). In 2003, the City of Windsor annexed 23 square kilometres from the Town of Tecumseh (City of Windsor 2021c). With its location adjacent to the City of Windsor, and the City's airport, Tecumseh is a suburban community. In 2006, the town had a population 24, 224 (Statistics Canada 2017).
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### 4.0 RESULTS

### 4.1 AGENCY AND MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION

In order to identify heritage resources within the Study Area, the MHSTCI, OHT, City of Windsor, and Town of Tecumseh were consulted.

At the provincial level, Karla Barboza, Team Lead, Heritage, with the MHSTCI, confirmed that there are no provincial heritage properties within or adjacent to the Study Area. Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner with the OHT, reported that there are no OHT conservation easement sites or OHT-owned properties within or adjacent to the Study Area.

At the municipal level, staff were consulted to determine the presence of municipally protected heritage properties. Table 4-1 provides an overview of the identified heritage resources in relation to the Study Area. Kristina Tang, Planner II - Revitalization \& Policy Initiatives, Planning \& Building Services, City of Windsor, identified five properties as heritage resources in relation to the Study Area. Three of the properties were determined to be situated within the Study Area. Chad Jeffery, Manager Planning, Town of Tecumseh, provided a map of heritage resources in the Town of Tecumseh which identified three properties as heritage resources in relation to the Study Area. One of the properties was determined to be situated within the Study Area.

Table 4-1: Identified and Protected Heritage Resources within the Study Area

| Municipality | Location/Municipal Address | Level of Recognition | Relationship to the Study Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Windsor | 2600 Airport Rd (3200 County Rd 42) | Listed on municipal register | Outside the Study Area |
| City of Windsor | 5680 Baseline Rd | Listed on municipal register | Inside the Study Area |
| City of Windsor | 4639 9th Concession Rd | Listed on municipal register | Inside the Study Area |
| City of Windsor | 4799 9th Concession Rd | Listed on municipal register | Outside the Study Area |
| City of Windsor | 4601 County Rd 17 (10th Concession) | Listed on municipal register | Inside the Study Area |
| Town of Tecumseh | 2300 Banwell Road | Designated Heritage Property | Inside the Study Area |
| Town of Tecumseh | 11945 Intersection Road | Listed on municipal register | Inside the Study Area |
| Town of Tecumseh | 2725 Highway 3 (Talbot Road) | Heritage Property Candidate | Outside the Study Area |
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### 4.2 FIELD PROGRAM

### 4.2.1 Potential Heritage Resources

As described in Section 2.3, a windshield survey was undertaken to identify potential heritage resources situated within, and adjacent to, the Study Area and confirm the presence of previously identified protected properties. Where identified, the potential heritage resource was photographically documented from the public RoW.

During the course of the survey, 72 individual sites were identified as containing potential heritage resources (Figure 4). Of those identified, five had been previously recognized by municipal heritage staff through listing on their municipal heritage register. A summary of these potential heritage resources is contained in Table 4-2 and Appendix A.

The Study Area contains a mixture of residential and commercial structures. The majority of the potential heritage resources date to the mid-20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century, between approximately 1940 to 1975 , based on topographic mapping. Eight properties date to the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to early $20^{\text {th }}$ century, specifically between 1882 and 1912, determined through historic and topographic mapping. Six of these eight properties display a similar one and a half storey structure with a T-shaped plan, while the remaining two are red brick two storey structures. Two of the eight properties are farmsteads.

### 4.3 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OF INTEREST

Where a potential heritage resource was identified within the Study Area, an evaluation of the CHVI of the property was undertaken. As described in Section 2.5, each potential heritage resource was evaluated according to O. Reg. 9/06, the criteria for determining CHVI. Detailed evaluations for each property are contained within Appendix A. In addition, each potential heritage resource was considered both as an individual structure and as part of a landscape. Where CHVI was identified, a structure or landscape was assigned a CHR number and the property was determined to contain a heritage resource. There were 72 potential heritage resources identified (Figure 4), 14 of which were determined to be cultural heritage resources (Figure 5). Table 4-2 summarizes the findings.
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1667$ <br> Shawnee <br> Road | 4 a | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3780 Lauzon Road | 4d | No | Farmstead |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3805 Lauzon Road | 4d | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banwell Road (railway line) | 4e | No | Railway Line |  | Railway line: Layout of the railway line. | Yes | CHR-1 |
| 2300 Banwell Road | 4e | Yes | Cemetery |  | Cemetery: Grave markers, provincial plaque, and mature deciduous trees. | Yes | CHR-2 |
| 11945 <br> Intersection Road | 4e | Yes | Farmstead |  | Residence: Two storey structure, high-pitched hip roof, brick chimney, hip dormer, symmetrical exterior, red brick exterior, covered full width porch, $3 / 1$ wood windows, and stone foundation. Barn: Timber frame structure and side gable roof. Landscape: Tree-lined laneway, mature maple and white pines. | Yes | CHR-3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3945 Lauzon Road | 4 g | No | Residence | I | None identified | No | N/A |
| 7816 County Road 42 | 4 g | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 7955 County Road 42 | 4 g | No | Residence |  | Associative: Connection to the Sikh community in Windsor and the local area, potential to yield information about the Sikh community and their influence on Windsor. Contextual: Guardwara Khalsa Parkash Windsor temple which acts as a landmark along County Road 42. | Yes | CHR-4 |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8421 County <br> Road 42 | 4 g | No | Residence/Commercial |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 8667 County Road 42 | 4 g | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 9244 County <br> Road 42 | 4 g | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $41207^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $41787^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession <br> Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $41407^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3277 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3355 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3415 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence | 栄登 | None identified | No | N/A |

## CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE ASSESSMENT, UPPER LITTLE RIVER WATERSHED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Results
June 24, 2021
Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3465 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3483 Baseline | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3567 Baseline | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3685 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3745 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3765 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3825 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3915 Baseline Road | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 3965 Baseline | 4h | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4145 Baseline Road | 4i | No | Residence | < | None identified | No | N/A |
| 4175 Baseline Road | 4i | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 4245 Baseline Road | 4i | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5680 Baseline Road | 4i | Yes | Farmstead |  | Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, brick chimney, and T-shaped plan. Barn: Timber frame structure, side gable roof, salt box side, wood paneled door, and wood multi-paned windows. Driveshed: one storey structure, side gable roof, and wood $2 / 2$ fixed windows. Smaller barn: side gable roof and rusticated concrete foundation. Outbuilding: horizontal wood siding, side gable roof, and wood $2 / 2$ fixed windows. | Yes | CHR-6 |
| 7295 Baseline Road | 4k | No | Residence |  | Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, gabled dormers, and T-shaped plan. | Yes | CHR-7 |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4310 County Road 17 | 4k | No | Outbuilding |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 8360 Baseline Road | 4k | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 8780 Baseline <br> Road | 4k | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |

## CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE ASSESSMENT, UPPER LITTLE RIVER WATERSHED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Results
June 24, 2021
Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3850 County Road 17 | 4k | No | Residence |  | Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched side gable roof, three-bay front façade, and stone foundation. Landscape: mature spruce trees. | Yes | CHR-8 |
| $47218^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession <br> Road | 41 | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $47278^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession <br> Road | 41 | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $47748^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession <br> Road | 4I | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $48248^{\mathrm{th}}$ <br> Concession Road | 41 | No | Outbuildings |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $46399^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession <br> Road | 4 m | Yes | Residence |  | Residence: Two storey structure, mediumpitched hip roof, gabled dormers, red brick exterior, covered wraparound brick, concrete and wood porch, $3 / 1$ and $4 / 1$ windows, and wood paneled door. | Yes | CHR-9 |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $50129^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road | 40 | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 4610 County Road 17 | 4 n | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| 4601 County Road 17 | 4 n | Yes | Residence |  | Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched side gable roof, stone clad exterior, three-bay front façade, and stone clad front porch. | Yes | CHR-10 |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5790 North <br> Talbot Road | 4 r | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
| $9^{\text {th }}$ <br> Concession Road (former railway line) | 4 r | No | Former railway line |  | Recreational Trail: Layout of the former Canada Southern Railway Line including linear corridor lined with naturalized vegetation. | Yes | CHR-14 |
| 3940 Highway 3 | 4 q | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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Table 4-2: Summary of Determination of CHVI

| Municipal Address | Figure Number | Previous Heritage Recognition | Resource Type | Photograph | Identified Attributes | CHVI | CHR <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5075 North Talbot Road | 4r | No | Residence |  | None identified | No | N/A |
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### 5.0 PROPOSED UNDERTAKING

### 5.1 DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

The Upper Little River Watershed EA has been prepared to determine a preferred approach to providing SWM control measures for the developing lands upstream of the E.C. Row Expressway and contributing to Upper Little River. A Master Plan Approach 2 approach was completed for this EA study. This approach identified the problem (Phase 1), developed six alternative solutions (Phase 2), developed a design concept for a portion of the Study Area (Phase 3), and documented the process in the Environmental Study Report (Phase 4) (Stantec 2021). No Phase 5, Implementation, was completed as part of this Master Plan Approach 2.

The Environmental Study Report selected Alternative 6 as the preliminary preferred alternative as it provides all stormwater management controls before out-letting to the downstream watercourses. Each facility would be required to provide water quality, water quantity, and erosion controls on a standalone basis. In this alternative the SWM facilities are grouped into stormwater management corridors to promote natural linkages, recreational trails, and greenways. The SWM facilities can provide controls for more than one property and will be located adjacent to other facilities and a watercourse. It is anticipated that facilities would be designed and constructed as development proceeds. The Study Area for the SWM will be developed by multiple landowners and the preferred alternative supports the ability of individual landowners to proceed independently while minimizing the total number of SWM facilities.

The stormwater areas are proposed to be congregated into stormwater management corridors which can be combined with trail systems and amenity areas for the surrounding developments. The stormwater management corridor will be located beside watercourses which will accept drainage from the end-of-pipe facilities. Heavy vegetation adjacent to all water bodies and minimal open water will also be implemented in order to make water features less attractive to bird species, a specific request from the Windsor Airport. As part of this work, several of the existing municipal drains are proposed to be abandoned and several new channels will be created that align with the proposed development plan for the area. In addition, the work will include re-grading the stream channel banks to create benches or terraces, which will help dissipate energy and re-connect the bankfull channel to a floodplain area (Stantec 2021).
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### 6.0 EVALUATION OF ANTICIPATED IMPACTS AND MITIGATION OPTIONS

The Upper Little River EA includes conceptual designs of the preferred alternative only for a section of the Study Area (Appendix B). Accordingly, an impact assessment cannot be completed since the relationship of Project Activities to identified CHRs is not known. Thus, general mitigation options have been prepared for future cultural heritage guidance in the Study Area including more detailed EAs and planning processes. The mitigation options were developed in accordance with the MHSTCI InfoSheet \#5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans from the Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (Government of Ontario 2006b). It is recommended that buffer zones, site plan controls, and other planning mechanisms be used as mitigation measures.

In general, for the Project, the following will need to be taken into account for each CHR to eliminate any potential impacts:

- The full design of Alternative 6 should be suitably planned in a manner that avoids any identified CHRs.
- All staging and construction activities should be planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to an identified CHR.
- Site plan controls should be put in place prior to construction to prevent potential Project impacts. Site plan controls include mapping CHRs on construction mapping and physically demarcating these properties to communicate the presence of these properties to construction crews. Physical protective measures should include at minimum the installation of temporary fencing around CHRs.
- If Project work is to occur within 50 metres of identified CHRs, it is recommended that a qualified building condition specialist or geotechnical engineer with previous experience working with heritage structures be consulted to identify appropriate vibration mitigation measures in advance of construction. Mitigation measures for vibration may include developing an appropriate vibration setback distance, a vibration attenuation study, and/or a construction monitoring program.
- Post-construction landscaping and rehabilitation plans should be undertaken in a manner that is sympathetic to the overall setting.


### 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7.1 AVOIDANCE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

The full design of Alternative 6 should be suitably planned in a manner that avoids any identified CHRs. Project components should be planned and undertaken in a manner to avoid the built heritage and cultural heritage landscape attributes of the identified CHRs.

### 7.2 SITE PLAN CONTROLS

It is recommended that site plan controls be put in place prior to construction activities to prevent potential impacts as a result of the Project. These controls should be indicated on all construction mapping and communicated to the construction team leads.

Site plan controls should include mapping CHRs within 50 metres of Project activities on construction maps and physically demarcating these properties to communicate the presence of these properties to construction crews. Physical protective measures should include at a minimum the installation of temporary fencing around CHRs. Depending on the proximity or Project activities, additional measures may be required such as stabilization of built heritage attributes in close proximity to construction work.

### 7.3 CONDITION SURVEYS AND VIBRATION MONITORING

If Project work is to occur within 50 metres of CHRs , it is recommended that a qualified building conditions specialist or geotechnical engineer with previous experience working with heritage structures be consulted to identify appropriate vibration mitigation measures in advance of construction. Mitigation measures for vibration may include developing an appropriate vibration setback distance, a vibration attenuation study, and/or a construction monitoring program.

### 7.4 DEPOSIT COPIES

To assist in the retention of historic information, copies of this report should be deposited with local repositories of historic material as well as with municipal and regional planning staff. Therefore, it is recommended that this report be deposited at the following locations:

City of Windsor Library<br>850 Ouellette Avenue<br>Windsor, ON<br>N9A 4M9

City of Windsor Heritage Committee
Suite 404, 400 City Hall Square East
Windsor, ON
N9A 7K6

Essex County Library, Tecumseh Branch 13675 St. Gregory's Road<br>Windsor, ON<br>N8N 3E4

Town of Tecumseh Municipal Heritage Committee 917 Lesperance Road<br>Tecumseh, ON<br>N8N 1W9
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### 8.0 CLOSURE

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit of Essex Region Conservation Authority, City of Windsor and Town of Tecumseh and may not be used by any third party without the express written consent of Stantec Consulting Ltd. Any use which a third party makes of this report is the responsibility of such third party.

We trust this report meets your current requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information or have additional questions about any facet of this report.

Yours truly,
STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.
Digitally signed
Lama Walte by Walter, Laura Date: 2021.06.25 09:36:15-04'00'
Laura Walter, MA, CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist
Tel: (705) 427-6044
Fax: (226) 268-5392
laura.walter@stantec.com


Tracie Carmichael, BA, B.Ed.
Managing Principal
Tel: (226) 927-3586
Fax: (519) 645-6575
tracie.carmichael@stantec.com
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## APPENDIX A Inventory of Heritage Resources

Municipal Address: 1667 Shawnee Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage. The one storey structure has a lowpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The residence is clad in vinyl siding and has $1 / 1$
 windows and a flat fixed wood window. The front entrance has a partial wood porch. The structure has a concrete foundation.

The residence sits on a large lot and has a mature maple tree on its front yard.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, <br> material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization <br> or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 1 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3780 Lauzon Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Farmstead
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and several outbuildings. The residence is a one storey structure with a high-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure has a brick exterior with modern
 windows. The entrance has a partial brick and concrete porch. The residence has a concrete foundation.

Situated to the rear of the residence is farm associated
outbuildings and four silos. The majority of the outbuildings are gable roof structures.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 5, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 2 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3805 Lauzon Road
Former Township or County: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1932-1940
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a laneway and a residence. The one storey structure has a high-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles, and a central chimney. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows. The structure has a salt box side, and an undetermined
 foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 3 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: Banwell Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor/Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Railway Line
Associated Dates: 1853
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains the former Great Western Railway Line, now part of the Canadian National (CN) Railway.


Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: This railway corridor is associated with the Great Western Railway Line that was constructed through the Township of Sandwich in 1853. The railway line operated between Windsor and Niagara Falls. The line was taken over by the Grand Trunk Railway in 1882, and the CN Railway in 1923. The railway line had a large influence on industrial development in Windsor and Tecumseh, and thus is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Railway line: Layout of the railway line.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: September 14, 2017. |


| Appendix | Page <br> A |
| :--- | ---: |
| Title | 4 of 75 |
| CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE/LANDSCAPE RECORD FORM |  |

Municipal Address: 2300 Banwell Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Cemetery
Associated Dates: circa 1850
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains the Banwell Road Black Cemetery. The cemetery has six grave markers that date to the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century. The cemetery contains the graves of early black settlers to the Township of Sandwich,
 including those associated with the Underground Railroad. The property has a provincial plaque that marks the significance of The Banwell Road Area Black Settlement.

The property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by the Town of Tecumseh.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: This cemetery dates to the mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century and is associated with the early black settlers in the Township of Sandwich. Beginning in the 1830s, at least 30 families fleeing enslavement and racial oppression in the United States settled in the Banwell Road area in the Township of Sandwich.
Identified Heritage Attributes: Cemetery: Grave markers, provincial plaque, and mature deciduous tree.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Upper Little River Watershed

A $\quad$| Page |
| ---: |
| 5 of 75 |

Municipal Address: 11945 Intersection Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Farmstead
Associated Dates: 1882-1912
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, a barn, and three outbuildings.

The residence is a two storey structure with a high-pitched
 hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The front (north) elevation has a central hip dormer. The structure has a symmetrical red brick exterior. The front elevation has a covered full width porch that is clad in stone and has brick piers. The upper exterior has $3 / 1$ wood windows. The residence has a stone foundation.
At the rear of the residence is a timber frame barn with a side gable roof that is clad in metal. The property has a tree-lined laneway, and mature maple and white pine trees.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this two storey residence dates to between approximately 1882 and 1912, determined through historic and topographic mapping. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse with Edwardian design influences. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: Two storey structure, high-pitched hip roof, brick chimney, hip dormer, symmetrical exterior, red brick exterior, covered full width porch, $3 / 1$ wood windows, and stone foundation. Barn: Timber frame structure and side gable roof. Landscape: Tree-lined laneway, mature maple and white pines.

Identification of CHVI: Yes
Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-3
Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 6 of 75 |
| A |  |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 7 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3945 Lauzon Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached modern garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched
 hip roof with asphalt shingles. The structure has an asymmetrical exterior with vinyl cladding. The residence has modern windows and doors, and a concrete foundation. The property has a mature maple tree.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 8 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 7816 County Road 42
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The asymmetrical
 exterior is clad in vinyl siding and brick. The residence has modern windows and doors, and an attached single-car garage. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 9 of 75 |
| A |  |

Municipal Address: 7955 County Road 42
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961 (residence), 1975-2004 (temple)
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains the Gurdwara Khalsa Parkash Windsor a modern temple, as well as a separate residence, and detached garage. The property is
 bordered with a large concrete and metal fence.

The temple is a large three-storey massing with a flat roof. The structure has six corner towers, and one central larger tower. Each tower is top with a dome that is painted white and top with a finial. The central dome has gold paint embellishments. The concrete structure has rectangular window openings. The north and west elevations have covered carports.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding. The front entrance has a partial porch and a wood paneled door. The residence appears abandoned as it is boarded up.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: This late $20^{\text {th }}$ to early $21^{\text {st }}$ century structure is associated with the Sikh community in Windsor and has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of the community's development in the City. This property acts as a landmark along County Road 42, and in the local area.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Associative: Connection to the Sikh community in Windsor and the local area, potential to yield information about the Sikh community and their influence on Windsor. Contextual: Guardwara Khalsa Parkash Windsor temple which acts as a landmark along County Road 42.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 10 of 75 |
| A |  |

## Municipal Address: 8421 County Road 42

Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence/Commercial
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence that is situated on a commercial property, "Frank Dupuis Landscaping \& Trucking Ltd." The residence is possibly used as commercial offices. The property contains
 modern outbuildings associated with the commercial business.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof that has asphalt shingles and a concrete block chimney. The front (north) elevation has a shed dormer. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows. The front elevation has a partial brick and concrete porch with metal railing. The structure has a concrete block foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 11 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 8667 County Road 42
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, and mature spruce and maple trees.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched
 side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The exterior is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The front (north) entrance has a partial concrete porch clad in brick. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 12 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

## Municipal Address: 9244 County Road 42

Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1932-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence. The property is bordered by a wood fence.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a
 medium-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The front (south) elevation has a hip dormer. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The structure has a concrete block foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 13 of 75 |
| A |  |

Municipal Address: $41207^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and outbuilding. The property has mature deciduous and coniferous trees.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure and has
 a medium-pitched gambrel roof with a brick chimney. The north and south roof elevations have large shed dormers. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows. The entrance has a covered partial porch with concrete steps and brick piers. The structure has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 4. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| iv.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| v. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| vi. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 5. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iv.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| v. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| vi. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, <br> designer or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| iv.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| v.Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| vi. Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 14 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: $41787^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a laneway and residence.

The residence is a one storey structure with a highpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick
 chimney. The exterior is clad in stone and has modern windows. The structure has a projecting entrance with a partial concrete porch that is clad in stone and has a metal railing. The foundation is undetermined.
The residence is situated behind a cedar hedge and the property has mature deciduous trees.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: $41407^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and three outbuildings.

The residence is one storey structure with a low-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The structure appears to have a north addition. The residence has a
 concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 16 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3255 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a single-car garage.


Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.

Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3225 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a low-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The split-level residence has a singlecar garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. <br> Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3325 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a low-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The split-level residence has a single-car
 garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3277 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a low-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The split-level residence has a double-car garage.


Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. <br> Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3355 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a
 low-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The split-level residence has a double-car garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3415 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in stone and has modern windows and doors. The residence has an attached double-car garage.


Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| iv. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3465 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a covered partial
 porch and a single-car garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3483 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage. The view of the residence is obstructed by vegetation.

The residence is a two storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof. The front (north) elevation has a shed dormer. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and brick and
 has modern windows and doors. The front elevation has a partial porch clad in brick with a metal railing. The structure has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3567 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1961-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows
 and doors. The residence has a covered partial concrete porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3605 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The
 structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3635 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1961-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a
 brick chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (north) elevation has a central projecting bay, and a covered partial porch. The side (west) elevation has a projecting entrance.

## Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3665 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The residence has an attached double-car
 garage. The structure has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 28 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3685 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched front facing gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows
 and doors. The residence has a double-car garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3745 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a
 concrete chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete porch and an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3765 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (north) elevation has a covered
 partial wood porch. The structure has an attached singlecar garage and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| H. <br> Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3825 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and stone and has modern windows and doors. The front (north) elevation has a
 modern addition that has a covered partial concrete entry porch. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3915 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached single-car garage.


The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in brick and aluminum siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3965 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern
 windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 3985 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.

The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles
 and two concrete chimneys. The front (north) elevation has a central gabled dormer. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The front elevation has a covered full width concrete porch clad in brick. The residence has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

Appendix Page

A

Municipal Address: 4085 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (north) elevation has a partial wood porch and a front facing gable. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 4095 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4145 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached single-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern
 windows and doors. The residence has a partial porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4175 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The front (north) elevation has two gabled dormers. The structure is clad in brick and has
 modern windows and doors. The front entrance has projecting entrance with an asymmetrical gable. The residence has an attached single-car garage, and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4245 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a partial wood porch and a
 concrete foundation

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4367 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Cemetery
Associated Dates: 1900
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains Fairbairn Union
Cemetery.
The cemetery was established in 1900. Thomas Fairbairn donated one acre of land from his farm for a cemetery, prior to his death on May 24, 1900. Thomas Fairbairn was
 the first burial in the cemetery.

The cemetery contains a mixture of grave markers from the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century to the $21^{\text {st }}$ century. The entrance to the cemetery is marked with brick piers with metal gates.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The Fairbairn Cemetery established in 1900, has a direct association with a person in the community, Thomas Fairbairn, who donated the property for a public burying ground in 1900. Fairbairn was the first person laid to rest within the cemetery. The Fairbairn Cemetery supports the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Cemetery: Grave markers and brick piers with metal gates.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4489 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick
 chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete and porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4441 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached single-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern
 windows and doors. The residence has a partial wood porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| irea, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 4475 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.
The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched hip roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern
 windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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## Municipal Address: $44358^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road

Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached single-car garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney.
 The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete porch and a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $44408^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1920-1940
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and modern outbuilding.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a concrete chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has
 modern windows and doors. The residence has a partial concrete porch and an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |

## Stantec
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Municipal Address: 5680 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Farmstead
Associated Dates: circa 1875 (date from Municipal Heritage Register)
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains two residences, several farm associated outbuildings, and four silos. The property contains mature maple trees.


The circa 1875 residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure has a T-shaped plan, with a covered wraparound verandah. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The foundation was not visible from the roadway.

The second residence, that dates between 1962 and 1975, is a one storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has partial wood entrance porch, an entrance gable, and a concrete foundation.
The property contains a timber frame barn that has a side gable roof that is clad with metal. The barn has a salt box side and is clad in metal. The south addition has a wood paneled door. The exterior has wood multi-pane windows. Adjacent to the barn is a mixture of late $19^{\text {th }}$ to modern outbuildings including:

A one storey driveshed, with a side gable roof that is clad in metal. Its exterior is clad in metal and has 2/2 wood fixed windows.

A one storey outbuilding with a side gable roof, that is clad in metal and has a concrete chimney. It has a horizontal wood siding exterior, with $2 / 2$ wood fixed windows.

An early $20^{\text {th }}$ century barn, with a side gable roof that is clad in metal. The exterior of the barn is clad in metal and has a rusticated concrete block foundation.

The property is listed on the City of Windsor Municipal Heritage Register and is associated with the Ure family.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. $\quad$Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
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| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.ls a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to about 1875. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich through its connection to the Ure family. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ century agricultural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, brick chimney, and T-shaped plan. Barn: Timber frame structure, side gable roof, salt box side, wood paneled door, and wood multi-paned windows. Driveshed: one storey structure, side gable roof, and wood 2/2 fixed windows. Smaller barn: side gable roof and rusticated concrete foundation. Outbuilding: horizontal wood siding, side gable roof, and wood $2 / 2$ fixed windows.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 7295 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1882-1912
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and modern outbuildings. The property is bordered in wood fencing.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles.
 The roofline has two gabled dormers. The residence has a T-shaped plan. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The north elevation has a covered partial wood porch. The structure has a rusticated concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to between approximately 1882 and 1912, based on historic and topographic mapping. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to early $20^{\text {th }}$ century agricultural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, gabled dormers, and T-shaped plan.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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## Municipal Address: 4310 County Road 17

Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Outbuilding
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a modern house, barn, and outbuilding. The property is bordered by wood fencing.

The barn is a timber frame structure with a gambrel roof that is clad in metal and has hay hoods and two
 ventilators. The outbuilding is a timber frame structure with a side gable roof that is clad in metal.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 8360 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached single-car garage.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick
 chimney. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has $1 / 1$ metal windows. The front (south) elevation has projecting entry porch with an asymmetrical gable. The residence has a partial concrete porch and a concrete foundation. The structure has a rear addition with an attached single-car garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. <br> Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 8780 Baseline Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage. The view of the residence is obstructed from the roadway by vegetation.

The residence is s a one storey structure with a lowpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The
 structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: 3850 County Road 17
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1882-1912
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and modern outbuildings. The property has mature spruce trees.

The residence is s a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitch side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The
 structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (west) three-bay façade has a covered partial wood porch. The residence has a south entry porch addition and a stone foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| H. <br> Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to between approximately 1882 and 1912, based on historic and topographic mapping. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched side gable roof, three-bay front façade, and stone foundation. Landscape: mature spruce trees.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 7, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $47218^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof and concrete chimney. The front (east) elevation has a shed dormer. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows
 and doors. The front elevation has a full width concrete porch with metal railings. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $47278^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached double-car garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched hip rook with brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and has modern windows and doors. The front
 (east) elevation has a partial concrete porch. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $47748^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The structure is clad in brick and stone and has
 modern windows and doors. The front (west) elevation has a partial concrete porch with metal railings. The structure has a concrete foundation and an attached single-car garage.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

Stantec
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Municipal Address: $48248^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Outbuildings
Associated Dates: 1920-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains three outbuildings and a cast-in-place concrete silo.

The largest outbuilding has a side gable roof and is clad
 in metal. Attached to the outbuilding is the concrete silo. Adjacent to the outbuilding and silo, are two smaller outbuildings with side gable roofs. One has vertical wood boards, the other is clad in metal.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec
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Municipal Address: $46399^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1912
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a laneway that leads to a residence and modern outbuildings.

The residence is a two and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles. The roofline has three gabled dormers. The structure has a red
 brick exterior. The majority of windows are modern except for some $4 / 1$ and $3 / 1$ windows on the lower storey. The residence has a covered wraparound brick, concrete, and wood verandah. The front (east) entrance has a wood paneled door. The structure has an undetermined foundation.
The residence is listed on the City of Windsor's Municipal Heritage Register. It is recognized as the John Hayes House.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this two storey residence dates to 1912. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse with Edwardian design influences. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: Two storey structure, medium-pitched hip roof, gabled dormers, red brick exterior, covered wraparound brick, concrete and wood porch, 3/1 and $4 / 1$ windows, and wood paneled door.

Identification of CHVI: Yes
Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-9
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Municipal Address: $44659^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1962
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and modern outbuildings.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched front facing gable roof and a brick chimney. The north and south elevations have shed
 dormers. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and stone and has modern windows and doors. The front (east) elevation has a covered full width concrete porch with metal railings. The foundation was undetermined.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $44459^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1962
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a modern garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a cross gable roof that has asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in stone and vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The
 residence has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018 |
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Municipal Address: $49799^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1942-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, two outbuildings and a concrete silo.

The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a brick chimney. The east elevation has a gabled dormer. The
 structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |
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Municipal Address: $50129^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, a modern garage, and modern outbuilding.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles and a stucco clad chimney. The exterior is clad in stucco
 and has modern windows and doors. The front (south) elevation has a partial concrete porch. The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
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Municipal Address: 4610 County Road 17
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a modern garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence has a
 concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 4601 County Road 17
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1932 (from the Municipal Heritage Register)
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence.
The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched side gable roof with metal shingles and a brick chimney. The front (east) elevation has a gabled
 dormer. The structure is clad in stone and has modern windows and doors. The three-bay front façade has a covered full width concrete porch that is clad in stone. The structure has a concrete foundation.
The property is listed on the City of Windsor's Municipal Heritage Register. The residence is recognized as the Dolphice St. Louis house.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity organization or institution that is significant to a community, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  | $\checkmark$ |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to 1932. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse with Bungalow design influences. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched side gable roof, stone clad exterior, three-bay front façade, and stone clad front porch.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-10 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 4500 County Road 17
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961 (according to topographic mapping), appears to be early $20^{\text {th }}$ century
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and two outbuildings.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure has a
 T-shaped plan. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (west) elevation has an enclosed partial porch and a gabled dormer. The residence has an undetermined foundation.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to between approximately 1940 and 1961 according to topographic maps of the study area, but the design of the structure points to an early $20^{\text {th }}$ century date. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, T-shaped plan, and gabled dormer.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-11 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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Municipal Address: 4521 County Road 17
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1882-1912
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, modern outbuilding, and wood outbuilding. Between the residence and the roadway are two mature spruce trees.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles.
 The roofline has three gabled dormers. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The front (east) elevation has a partial wood porch. The residence has a rusticated concrete foundation.

At the rear of the property is a vertical wood outbuilding with a side gable roof that is clad with metal.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| H. <br> Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii.Is a landmark. |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to between approximately 1882 and 1912, based on historic and topographic mapping. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, and gabled dormers. Outbuilding: vertical wood boards and side gable roof.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-12 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 5284 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Park
Associated Dates: 1962-1975
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a community park, the Weston Park. The park is approximately nine acres.

The park contains a playground, two baseball diamonds, basketball courts, two tennis courts, a parking area,
soccer field, and an outbuilding.


Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O.
Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
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Municipal Address: 5648 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1882-1913
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage. The property has mature maple trees.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles. The structure has a T-shaped plan, with a front (south) one
 storey addition. The residence is clad in vinyl siding and brick and has modern windows and doors. The structure has a concrete foundation.

The single-car garage to the rear of the residence is a one storey structure with a gable roof. Its exterior is clad in brick and vinyl siding.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method <br> ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or <br> iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. <br> 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, <br> i.Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, <br> ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or <br> iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. <br> 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: The construction of this one and a half storey residence dates to between approximately 1882 and 1913, based on historic and topographic mapping. It is a representative example of a vernacular Ontario farmhouse. This residence has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Township of Sandwich. This property supports the late $19^{\text {th }}$ to early $20^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Residence: One and a half storey structure, medium-pitched cross gable roof, and T-shaped plan.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-13 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 5700 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a detached garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The exterior is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors.
 The structure has a concrete foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
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Municipal Address: 5760 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and outbuilding.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a high-pitched side gable roof with asphalt shingles. The
 front (south) elevation has two gabled dormers. The residence is clad in brick and vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The structure has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 5790 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence and a garage.

The residence is a one storey structure with a low-pitched hip roof with asphalt shingles. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors. The residence
 has a concrete foundation.

The double-car garage to the rear of the residence is a one storey structure with a gable roof. Its exterior is clad in vinyl siding.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  |  |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: $9^{\text {th }}$ Concession Road (former railway line)
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: Town of Tecumseh
Resource Type: Trail
Associated Dates: 1890
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains the former railway corridor of the Michigan Central (M.C.) Railway. The rail line has been removed and is now a gravel path that is bordered by wood lots.


The railway line was between London and Windsor in 1890. The railway line was owned by M.C. until 1985, when it was taken over by the Canadian National Railway/Canadian Pacific Railway.
Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, <br> ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or <br> iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: This former railway corridor is associated with the M.C. line that operated across southwestern Ontario and connected to the United States. The line was completed through the Township of Sandwich in 1890 . The line was removed in the late $20^{\text {th }}$ century. This former railway corridor supports the $19^{\text {th }}$ century rural character of the area and is physically and historically linked to its surroundings.

Identified Heritage Attributes: Recreational Trail: Layout of the former Canada Southern Railway Line including linear corridor lined with naturalized vegetation.

| Identification of CHVI: Yes | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: CHR-14 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
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Municipal Address: 3940 Highway 3
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, outbuildings, and a horse track. The front (south) yard has wood fencing.

The residence is a one and a half storey structure with a medium-pitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles
 and a brick chimney. The front (south) elevation has a projecting one storey section with a gable roof. The structure is clad in vinyl siding and has modern windows and doors.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  |  |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i.Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an <br> area, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii.Is a landmark. | $\checkmark$ |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |


| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 74 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |

Municipal Address: 5075 North Talbot Road
Former Township: Township of Sandwich
Municipality: City of Windsor
Resource Type: Residence
Associated Dates: 1940-1961
Relationship to Project: Within the Study Area
Description: The property contains a residence, and two outbuildings. The view of the residence is obstructed by vegetation.


The residence is a one storey structure with a mediumpitched cross gable roof with asphalt shingles and a concrete chimney. The exterior is clad in vinyl and a mixture of $3 / 1$ wood windows and modern windows. The structure has an undetermined foundation.

Indicators of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest from O. Reg. 9/06:

| 1. The property has design value or physical value because it, | Yes | No |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| i.Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, <br> expression, material or construction method |  | $\checkmark$ |
| ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or |  | $\checkmark$ |
| iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. The property has historical value or associative value because it, |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity <br> organization or institution that is significant to a community, | $\checkmark$ |  |
| ii. Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an <br> understanding of a community of culture, or | $\checkmark$ |  |
| iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer <br> or theorist who is significant to a community. | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. The property has contextual value because it, |  |  |
| i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an |  |  |
| i. area, |  |  |

Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: None identified.
Identified Heritage Attributes: None identified.

| Identification of CHVI: No | Cultural Heritage Resource Number: N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Completed by (name): Laura Walter | Date Completed: May 14, 2018. |

## Stantec

| Client/Project | May 2018 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Little River Watershed | 160311265 |
| Environmental Assessment | Page |
| Appendix | 75 of 75 |
| A |  |
| Title |  |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In no way will the ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

[^1]:    Please consider the environment before printing this email
    This e-mail transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the express use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us by telephone at the number above and arrange to return this transmission to us or destroy it.

