NEW GOLD RAINY RIVER MINE APPENDIX G VEGETATION PLOT WORK SUMMARY MEMO





112 - 112 Research Drive Saskatoon, SK S7N 3R3 Canada

T: (306) 955 0702 **F:** (306) 955 1596

www.okc-sk.com

Memorandum

Re:	Rainy River Mine - 2021 Vegetation Trial Monitoring Summary Rev0
Date:	December 6, 2021
Our ref:	1003-024-006
Cc:	Lindsay Tallon – Okane Consultants
From:	Haley Cunningham, Junior Engineer
То:	Garnet Cornell – Environment Supervisor, New Gold Inc.

New Gold Inc. (New Gold) has established a vegetation trial at the Rainy River Mine (RRM) to investigate the performance of locally common species with operationally feasible cover system configurations. It is anticipated that learnings from the trial will serve to inform the closure plan, and that this work will contribute to New Gold's commitment to demonstrate to government regulators and community stakeholders that vegetation can be re-established during progressive reclamation and closure. Construction at the trial was finished in September 2019, and many of the experimental tree plots were planted in late October 2019. Hydroseeding of the slopes was completed in the fall of 2020. The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize monitoring activities completed by Okane Consultants (Okane) in 2021 and to document baseline conditions observed.

Background

The vegetation trial is designed as a randomized block study and is sited on the plateau of a dedicated trial area. Combinations of four soil treatments and nine vegetation treatments are arranged in three replicates. A destructive plot area is designated for destructive root sampling and investigation as the trial progresses. Slopes surrounding the block study have



been seeded with various methods and are used to qualitatively evaluate operational seeding techniques, vegetation establishment and erosion. Planned arrangement of the trial area is presented for reference in Figure 1 to 3.



Figure 1: Arrangement of soil treatments in experimental tree plots



Figure 2: Arrangement of vegetation treatments in experimental tree plots





Figure 3: Arrangement of slope treatments

The general cover system configuration planned for use on the Rainy River site stockpiles consists of a 0.5 m barrier layer overlain by a 1.0 m growth medium layer, designed to limit net percolation (NP) and control oxygen (O₂) ingress to the mine rock. The enhanced cover system uses both moisture store-and-release and enhanced runoff principles to achieve reduced NP. The barrier layer within the cover system controls O₂ ingress by effectively eliminating advective gas transport.

The vegetation trial was constructed in 2019 using the same cover system design, with clay overburden used for both the barrier and growth medium layers. Four soil treatments were chosen to represent potential options for operational revegetation:

- 1) Thin topsoil a 0.15 m layer of topsoil was applied to the surface;
- 2) Tilled topsoil a 0.15 m layer of topsoil was applied to the surface and then mixed into the overburden using a skid steer tiller;
- 3) Fertilized overburden a commercial mix of fertilizer, mainly comprised of bonemeal, was applied to the overburden surface using a skid steer tiller; and
- 4) Control no amendment or modification to the overburden surface.

The species chosen for inclusion in the trial represent locally common or significant species:

- 1) Aspen;
- 2) Black spruce;



- 3) Black ash;
- 4) Eastern white cedar;
- 5) White spruce;
- 6) Jack pine;
- 7) Ground Cover Mix may include species typical for the ecosystem, such as bearberry, blueberry, ground cedar, or Labrador tea;
- 8) Shrub Mix includes available species typical of the ecosystem, such as high bush cranberry, Saskatoon berry, beaked hazelnut, alder or red osier dogwood;
- 9) Community Mix culturally significant species selected by local communities, not necessarily found in local area.

Experimental tree plot planting on the plateau commenced in late October 2019 but was not completed that year. Planting was completed in November 2020. Of note, Tobacco and Juniper species were not planted and are planned to be excluded from the trial. Commercial availability of tobacco and juniper species is limited, and it would not be feasible to include them in large-scale reclamation operations.

The slope areas surrounding the trial were hydroseeded in late September 2019 and included a test of commercially available ProGanics Biotic Soil Media from Profile Products. Other sections of the landform slopes were broadcast seeded, track packed, or left unseeded as a control. In September 2020, all slopes were treated with ProGanics Biotic Soil Media to prevent further erosion.

Construction of the overburden destructive plot was completed in autumn 2019. Some species were planted on the plot in late October 2019, and planting was completed in November 2020.

Monitoring Activities

Okane personnel visited the vegetation trial in summer 2021 to complete an erosion survey, inventory vegetation that had been planted in November 2020, record growth indicator measurements for early plant growth trajectories, and complete a root investigation at the destructive plots. Haley Cunningham and Lyndsey Thorson visited the site and recorded observations from August 17 to 18, 2021.

Slope Erosion Survey

In general, significant erosion was observed on the sloped areas of the trial. Measured erosional features are included in Table 1.



Slope Orientation	Hydroseed	Broadcast	Traffic	Control
North	S, R Uniform shallow erosion over slope G Lower slope Depth = ~35 cm Width = 40-50 cm	S, R Erosion is minimal over slope G Mid slope – full slope length Depth = 30 cm Width = 40-60 cm	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 10 cm)	S, R, G Erosion is uniform over slope (Depth < 30 cm)
East	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 3 cm)	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 5 cm)	n/a	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 5 cm)
South	S, R Lower slope – partial slope length Depth = 20 cm Width = 30-40 cm G Entire slope length (East side) Depth = 37 cm Width = 50-60 cm Entire slope length (West side) Depth = 30 cm Width = 55-65 cm	S, R Uniform shallow erosion over slope G Entire slope length Depth = 40 cm Max width =~1.2 m	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 5 cm)	S, R Erosion is minimal, uniform over slope, and shallow rill erosion (Depth < 5 cm)
West	S, R Shallow and narrow rill erosion at crest and toe of slope (Depth < 10 cm)	S, R Shallow rill erosion over slope (Depth < 5 cm) G Lower slope Depth = 32 cm Max width = 76 cm	n/a	S, R Shallow rill erosion over slope (Depth < 5 cm) G Lower slope Depth = 33 cm Max width = 66 cm

Table 1: Major erosion features on slope treatments (S-sheet, R-rill, G-gully)





Figure 4: South Slope Rill (left) and Gully (right) erosion



Figure 5: North Slope Rill (left) and Gully (right) erosion



Figure 6: West Slope Rill (left) and Gully (right)

Integrated Mine Waste Management and Closure Services Specialists in Geochemistry and Unsaturated Zone Hydrology 6



Annual Growth Measurements

The purpose of the late summer / early fall site visit was to collect annual growth measurements that can be used to quantify vegetation growth in the experimental tree plots at regular annual intervals. General observations were also noted along the slopes and at the Destructive Plot. Haley Cunningham and Lyndsey Thorson collected measurements from August 17 to 18, 2021.

Slopes

Vegetation ground coverage generally increased, ranging from 25% to 75% over the slopes (Table 2). Of note, all slopes were treated with ProGanics Biotic Soil Media in September 2020 to minimize further erosion. Ground coverage increased from 2020 in which most slope treatment areas had on average 25% coverage to almost 50% coverage in 2021.

Slope Orientation	Hydroseed	Broadcast	Traffic	Control
North	50-75%Various weeds25-50%Northand grasses, uniformMore sparse vegetation, coverage		50% Various weeds and grasses, more dense and uniform coverage	50-75% Wheat grass and additional weed types, uniform coverage
	75%	75%		75%
East	Various weeds and grasses, more dense and n uniform coverage	Various weeds and grasses, more dense and uniform coverage	n/a	Various weeds and grasses, more dense and uniform coverage
		50%	50-75%	50-75%
South	25-50% Mostly wheat grass, uniform coverage	Mostly wheat grass, additional weed types, uniform coverage	Mostly wheat grass, additional weed types, uniform coverage	Mostly wheat grass, more dense and uniform coverage
	25-50%	25-50%		25-50%
West	Various weeds and grasses, coverage better at base of slope	Various weeds and grasses, coverage better at base of slope	n/a	Various weeds and grasses, coverage better at base of slope

Table 2: Major erosior	n features on slop	e treatments (S-sheet, R-ril	I, G-gully)
------------------------	--------------------	----------------	----------------	-------------

Integrated Mine Waste Management and Closure Services Specialists in Geochemistry and Unsaturated Zone Hydrology 7





Figure 7: South Slope Hydroseed – August 26, 2020 (left) and August 18, 2021 (right)



Figure 8: East Slope - August 26, 2020 (left) and August 18, 2021 (right)



Figure 9: North Slope Control - August 26, 2020 (left) and August 18, 2021 (right)





Figure 10: West Slope Broadcast - August 26, 2020 (left) and August 18, 2021 (right)

Plateau

Jack pine plots were not planted at the time of the field visit. It appears that in the Block 3 tilled topsoil treatment, black spruce was planted in the sub-plot designated for white spruce. The Community Mix plots were not planted, except for some grass species in select plots. Of note, the Ground Cover Mix plots appear to have been planted with a tree species, and two shrub species, not typical of ground cover. A quality control check is recommended for the 2022 site visit to verify locations and compositions of vegetation plots.

Overall the general health of the planted vegetation appeared to be struggling compared to last year. Some general observations for the various species include:

- Black Spruce generally appeared to be doing better for the fertilized overburden and control soil treatments;
- White Spruce appeared to be struggling for all four soil treatments; and
- Eastern White Cedar overall appeared to be doing better for the fertilized overburden and control soil treatments.

A general health check was performed during the survey. Vegetation was rated on a qualitative 5-point scale to gauge if the tree/ shrub had established well:

- Healthy (H) the specimen generally appeared to be in good health;
- Healthy / Struggling (H/S) the specimen was not in prime condition, showing some sign(s) of poor health;
- Struggling (S) the specimen was in poor condition, with the majority of the plant showing signs of wilting, lost leaves, or discolouration;



- Struggling / Dead (S/D) the specimen was in very poor health or unclear if the plant had died; and
- Dead (D) the specimen was clearly dead or had been completely uprooted.

Table 3 provides a summary of gauged health observed during the experimental tree plot survey. Generally, some vegetation loss and health decline were observed between Autumn 2020 and Autumn 2021.

C	Soil	Blo	ck 1	Bloc	ck 2	Block 3		
species	Treatment	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	
	Thin Topsoil	9H, 1D	, 6H, 3S, 6H, 1H/ 1D 3S/D		6H, 4D	10H, 1D	5H/S, 3S, 2D	
Aspen	Tilled Topsoil	10H	5H, 1S, 4D	9H, 1S/D	10H	9H, 1S	10H	
	Fertilized Overburden	9H, 1D	9H, 1D	10H	10H	10H, 1D	10H	
	Control	9H, 1D	9H, 1D	10H	10H	10H	10H	
	Thin Topsoil	10H	2H, 3S, 5D	10H	3H, 3S, 4D	10H*	10D	
Black	Tilled Topsoil	9H, 1D	4H/S, 1S, 5D	3H, 6S, 1D	10D	10H	1S, 9D	
Spruce	Fertilized Overburden	10H	10H	10H	10H	9H, 1H/S	10D	
	Control	Control 10H 10H 10H		10H	10H	10H	6H, 2S, 2D	
	Thin Topsoil	10H	10S	9H, 1H/S	10H	9H, 1D	9S, 1D	
	Tilled Topsoil	10H	9S	9H, 1D	9H/S, 1D	10H	4H, 6S	
Black Ash	Fertilized Overburden	10H	он 10н 10		10H	10H	10H	
	Control	10H	10H	10H	10H	9H, 1H/S	9H, 1S	
	Thin Topsoil	105	10S/D	10H	10S	11H/S	11S/D	
Eastern	Tilled Topsoil	105	10S/D	10H	10S/D	10S/D	10S	
White Cedar	Fertilized Overburden	10H	10H/S	10H	10H	11H/S	10S, 1D	
	Control	10H/S	10S	10H	10H	11H/S	115	
	Thin Topsoil	-	10D	-	10D	-	1H, 2S, 7D	
White Spruce	Tilled Topsoil	-	10D	-	10D	-	10D	
00.000	Fertilized Overburden	-	3S, 7D	-	105	-	1S, 9D	

Table 3: General health of planted trees and shrubs (H-healthy, S-struggling, D-dead)



C	Soil	Blo	ck 1	Bloc	:k 2	Block 3		
species	Treatment	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	
	Control	-	1S, 9S/D	-	3H, 3S, 4D	-	3S, 7D	
	Thin Topsoil	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Tilled Topsoil	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Jack Pine	Fertilized Overburden	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Thin Topsoil	6H	4S, 2D	6H	6S	6H	5S	
Ground Cover Mix	Tilled Topsoil	4S, 1S/D, 1D	1S, 3S/D, 2D	5H, 1D	65	6H/S	3S, 3D	
	Fertilized Overburden	6H	65	4H, 1H/S	6H/S	6H	65	
	Control	4H, 2S	6S	5H, 1H/S	6S	6H	6S	
	Thin Topsoil	4H	2S/D, 2D	4H	1S, 3D	4H	2S, 2D	
	Tilled Topsoil	4H	4S	4H	4S	Н	3S, 1D	
Shrub Mix	Fertilized Overburden	4H	4H	4H	4H	4H	1H, 2S, 1D	
	Control	4H	4H	4H	4H	4H	1H, 3S	
	Thin Topsoil	-	-	-	-	ЗH	3H	
Community	Tilled Topsoil	-	-		3H		3H	
Community Mix	Fertilized Overburden	2H	2H	-	-		ЗН	
	Control	ЗH	ЗH		-	ЗH	ЗH	

* Planted in white spruce design plot;





Figure 11: Block 2 – Fertilized Overburden - Black Spruce (left) and White Spruce (right)



Figure 12: Block 2 - Fertilized Overburden – Cedar (left) and Tilled Topsoil – Cedar (right)

During the 2021 survey, three trees were randomly selected in each plot to measure the growth indicators. Several growth indicator measurements were recorded during the autumn survey for annual growth comparisons:

- Root Collar the diameter of the tree base at the widest part of the root collar (where the root joins the stem), or just above the ground surface, whichever is higher;
- Total Height the distance between the root collar and the base of the terminal bud (of the tallest stem). For leaning trees, this distance was measured along the slope of the stem;
- Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) the diameter of the tree at 1.3 m above the base; and
- Crown Diameter the average horizontal width of the crown.

A summary of growth indicator measurements by plot are provided in Appendix A. Average indicator measurements by species are included in Table 4.



Tree Species	Root Collar (mm)	Crown Diameter (cm)	Hei (c	ight m)	Di (m	BH Im)		
	20	020	2020	2021	2020	2021		
Aspen	21.5 +/- 2.0	24.6 +/- 10.2	258.6 +/- 26	254.9 +/- 33.2	14 +/- 1.6	15.2 +/- 1.1		
Black spruce	22.5 +/- 3.1	26.7 +/- 7.5	99.5 +/- 17.8	107.8 +/- 16.8	n/a			
Black ash	21.6 +/- 2.4	29.9 +/- 9	219.6 +/- 30.4	213.4 +/- 31.3	10.8 +/- 2.2	11.3 +/- 2.4		
Eastern white cedar	22 +/- 4.7	16.3 +/- 6.1	99.4 +/- 10.8	96.5 +/- 16.5	n/a			
White spruce	Not planted		Not planted	68.1 +/- 16.7	Not planted	n/a		
Jack pine	Not planted							

Measurements expressed as mean +/- SD

Ground cover was estimated at each plot during both the spring and autumn surveys. During the 2021 autumn survey, ground cover increased in all plots, and most notably in plots including topsoil (Table 5). Figures 13 to 16 compare plots from each soil treatment group as observed during the spring and autumn 2020 surveys.

Table 5: Average ground coverage (%) observed in Autumn 2020 and 2021

Soil	Block 1		Blo	Block 2		ck 3	Average		
Treatment	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021	
Thin Topsoil	67	75	75	75	75	75	72	75	
Tilled Topsoil	75	75	75	75	64	75	71	75	
Fertilized Overburden	17	19	17	19	25	19	19	19	
Control	19	19	17	19	22	19	19	19	





Figure 13: Block 2 – Thin Topsoil – Eastern white cedar plot as observed on August 28, 2020, (left), and August 17, 2021 (right)



Figure 14: Block 1 – Tilled Topsoil – Black Spruce plot as observed on August 28, 2020, (left) and August 17, 2021 (right)





Figure 15: Block 2 – Fertilized Overburden – Black ash plot as observed on August 28, 2020, (left) and August 17, 2021 (right)



Figure 16: Block 3 – Control – Aspen plot as observed on August 28, 2020, (left) and August 17, 2021 (right)

Destructive Plot

Minimal erosion was observed in the destructive plot, except for some down-slope erosion on the north edge of the plot. Vegetation was generally noted to have established well. Estimated percent ground cover during the annual survey in autumn was approximately 75% for 2020 and 2021. Only general observations of poor health were noted during the autumn visit; Table 6 includes a summary of general health, extrapolating the number of healthy trees from the totals recorded.



Table 6: General health of trees and shrubs planted in the Destructive Plot (H-healthy, Sstruggling, D-dead)

Curra la c	Destructive Plot					
Species	2020	2021				
Aspen	8 H, 4 S	7 H, 2 S, 3 D				
Black spruce	14 H	5 H, 3 H/S, 6 D				
Black ash	21 H, 1 S	1 H/S, 13 S, 1 S/D, 6 D				
Eastern white cedar	11 S	8 \$/D				
White spruce	-	6 D				
Jack pine	10 H, 1 S	1 S/D, 10 D				
Shrub (1)	8 H	8 S/D				
Shrub (2)	20 H					

Only struggling or dead trees were noted in the autumn survey **(bolded)**, all other specimens were labelled as healthy.

Shrub (1) assumed to be raspberry bushes; Shrub (2) unknown and not recorded in 2021.



Figure 17: Destructive plot ground coverage

In addition, a root investigation was complete to investigate root depth and spread (Table 7). Rooting depth did not extend into the underlying till and remained within the overlying topsoil. Root spread appeared to be minimal, it was observed that the root spread did not appear to exceed that in which it was likely originally planted.



Species	Root Depth	Root Spread
Aspen	23 cm	7 - 10 cm
Black spruce	23 cm	12 - 15 cm
Black ash	23 cm	7 - 10 cm (Max horizontal spread = 38 cm)
Eastern white cedar	23 cm	7 - 10 cm
White spruce	23 cm	5 - 7 cm (Minimal root spread)

Table 7: Destructive Plot Root Investigation

Closure

We trust information provided in this memorandum is satisfactory for your requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (306) 850-6140 or hcunningham@okc-sk.com should you have any questions or comments.

Appendix A

Plot Growth Indicator Measurements & General Health

				Total H	neight	DB	н		Health Cheek		alth Check Jotal Count		Total Count Ground Cover		
Block	Soil Treatment	Vegetation	Date	Mean	+/- SD	Mean	+/- SD	-	не	Hedini Check			Iotal Count	Ground Cover	Comment
Diook		Treatment		(mm)	(cm)	(mm)	(cm)	н	H/S	S	S/D	D	(# trees or shrubs)	(%)	Common
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Aspen	8/17/2021	264.9	8.2	15.0	0.8	6	-	3	-	1	10	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Black spruce	8/17/2021	108.0	8.5	n/c	c	2		3		5	10	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Black ash	8/17/2021	246.1	17.0	11.6	1.2			10			10	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	98.3	2.4	n/o	c				10		10	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	White spruce**	8/17/2021									10	10	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Jack pine	8/17/2021				No	t planted							
Dia alc 1	Their Tennell	Crowed Cover Mix	0/17/0001	254.6	15.0	13.5	0.5			2			2	7 607	Trees
BIOCK I	inin iopsoli	Ground Cover Mix	8/1//2021	100.0		n/a				2		2	4	- / 3% -	Shrubs
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	111.2	10.3	n/c	a				2	2	4	75%	
Block 1	Thin Topsoil	Community Mix	8/17/2021	-	-	-	-							75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Aspen	8/17/2021	276.0	19.3	15.3	0.9	5		1		4	10	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Black spruce	8/17/2021	96.5	19.3	n/o	a		4	1		5	10	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Black ash	8/17/2021	224.9	8.2	12.0	0.8			9			10	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	112.9	10.3	n/o	a				10		10	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	White spruce**	8/17/2021									10	10	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Jack pine	8/17/2021				No	t planted						75%	
Plack 1	Tilled Tensoil	Cround Cover Mix	8/17/2021									2	2	7507	Trees
DIOCK I		Ground Cover Mix	8/1//2021	33.5	10.0	n/o	a			1	3		4	73%	Shrubs
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	82.8	33.2	n/o	a			4			4	75%	
Block 1	Tilled Topsoil	Community Mix	8/17/2021	-	-	-	-							75%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Aspen	8/17/2021	264.8	31.7	15.9	1.4	9				1	10	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Black spruce	8/17/2021	99.2	12.2	n/o	a	10					10	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Black ash	8/17/2021	222.6	43.7	13.1	2.5	10					10	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	97.9	9.4	n/o	a		10				10	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	White spruce	8/17/2021	68.0	6.2	n/c	a			3		7	10	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Jack pine	8/17/2021				No	t planted						25%	
Block 1	Eartilizad Overburden	Ground Cover Mix	8/17/2021	240.0	n/a	18.0	n/a			2			2	- 2597 -	Trees
DIOCK I		Groond Cover Mix	0/1//2021	62.0	37.5	n/c	a			4			4	- 25% -	Shrubs
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	94.1	30.1	n/o	a	4					4	25%	
Block 1	Fertilized Overburden	Community Mix	8/17/2021					2					2	0%	
Block 1	Control	Aspen	8/17/2021	229.6	30.1	15.3	1.2	9				1	10	25%	
Block 1	Control	Black spruce	8/17/2021	109.5	10.8	n/c	a	10					10		

Table 8: Plot growth indicator measurements and general health



	Soil Treatment	Vegetation Treatment		Total I	neight	DI	вн							Cround Cover	
Block			Date	Mean	+/- SD	Mean	+/- SD	-	Health Check				Total Count	Ground Cover	Comment
DIOCK			Dule	(mm)	(cm)	(mm)	(cm)	Н	H/S	S	\$/D	D	(# trees or shrubs)	(%)	Comment
Block 1	Control	Black ash	8/17/2021	208.2	8.5	12.0	0.8	10					10	25%	
Block 1	Control	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	98.1	6.2	n,	/a			10			10	25%	
Block 1	Control	White spruce	8/17/2021	65		n/a				1		9	10	25%	
Block 1	Control	Jack pine	8/17/2021					n/a						0%	
Block 1	Control	Ground Cover Mix	8/17/2021	280.0	n/a	19.0	n/a			2			2	- 25%	Trees
DIOCK I	Corniol	Groond Cover Mix	0/1//2021	67.8	37.5	n,	/a			4			4	- 25%	Shrubs
Block 1	Control	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	113.2	6.2	n,	/a	4					4	25%	
Block 1	Control	Community Mix	8/17/2021					3					3	0%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Aspen	8/17/2021	243.7	24.8	14.6	0.9	6				4	10	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Black spruce	8/17/2021	128.8	17.8	6.0	n/a	3		3		4	10	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Black ash	8/17/2021	174.1	17.8	9.3	1.2	10					10	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	92.3	13.1	n,	/a			10			10	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	White spruce**	8/17/2021									10	10	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Jack pine	8/17/2021					n/a						75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Ground Cover Mix	8/17/2021	240.0	n/a	15.0	n/a			2			2	- 75%	Trees
			0/1//2021	60.6	35.0	n,	/a			4			4		Shrubs
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	70.0		n/a				1		3	4	75%	
Block 2	Thin Topsoil	Community Mix	8/17/2021	-	-	-	-							75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Aspen	8/17/2021	259.5	52.1	15.0	0.8	10					10	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Black spruce**	8/17/2021					3		6		1	10	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Black ash	8/17/2021	186.4	45.2	11.2	1.7		9			1	10	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/17/2021	102.8	10.3	n,	/a				10		10	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	White spruce	8/17/2021									10	10	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Jack pine	8/17/2021				No	t planted						75%	
	Tilled Topsoil	Ground Cover Mix								2			2		Trees
Block 2			8/17/2021	49.3	30.9	n,	/a			4			4	- 75% -	Shrubs
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/17/2021	62.8	29.5	n,	/a			4			4	75%	
Block 2	Tilled Topsoil	Community Mix	8/17/2021					3					3	75%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Aspen	8/18/2021	254.6	14.7	15.0	0	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Black spruce	8/18/2021	119.5	10.8	n,	/a	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Black ash	8/18/2021	222.2	22.5	13.2	3.8	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	96.6	2.4	n,	/a	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	White spruce	8/18/2021	61.6	2.4	n,	/a			10			10	25%	



	Soil Treatment	Vegetation Treatment		Total height		DBH									
Black			Data	Mean	+/- SD	Mean	+/- SC)	Не	alth Che	eck		Total Count	Ground Cover	Comment
BIOCK			Dule	(mm)	(cm)	(mm)	(cm)	н	H/S	S	S/D	D	(# trees or shrubs)	(%)	
Block 2	- Fertilized Overburden	Jack pine	8/18/2021	-		-	-	Not planted	-		-	-		0%	-
Plack 0	Fortilized Overburden	Cround Cover Mix	8/18/2021	225.0	n/a	12.0	n/a		2				2	- 25%	Trees
DIUCK Z	remized Overburden	Ground Cover Mix	0/10/2021	40.6	47.5	I	n/a		4				4		Shrubs
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	132.7	13.1	I	n/a	4					4	25%	
Block 2	Fertilized Overburden	Community Mix	8/18/2021	-	-	-	-							0%	
Block 2	Control	Aspen	8/18/2021	265.2	27.2	15.3	1.2	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Control	Black spruce	8/18/2021	96.5	4.7	I	n/a	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Control	Black ash	8/18/2021	227.4	20.1	12.0	0.8	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Control	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	96.3	8.5	I	n/a	10					10	25%	
Block 2	Control	White spruce	8/18/2021	60.0	12.1	I	n/a	3		3		4	10	25%	
Block 2	Control	Jack pine	8/18/2021					Not planted						0%	
Pla als O	0	Ground Cover Mix	0 (10 (2001	235.0	n/a	17.0	n/a				2		2	0 EØZ	Tree
BIOCK 2	Coniroi		8/18/2021	60.0	17.5		n/a				4		4	- 23%	Shrubs
Block 2	Control	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	116.3	8.5		n/a		4				4	25%	
Block 2	Control	Community Mix	8/18/2021	-	-	-	-							0%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Aspen	8/18/2021	278.8	25.5	16.0	0.8		5	3		2	11	75%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Black spruce**	8/18/2021									10	10	75%	Planted in white spruce design plot
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Black ash	8/18/2021	243.2	8.5	12.0	0.8			9		1	10	75%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	89.4	10.8	l	n/a				11		11	75%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	White spruce	8/18/2021	91.4	18.4	ļ	n/a	1		2		7	10	75%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Jack pine	8/18/2021					Not planted						75%	
Dia als O		Crowned Cover Min	0 (10 (0001	225.0	n/a	14.0	n/a			2			2	7 607	Tree
BIOCK 3	inin iopsoli	Ground Cover Mix	8/18/2021	71.4	12.5	l	n/a			4			4	- /5%	Shrubs
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	87.5	2.5	I	n/a			2			2	75%	
Block 3	Thin Topsoil	Community Mix	8/18/2021					3					3	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Aspen	8/18/2021	279.6	14.7	15.7	0.5	10					10	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Black spruce	8/18/2021	110.0		n/a				1		9	10	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Black ash	8/18/2021	203.7	22.7	11.8	2.2	4		6			10	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	117.9	9.4		n/a			10			10	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	White spruce**	8/18/2021									10	10	75%	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Jack pine	8/18/2021					Not planted						75%	
	Tilled Topsoil	Ground Cover Mix		220.0	n/a	15.0	n/a			1		1	2	7 6 10	Trees
BIOCK 3			8/18/2021	29.6	5.0		n/a			2		2	4	- / 5%	Shrubs
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	47.6	42.4		n/a			3		1	4	75%	



Block	Soil Treatment	Vegetation Treatment		Total	height	DBH					l-		Tabal Cause	Created Course	
			Date	Mean	+/- SD	Mean	+/- SD	-	не	alfn Ch	еск		iotal Count	Ground Cover	Comment
			2010	(mm)	(cm)	(mm)	(cm)	Н	H/S	S	S/D	D	(# trees or shrubs)	(%)	
Block 3	Tilled Topsoil	Community Mix	8/18/2021	-	-	-	-	3					3	75%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Aspen	8/18/2021	231.1	15.5	14.7	0.5	10					11	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Black spruce	8/18/2021					9	1				10	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Black ash	8/18/2021	214.7	10.8	9.0	0.8	10					10	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	86.5	4.7	n/e	a			1		9	11	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	White spruce	8/18/2021	90.0		n/a				1		9	10	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Jack pine	8/18/2021				No	t planted						0%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Ground Cover Mix	9/19/2021	235.0	n/a	12.0	n/a			2			2	- 25%	Trees
			0/10/2021	63.2	30.0	n/e	a			4			4		Shrubs
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	89.6	24.9	n/e	a	1		2		1	4	25%	
Block 3	Fertilized Overburden	Community Mix	8/18/2021					3					3	0%	
Block 3	Control	Aspen	8/18/2021	220.5	34.2	14.9	1.4	10					10	25%	
Block 3	Control	Black spruce	8/18/2021	107.1	16.5	n/e	a	10					10	25%	
Block 3	Control	Black ash	8/18/2021	199.7	27.2	9.2	3.1	9		1			10	25%	
Block 3	Control	Eastern white cedar	8/18/2021	75.9	37.9	n/	a			11			11	25%	
Block 3	Control	White spruce	8/18/2021	58.9	10.8	n/e	a			3		7	10	25%	
Block 3	Control	Jack pine	8/18/2021				No	t planted						0%	
Dia ak 2	Control	Ground Cover Mix	0/10/0001	235.0	n/a	12.0	n/a			2			2	0.507	Trees
BIOCK 3			0/10/2021	44.2	17.5	n/	a			4			4	Z3%	Shrubs
Block 3	Control	Shrub Mix	8/18/2021	81.7	16.5	n/	a	1		3			4	25%	
Block 3	Control	Community Mix	8/18/2021					3					3	0%	

*Only one tree tall enough for DBH, no SD given

** Dead species were not measured

