APPENDIX B GEOTECHNICAL REPORTS

B.1: Geotechnical Data Report

Part H: Appendix F

Annacis Island WWTP New Outfall System

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority Project and Environmental Review Application

This page intentionally left blank

Hydrogeological Testing Results

 DATE 26 September 2017 **REFERENCE No.** 1525010-033-TM-Rev0

TO Viji Fernando

FROM Nathan Fretz,

Don Chorley **EMAIL** nfretz@golder.com, dchorley@golder.com

ANNACIS ISLAND WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT TRANSIENT MITIGATION AND OUTFALL - HYDROGEOLOGICAL TESTING AND RESULTS

1.0 FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

The scope of work for the hydrogeological component of the field investigations at the Annacis Island Waste Water Treatment Plant (the Site) located in Delta, BC included the following main tasks:

- Water level monitoring at select wells and in the Fraser River to calculate hydraulic gradient in the vicinity of the proposed effluent shaft and outfall shaft along the Option 6 outfall alignment.
- Single-well response testing in monitoring wells screened within various hydrostratigraphic units to estimate hydraulic conductivity.
- Dissolved gas sampling in select monitoring wells to estimate dissolved hydrogen sulfide, carbon dioxide, and methane gas concentrations in groundwater at the proposed effluent shaft and outfall shaft along the Option 6 outfall alignment, as well as the potential future shaft location associated with the conveyance system from the Stage V expansion of the treatment plant to the proposed outfall.

This memo describes two separate hydrogeological field programs carried out at the Site. The first program was carried out in April and May of 2016 along the preferred western alignment corridor. The second program was carried out in December of 2016 along the Option 6 outfall alignment corridor. Data from both field programs have are included in this document.

1.1 Water Level Monitoring

Solinst Levelogger pressure transducers were installed in select monitoring wells and the Fraser River over two separate time intervals in order to monitor groundwater level fluctuations and response to tides.

Pressure transducers were installed in the following locations over the period of April 27 to May 6, 2016 to record water levels in support of the preferred western alignment corridor:

- SH16-01 (10m, 35m, and 55m piezometers)
- SH16-02 (10m, 45m, and 52m piezometers)
- SH16-03 (10m piezometer)
- SH16-04 (10m and 36.6m piezometer)

Pressure transducers were installed in the following locations over the period of December 23 to 29, 2016 to record water levels in support of the Option 6 alignment corridor:

- SH16-05 (10m and 33m piezometers)
- SH16-06 (10m and 33m piezometers)
- SH16-07 (10m and 31m piezometers)
- Fraser River (installed off the end of Turning Point Brewery's dock)

In addition to the locations listed above, a Solinst Barologger pressure transducer was installed at SH16-02 to monitor changes in atmospheric pressure during the monitoring periods. All transducers were synchronized and were set to collect data every 5 minutes.

1.2 Single-Well Response Tests

Single-well response tests (slug tests) were conducted at monitoring wells using either pneumatic slug or solid slug methods; a solid slug method was employed in cases where lower permeability dictated its use.

Pneumatic slug tests involve using air pressure to cause near-instantaneous changes in water level in wells. A Midwest GeoSciences Group Pneumatic "Hi-K" Slug™ Assembly (the "assembly") was installed on select wells to control the pressure in the well heads. Positive pressure was applied with the assembly to conduct rising head tests with water level displacements varying between 0.3 m and 0.8 m.

Solid slug tests involve lowering or raising an object of known mass into or out of the water column to cause a sudden change in water level in a well. Weighted sections of closed PVC pipe were used to conduct rising and falling head tests with water level displacements varying between 0.4 m to 1.0 m.

During testing, continuous water levels were recorded using a Solinst Levelogger pressure transducer and directread cable. Table 1 summarizes the testing methods performed at each monitoring well.

Table 1: Slug Tests

When possible, multiple slug tests were conducted at individual monitoring wells to assess the sufficiency of well development and to assess the reproducibility of the slug tests. In the case of pneumatic slug tests, three tests were completed at approximately the same initial displacement and an additional two tests were conducted at greater and lesser displacements. In the case of solid slug tests, multiple tests were conducted with the same slug volume except when time constraints relating to long test-times in low K material prevented it.

1.3 Dissolved Gas Sampling

Select monitoring wells located in the vicinity of the proposed effluent shaft (SH16-01) and outfall shaft (SH16-05) along the Option 6 outfall alignment, as well as the potential future shaft location (SH16-07) were sampled for analysis of dissolved hydrogen sulfide, carbon dioxide, and methane gases. The following monitoring wells were sampled:

- SH16-01(10m)
- SH16-01(35m)
- \blacksquare SH16-05(10m)
- \blacksquare SH16-05(33m)
- \blacksquare SH16-07(10m)
- SH16-07(31m)

Dissolved gas samples were collected in-situ using Snap Samplers and were analyzed via laboratory single-stage flash analytical techniques.

A Snap Sampler (Britt et al, 2010) is a passive sampling system that consists of a series of individual samplers that each hold a Snap Sampler bottle. Each bottle has caps on either end that are connected together through the bottle with a Teflon-coated spring. The caps are set in an open position during deployment with a release-pin system, and are closed just prior to retrieval by pneumatically triggering the release-pin. Once the bottles are closed in-situ, the entire Snap Sampler system is retrieved and the bottles are prepared for laboratory submittal. Since sample bottles are closed downhole and delivered to a laboratory in said bottles, there is no exposure to the atmosphere due to sample-transfer to alternate bottles, which can result in volatilization of gases and changes to chemistry from exposure to oxygen.

Snap Samplers capable of sampling with up to three 40 mL bottles at a time were employed. Laboratory sample volume requirements dictated that 15 bottles be collected per location. To facilitate this, the Snap Samplers were deployed and retrieved five times at each location. A peristaltic pump system was set a distance above the top of the well screens and pumped at a low flowrate to ensure that water level drawdown was minimal (a requirement of the low-flow sampling method). Stabilization of hydraulic conditions was allowed to occur for approximately 10 minutes before the Snap Samplers were closed and retrieved. Samples were sent to AGAT Laboratories (AGAT) in Calgary, AB under chain of custody protocols.

2.0 RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

2.1 Water Level Monitoring

2.1.1 Pre-processing of water levels

Barometric pressure fluctuations were removed from the Solinst Levelogger pressure data using Solinst data management software together with barometric data collected from the Solinst Barologger. Pressure readings were then converted to hydraulic heads with the elevation datum set to m geodetic. To convert from m geodetic to CGVD28-GVRD, add 100 m.

2.1.2 Water Levels

Figure 1a-c and 2a-b present continuous hydraulic head data at the monitoring wells over the periods of April 27 to May 6, 2016 and December 23 to 29, 2016, respectively. Seventy-two hour moving average hydraulic heads were calculated for each well using an averaging method described in Serfes (1991) and are presented as dashed lines in Figures 1a-c and 2a-b.

2.1.3 Hydraulic Gradients

Instantaneous and seventy-two hour moving average hydraulic gradients were conservatively calculated from the continuous hydraulic head data, using available well-pairs. Figures 3 and 4 present hydraulic gradients between well pairs at various depths over the periods of April 27 to May 6, 2016 and December 23 to 29, 2016, respectively. Positive gradients (i.e., greater than zero) designate groundwater flow towards the Fraser River and negative gradients designate groundwater flow inland away from the river.

Over the period of April 27 to May 6, 2016 the largest hydraulic gradients were calculated between SH16-02(10m) and SH16-03(10m) and between SH16-01(35m) and SH16-04(36.6m). The maximum instantaneous hydraulic gradients at 10 m and 35 m depth was approximately 0.0027 m/m and 0.0018 m/m, respectively and the average hydraulic gradients at 10 m and 35 m depth was approximately 0.0010 m/m and 0.0004 m/m, respectively.

Over the period of December 23 to 29, 2016 the largest hydraulic gradients were between SH16-05(10m) and SH16-06(10m) and between SH16-05(33m) and SH16-06(33m). The maximum instantaneous hydraulic gradients at 10 m and 33 m depth was approximately 0.0033 m/m and 0.0037 m/m, respectively and the average hydraulic gradients at 10 m and 33 m depth was approximately 0.0004 m/m and 0.0005 m/m, respectively.

The calculated hydraulic gradients at well-pairs monitored along the preferred western alignment corridor and the Option 6 outfall alignment corridor indicate that net groundwater flow is directed towards the river, with some reversal of flow direction during a tidal cycle. The magnitude and direction of hydraulic gradients at the Site will vary with the timing and amplitude of the tide in the Fraser River, as well as with other environmental fluctuations. Therefore, the gradients presented above are representative of conditions that existed at the Site during the monitoring periods from April 27 to May 6, 2016 and December 23 to 29, 2016.

2.2 Results of Single-Well Response Testing

Hydrogeological responses observed during slug testing were analyzed using AQTESOLV, a commercially available software package for aquifer test analysis (Duffield, 2007). Test data were analyzed using the Bower and Rice (1976) semi-analytical method for fully or partially penetrating wells. Table 2 below summarizes the slug test results.

Monitoring Location	Depth (m)	Soil Classification (from borehole logs)	Hydraulic Conductivity (Geometric Mean) (m/s)
SH16-01	10	SILT to sandy SILT	$1x10^{-5}$
SH16-01	35	SAND	$2x10^{-5}$
SH16-01	55	SILTto SILTY CLAY	$2x10^{-7}$
SH16-02	10	SAND	$5x10^{-5}$
SH16-02	45	SAND	$2x10^{-7(A)}$
SH16-02	52	SILTY CLAY	7x10-8
SH16-03	10	SAND	$4x10^{-5}$
SH16-04	10	SAND	$1x10^{-5}$
SH16-04	36.6	Sandy GRAVEL	$2x10^{-4}$
SH16-05	10	SAND	$2x10^{-6}$
SH16-05	33	SILTY SAND to SAND	$8x10^{-6}$
SH16-05	55	SILTY CLAY	$---(B)$
SH16-06	10	SILTY SAND to SAND	$2x10^{-5}$
SH16-06	33	SAND to SILTY SAND	$3x10^{-5}$
SH16-07	10	SAND	$3x10^{-4}$
SH16-07	31	SAND	$5x10^{-5}$
SH16-07	48	SILTY CLAY to CLAYEY SILT	$---(B)$

Table 2: Hydraulic Conductivity Calculated from Slug Test Data

 \overline{A} . Likely not representative of the material logged in the borehole.

(B) Noise to signal ratio was too high to obtain a meaningful response from slug tests.

Attachment 1 provides the slug tests analysis outputs from AQTESOLV.

It should be noted that slug tests provide point-scale estimates of hydraulic conductivity and are generally representative of formation properties in the immediate vicinity of the well screens. It has been found that because of this, single-well response tests tend to underestimate the bulk hydraulic conductivity of a layer by a scaling factor of 2 to 5 times (Niemann and Rovey, 2009).

2.2.1 Interpretation of Gravel Layer Hydraulic Conductivity

The hydraulic conductivity of a gravel layer encountered in borehole SH16-04 and estimated from the single-well response test at SH16-04(36.6m), was lower than initially expected based on borehole log descriptions of predominantly gravel material, but falls within the range of typical values for unconsolidated sands and gravels (Domenico and Schwartz, 1990). Therefore, hydraulic conductivity was also estimated from grain-size analyses as an additional check.

Hydraulic conductivity was estimated using HydrogeoSieveXL, an excel-based tool for calculating hydraulic conductivity from grain-size distribution curves that includes 15 different analysis-methods (Devlin, 2015). Four grain-size analysis samples (#'s 22, 24, 26, and 28) from BH15-03 (Golder, 2015) were used in the analysis; BH15-03 was drilled in the vicinity of SH16-04. The grain-size samples were collected over a depth of 10 metres, between approximately 30 m and 40 m below ground surface. Based on the grain-size distributions of the samples, six analysis-methods were considered applicable to estimate hydraulic conductivity: Slichter (1898), Terzaghi (1925), Beyer (1964), Zamarin (1928), Barr (2001), and Alyamani and Sen (1993). Table 3 below summarizes the hydraulic conductivity estimates as well as the percent recovery of the soil core during drilling.

The geometric mean of hydraulic conductivity for the individual samples ranged from $7x10^{-3}$ m/s to $7x10^{-5}$ m/s, with a geometric mean for all four samples of $4x10^{-4}$ m/s. Attachment 2 provides the HydrogeoSieveXL output for the grain-size samples.

The estimate of hydraulic conductivity from grain-size analyses (geometric mean of $4x10^{-4}$ m/s) is similar to the slug test result at SH16-05(36.6m) ($2x10^{-4}$ m/s). The average percent recovery during drilling was about 50 percent and it is understood that the finer-grained fraction of the material was more likely to be lost than the coarsergrained gravels. As a result, it is likely that the grain-size analyses provide an overestimate of the hydraulic conductivity.

2.3 Dissolved Gas Sampling

Table 4 presents gas analysis results from groundwater samples collected via Snap Sampler and processed by AGAT, using single-stage flash analytical techniques, for hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), carbon dioxide (CO₂), and methane (CH4) gases. Lab certificates for the gas analyses are provided in Attachment 3.

The results provided by AGAT (in ppm for H₂S and mole fraction for CH₄ and CO₂) represent the proportion of those components measured in the gas mixture extracted during the single-stage flash. These results were converted into the amount of a single component (mg) released per litre of groundwater using the gas in solution (m 3 _{gas}/m 3 _{sample}) extracted by AGAT from single-stage flash. The H₂S values were converted to mg of H₂S gas per litre of groundwater and expressed in parts per million (ppm). The CH₄ and CO₂ results were converted from mole fraction to mg/Lwater using the following formula:

$$
C_i\left(\frac{mg}{L_{water}}\right) = C_i\left(\frac{mol}{mol}\right) \cdot i \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_{gas}}{MW_{gas}}\right) \cdot MW_i \cdot 1000
$$

where C_i is the concentration of the single gas, i is the gas-in-solution ratio, ρ_{gas} is the absolute density of the gas sample, MW_{gas} is the molecular weight of the gas sample and MW_i is the molecular weight of the single gas. CH₄ and CO2 results were then converted to percent.

Table 4: Dissolved Gas Results

(A) Gas in solution extracted by lab from single-stage flash. Cubic metres of gas per cubic metres of water at standard conditions (101.325 kPa, $15.0 °C)$

(B) Absolute sample density of the entire gas portion extracted from single-stage flash.

(c) Molecular weight of the total gas sample extracted from single-stage flash.

^(D) Mole fraction of gas component, air free as received.

 (E) ppm of H₂S gas in the gas sample extracted from single-stage flash.

 (F) Milligrams of gas component per L of water (mg/L_{water}) expressed as a percent.

(G) Milligrams of H₂S gas per L of water (mg/L_{water}) expressed in ppm.

(H) ND (Non Detect) = Concentrations were below the laboratory detection limit of 0.1 ppm H_2 S in the gas sample extracted from single-stage flash.

3.0 **CLOSURE**

We trust that this report provides you with the information you require at this time. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact us at your convenience.

GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

Nathan Fretz, MSc, GIT Hydrogeologist

CHORLEY #19648 **BRITISH** COLUMBIA **SCIEN**

Don Chorley, MSc, PGeo Principal, Senior Hydrogeologist

NF/DC/asd Attachments: Figures 1 to 4 Attachment 1 - Slug Test Reports Attachment 2 - Grain Size Analysis Report Attachment 3 - AGAT Laboratories Reports

o:\final\2015\3 proj\1525010 cdm_annacis island wwtp\1525010-033-tm-rev0\1525010-033-tm-rev0-appendix d 26sep_17.docx

4.0 REFERENCES

- Alyamani, M.S., Sen Z. 1993. Determination of hydraulic conductivity from complete grain-size distribution curves. Ground Water, v. 31, no. 4, 551-555.
- Barr, D.W. 2001. Coefficient of permeability determined by measurable parameters. Ground Water, v. 39, no. 3, 356-361.
- Beyer, W. 1964. "Zur Bestimmung der Wasserdurchlässigkeit von Kiesen und Sanden aus der Kornverteilungskurve." Wasserwirtschaft-Wassertechnik 14(6): 165-168.
- Bouwer, H. and R.C. Rice, 1976. A slug test method for determining hydraulic conductivity of unconfined aquifers with completely or partially penetrating wells, Water Resources Research, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 423-428.
- Devlin, J.F., 2015. HydrogeoSieveXL: and Excel-based tool to estimate hydraulic conductivity from grain-size analysis. Hydrogeology Journal 23: 837-844.
- Domenico, P.A. and F.W. Schwartz, 1990. Physical and Chemical Hydrogeology, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 824 p.
- Duffield, G.M.., 2007. AQTESOLV for Windows v4.5., User's Guide. HydroSolve Inc., Reston, VA.
- Niemann, W.L. and C.W. Rovey. 2009. A systematic field-based testing program of hydraulic conductivity and dispersivity over a range in scale. Hydrogeology Journal, v 17, p 307-320.
- Golder Associates Ltd., 2015. Geotechnical Interpretive Report AIWWTP Transient Mitigation and Outfall Predesign. Submitted to CDM Smith Canada ULC.
- Serfes, M.E., 1991. Determining the Mean Hydraulic Gradient of Ground Water Affected by Tidal Fluctuations. Ground Water, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 549-555.
- Slichter, C.S., 1898, Theoretical investigations of the motion of ground waters: United States Geological Survey, 19th Annual Report, p 295-384.
- Terzaghi, K., 1925, Principles of soil mechanics: Engineering News-Record, v. 95, p 832.
- Zamarin, J.A. 1928. Calculation of ground-water flow (in Russian). Trudey I.V.H. Taskeni.

ATTACHMENT 1

Slug Test Reports

ATTACHMENT 2

Grain Size Analysis Reports

K from Grain Size Analysis Report Date: 30-May-16

Sample Name: BH15-03 Sample #22

Mass Sample (g): 100 T (oC) 20

Poorly sorted gravel low in fines

Poorly sorted sandy gravel low in fines

K from Grain Size Analysis Report Date: 30-May-16

Sample Name: BH15-03 Sample #26

Mass Sample (g): 100 T (oC) 20

Poorly sorted gravel low in fines

K from Grain Size Analysis Report Date: 30-May-16

Sample Name: BH15-03 Sample #28

Mass Sample (g): 100 T (oC) 20

Poorly sorted sandy gravel low in fines

ATTACHMENT 3

AGAT Laboratories Reports

3700 21st Street NE Calgary, AB T2E 6V6 403.299.2000

Reservoir Characterization

Single Stage Flash

Golder Associates Ltd. Suite 200 - 2920 Virtual Way Vancouver, BC V5M 0C4

(A) Cubic meters of gas per cubic meter of water at standard conditions (101.325 kPaa, 15.0 °C) (B) The detailed description of Gas In Solution (GIS) can be found in AER Directive 17

2910 12TH STREET NE CALGARY, ALBERTA CANADA T2E 7P7 TEL (403)299-2000 FAX (403)299-2010 http://www.agatlabs.com

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD. 102, 2535 - 3 AVENUE SE CALGARY, AB T2A7W5 (403) 299-5600

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENE REVIEWED BY: Rong Jin, Condensate Technician

DATE REPORTED: Jan 10, 2017

PAGES (INCLUDING COVER): 8

VERSION*: 1

Should you require any information regarding this analysis please contact your client services representative at (403) 299-2000

All samples will be disposed of within 30 days following analysis. Please contact the lab if you require additional sample storage time.

Laboratories (V1) *Page 1 of 8*

Member of: Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) Western Enviro-Agricultural Laboratory Association (WEALA) Environmental Services Association of Alberta (ESAA)

AGAT Laboratories is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc. (CALA) and/or Standards Council of Canada (SCC) for specific tests listed on the scope of accreditation. AGAT Laboratories (Mississauga) is also accredited by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc. (CALA) for specific drinking water tests. Accreditations are location and parameter specific. A complete listing of parameters for each location is available from www.cala.ca and/or www.scc.ca. The tests in this report may not necessarily be included in the scope of accreditation.

Results relate only to the items tested and to all the items tested

All reportable information as specified by ISO 17025:2005 is available from AGAT Laboratories upon request

Certificate of Analysis

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) *Page 2 of 8*

AGAT Laboratories is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc. (CALA) and/or Standards Council of Canada (SCC) for specific tests
listed on the scope of accreditation. AGAT L tests. Accreditations are location and parameter specific. A complete listing of parameters for each location is available from www.cala.ca and/or www.scc.ca. The tests in this report may not necessarily be included in the scope of accreditation.

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

Identification based on retention time relative to standard.

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) *Page 3 of 8*

AGAT Laboratories is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc. (CALA) and/or Standards Council of Canada (SCC) for specific tests listed on the scope of accreditation. AGAT Laboratories (Mississauga) is also accredited by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation Inc. (CALA) for specific drinking water tests. Accreditations are location and parameter specific. A complete listing of parameters for each location is available from www.cala.ca and/or www.scc.ca. The tests in this report may not necessarily be included in the scope of accreditation.

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) *Page 4 of 8*

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) Page 5 of 8 Page 5 of 8

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) *Page 6 of 8*

CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.

PROJECT:

AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581

ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY:

Hydrogen sulphide quantified using its standard response factor.

Certified By:

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS (V1) Page 7 of 8

2910 12TH STREET NE CALGARY, ALBERTA CANADA T2E 7P7 TEL (403)299-2000 FAX (403)299-2010 http://www.agatlabs.com

Method Summary

Occupational Hygiene Analysis |
HC-0160, HC-801 GPA 2286-95, ASTM D5504-12 GC/SCD/TCD GC/SCD/TCD **SAMPLING SITE: SAMPLED BY: AGAT WORK ORDER: 17C175581 ATTENTION TO: Matt Zeppetelli / JOrdan Wilson CLIENT NAME: GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD. PROJECT: PARAMETER AGAT S.O.P LITERATURE REFERENCE ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUE**

GAS ANALYSIS

GAS ANALYSIS

GAS ANALYSIS

GAS ANALYSIS

