Enhance Energy Inc., Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc., and North West Redwater Partnership

DIVISION B: DETAILED REPORT Calendar Year 2022

KNOWLEDGE SHARING REPORT

Submitted on: March 31, 2023

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Table of Contents

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

List of Figures

P a g e | 5 © 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

List of Tables

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Page $|6$

List of Appendices

NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership. © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved.

This document contains the information of, and is the sole property of, North West Redwater Partnership ("NWR"), Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. ("WCS"), an affiliate of Wolf Midstream, Enhance Energy Inc. ("Enhance") and their respective licensors and shall not be used, reproduced, copied, disclosed, published, distributed, sold, leased, lent, altered, transmitted in any form or by any means, or otherwise exploited for any purpose other than the limited purpose(s) for which it is furnished to the Province of Alberta and in accordance with NWR's, WCS's and Enhance's respective written agreements with the Province of Alberta, except with the written permission of NWR and/or WCS and/or Enhance, as the case may be. For greater certainty, the diagrams, flowcharts, and technical descriptions included herein are for information purposes only and may not be used for any other purpose.

While reasonable efforts were undertaken so that the information contained in this document was accurate at the time of printing, none of NWR, WCS or Enhance assume any liability for errors or omissions. Changes and corrections to the information in this document may be incorporated in future versions hereof. Except as may be otherwise expressly agreed to in writing by NWR and/or WCS and/or Enhance, as the case may be, the information contained in this document is provided without any express, statutory, or implied representations, warranties or conditions, all of which are hereby disclaimed, and none of the authors, NWR, WCS, Enhance or their respective licensors will be liable for any damages or liability arising from or caused by any use or reliance upon this documentation. None of NWR, WCS or Enhance is responsible for any modifications, additions, or deletions to the original version of this documentation provided by NWR, WCS and Enhance to the Province of Alberta, unless such modifications, additions, or deletions were performed by NWR and/or WCS and/or Enhance as the case may be.

In order to ensure consistency across platforms, operational information contained in this report uses the Project definition as outlined in the "Enhance Energy CO2-EOR Project at Clive Field, Project ID: 8613-7752" as reported in the Alberta Emission Offset Registry ('the Registry') at AEOR Listing Detail (csaregistries.ca). $CO₂$ injected numbers in this report differ from the Registry reports. The Draft EOR protocol requires a 0.5% discount be subtracted from injected volumes to allow for "unintentional reversals" and Enhance has applied this discount in documents filed with the Registry. Injected volumes in this report do not include the discount. Associated injection amounts, energy use and emissions data are based on third-party verified Offset Project Reports filed with the Registry.

Remaining collective funding (RCF), as defined in the CCS FUNDING AGREEMENT – THE ALBERTA CARBON TRUNK LINE PROJECT made the 30th day of September 2010, defines net tonnes of $CO₂$ sequestered in a year as the mass of $CO₂$ injected in the year less any $CO₂$ that escapes or is extracted from the subsurface. It does not include a holdback or offsets from energy or other inputs used by the Project. These amounts are not reported in this document.

 $CO₂$ is captured from two industrial facilities in Alberta. One is located approximately 12 km east of the Town of Gibbons at the Sturgeon Refinery (56216 RR20, AB-643, Sturgeon County, AB T0A 1N0) which is owned and operated by North West Redwater (NWR) Partnership. The approximate LSD for the refinery is LSD 5 to 16-18- 056-21W4. The NWR CO₂ recovery unit (NWR CRU) is located at LSD 12-18-056-21W4. It consists of a booster compressor and associated equipment that captures dry $CO₂$ from the NWR Rectisol Unit and boosts it into a gathering line than runs to the Wolf Sturgeon Compressor Station (SCS) where the $CO₂$ is further compressed to ACTL pipeline pressure.

The second CO₂ capture operation, the Wolf Redwater CO₂ Recovery Unit (RCRU), is adjacent to the Nutrien's Redwater Fertilizer Plant in Sturgeon County, Alberta (LSD 5 & 6, NW17-056-21W4). The equipment associated with the RCRU is located at LSD 04-17-056-21W4.

The $CO₂$ is transported from the capture facilities to the EOR operation at Enhance Energy's Clive field via pipeline. The CO2 pipeline, called the Alberta Carbon Trunk Line (ACTL), operated by Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. (WCS), is 240 kilometers in length. It begins at the tie-in point of the RCRU and the Wolf SCS located at 14-07- 056-21 W4M. The pipeline continues south, ending at the Clive 04-15 battery located at 4-15-40-24W4M in Central Alberta. Enhance takes delivery of the $CO₂$ at this point where an on-line analyzer and $CO₂$ delivery meter are used to determine the mass of $CO₂$ delivered to the project for EOR and storage. The $CO₂$ is then distributed through the Clive injection system to nine dedicated horizontal $CO₂$ injection wells where it is injected into the Leduc formation at a depth of approximately 2000 metres. Recycle $CO₂$ is produced with solution gas and oil from newly drilled horizontal production wells through a dedicated gathering system to the Clive battery. At the battery, the $CO₂$ and solution gas are separated from the oil and water and compressed into the CO₂ injection system downstream of the delivery meter where they are re-injected along with the fresh $CO₂$.

Enhance, WCS and NWR have followed the requirements of Schedule E to the CCS FUNDING AGREEMENT – THE ALBERTA CARBON TRUNK LINE PROJECT made the 30th day of September 2010 in preparing this report. The Project continued in the operational phase during 2022; therefore, certain materials that were reported in prior years, such as construction and commissioning, are not repeated since the focus has shifted to reporting current year operational data and information. If historical information is needed, the reader is directed to prior year versions of this report.

CERTIFICATION ON BEHALF OF NORTH WEST REDWATER PARTNERSHIP

CERTIFIED on behalf of the North West Redwater Partnership named in the "CSS Funding Agreement - The Alberta Carbon Trunk Line Project," to be true, accurate and complete, to the best of my knowledge, based on reasonable inquiry and due diligence, as of the date of this certification.

The Certification applies to the information supplied by the North West Redwater Partnership only and does not imply certification of information supplied by other Recipients.

Per: Peter Duda 43 MDT)

Date: March 23, 2023

Page | 11

Peter Duda General Manager - NWRP

CERTIFICATION ON BEHALF OF WOLF CARBON SOLUTIONS INC.

CERTIFIED on behalf of Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. named in the "CCS Funding Agreement - The Alberta Carbon Trunk Line Project" to be true, accurate and complete, to the best of my knowledge, based on reasonable inquiry and due diligence, as of the date of this certification.

The Certification applies to the information supplied by Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. only and does not imply certification of information supplied by other Recipients.

Date: March 31, 2023

Jeff Pearson, P. Eng. President

Properties of the source $CO₂$ streams at the NWR CRU and RCRU are not materially different than design conditions that are described in Section 1.1 of the 2019 detailed knowledge sharing report.

1.1.1 Quantitative

1.1.1.1 Nutrien Design Stream

No changes to design data. 2022 gas analyses from the Nutrien CO₂ outlet stream are provided in Appendix i. Inlet temperature and pressure data is provided in this section.

1.1.1.2 NWR Design Stream

No changes to design data. 2022 gas analyses from the NWR CO₂ outlet stream (taken at the SCS) are provided in Appendix i. Inlet temperature and pressure data is provided in this section.

1.1.2 Qualitative

1.1.2.1 Commentary Nutrien Stream

There were no significant changes in the Nutrien $CO₂$ stream from the prior year. Actual data from samples of pipeline CO2 originating at RCRU and taken during 2022 is provided below. Analyses from samples taken at the outlet of the RCRU are included in Appendix i.

Table 1- Nutrien Normal Gas Composition

A plot of pressure and temperature at the inlet to RCRU through 2022 is provided below.

Other inlet temperature drops coincided with other Nutrien outages or low volume deliveries causing RCRU to shut down:

- Mid Dec 2021 to Late Feb 2022 Nutrien Plant #9 experienced an unplanned outage requiring significant repairs and resulted in no $CO₂$ deliveries during this period through RCRU.
- Mid-September 2022 Nutrien experienced a plant trip resulting in nine days of unplanned downtime.
- October 2022 Nutrien completed a planned three-week plant turnaround.
- Late December 2022 Nutrien experienced three days of unplanned downtime.

P a g e | 14

Figure 1- WCS RCRU Inlet Stream Pressure (blue) and Temperature (orange)

1.1.2.2 Commentary on NWR Stream (from Rectisol®)

There are no changes in the NWR Stream to report.

Due to the location of the NWR CRU within the Sturgeon Refinery it is difficult to coordinate sampling directly at the CRU. Analyses from samples taken at the outlet of the SCS are included in Appendix i. Since there are no processes, other than compression, at the NWR CRU or the SCS, these analyses are representative of the gas composition at the NWR CRU. Inlet temperature and pressure and discharge pressure for the NWR CRU are shown in Figure 2. Zero inlet and discharge pressures denote periods when the CRU was not operating due to lack of CO₂ deliveries from the Rectisol Unit.

Figure 2- NWR CRU Temperature and Pressure Data

1.1.2.3 Commentary on NWR Stream as provided at SCS

Actual data from samples of pipeline CO₂ originating at SCS and taken during operations during 2022 is provided below.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 16

Table 2- SCS Normal Gas Composition

A plot of pressure and temperature at the inlet to SCS through 2022 is provided below.

Figure 3- WCS SCS Inlet Stream Pressure (blue) and Temperature (orange)

Inlet temperature drops coincided with outages or low volume deliveries causing WCS SCS to shut down:

- Early August to Early October NWR completed a 66 day planned plant turnaround.
- Late October to late November NWR experienced an unplanned outage affecting the refinery. No CO₂ volumes were delivered.

A plot of inlet and outlet pressure at SCS throughout 2022 is provided below. Pressure drops are caused by the same factors noted for Figure 3.

Figure 4- SCS Inlet and Outlet Pressure

1.1.3 Operation Report of Conditioning Equipment

1.1.3.1 Commentary RCRU

- In-service routine inspections were completed at RCRU throughout the year as part of WCS' preventative maintenance program, non-routine preventative maintenance, equipment inspections, piping modifications and pump repairs were completed during two separate outages upstream of RCRU. The work completed will reduce future costs and downtime.
- Vibration analysis of rotating equipment was performed to identify any areas of concern that can be addressed prior to failure. Structural modifications were performed to promote long term reliability.
- Annual corrosion coupon analysis was performed on the 36" carrier pipe. The corrosion rate and pitting rate historically remain low.

1.1.3.2 Commentary NWR CRU

The $CO₂$ inlet to the NWR CRU is dry and requires no conditioning.

No solvents are used for CO₂ capture at the Nutrien CRU.

NWR employs Rectisol® which is a physical absorption process carried out at low temperatures and high pressures using refrigerated methanol (CH3OH or MEOH) as the solvent medium for physical absorption. Methanol is a liquid organic polar solvent that has significant advantages as a physical absorbent. It has strong solubility with CO₂, hydrogen sulphide (H2S) and other undesirable trace compounds. It is highly stable, and unlike chemical solvents, its effectiveness does not deteriorate over time. Finally, it is inexpensive, and supply is readily available in Alberta's Industrial Heartland. The solvent is regenerated using steam.

The table below summarizes the aggregated data for regenerated methanol solvent in the Rectisol system for the year 2022. The data shows that the solvent is being completely regenerated of the contaminants in the absorption/regeneration cycle. Rectisol units are typically operated with a water content of 1.5 wt% or less; the average water content of 0.75 wt% is considered an efficient operation.

P a g e | 19

Table 2- Rectisol Methanol Analysis Post-Regeneration

Further details regarding design considerations are included in the 2019 detailed report.

Considerations regarding process heat integration and configuration in the design phase were primarily considered for the NWR plant. This is because the $CO₂$ capture component at the NWR site is integrated into a new facility and thus processes could be designed at inception with optimized heat integration. For the $CO₂$ compression train, heat integration is not feasible because the heat value is low grade and uneconomic to recover. There is no requirement for heat integration at the Nutrien plant as the $CO₂$ stream is currently vented from an existing plant process.

There were no changes to the heat integration configuration reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 1.3 of the 2019 detailed report.

There were no material changes to process design including PFDs, plot plans or measurement schematics for the Rectisol® unit, NWR CRU, SCS or RCRU. Please refer to the 2019 knowledge sharing report for this information.

Work began in 2022 to tie-in the Nutrien Plant #1 CO₂ supply to the RCRU as contemplated in the original Project Funding Proposal. This project entails installation of an electrically driven blower and associated inlet and outlet piping to move CO₂ rich off-gas from Plant #1 to the existing RCRU. Currently installed dehydration and compression equipment at the RCRU does not require modification based on expected output from the existing Nutrien supply and the added Plant #1 volumes. The project is scheduled to be completed in 2023.

Energy use data for the Redwater and NWR CRUs is provided below.

The RCRU contains both dehydration and compression processes that are integrated to provide optimum performance of the system. It is not possible to isolate energy use for compression from the overall process. Therefore, energy use reported below is for the entire CRU in both cases.

1.5.1 Quantitative

1.5.1.1 Energy of Capture Expressed As MJ/Kg Of $CO₂$ Captured WCS (RCRU and NWR CRU)

Energy use is summarized for 2022 as follows:

Table 3- Energy use at RCRU and NWR CRU

Energy use at the SCS and the remainder of the ACTL is reported in Section 2.5.

1.5.2 NWR Rectisol®

Table 4- Rectisol Energy Use

Note: The Rectisol Unit is primarily used for H2 production. The above figures are on the basis of allocating 100% of energy to CO₂ capture which is inconsistent with the boundary condition (pre ACTL) of venting CO₂ or with an allocation between H2 and $CO₂$ recovery and should therefore only be used a reference.

During preparation of this document an error was found in reported energy use by the Rectisol Unit in the 2021 report. The corrected information is provided in the following table.

P a g e | 24

Figure 5- Rectisol® Process Block Flow Diagram including Mass Balance

1.5.3 Qualitative

Benchmarking Estimate

1.5.3.1 RCRU

The boundaries for the energy balance at RCRU are based on the Project Plan, a schematic showing the process flow can be found in *Appendix ii.*

1.5.3.2 NWR CRU

The boundary of the NWR CRU capture is the outlet of the Reabsorber (Cold Regeneration) where $CO₂$ offgas is directed to the NWR CRU as shown in Figure 6. The SCS is considered part of the ACTL.

Figure 6- NWR CO₂ Capture Energy Boundary Diagram

1.6.1 Quantitative

1.6.1.1 RCRU

 $CO₂$ capture ratio metrics do not apply to the fraction of formed $CO₂$ from the Nutrien process. The Nutrien process does not use an additional process to separate the $CO₂$ from their main fertilizer process, as the $CO₂$ is a by-product that is presently being vented to the atmosphere as a wet, pure $CO₂$ stream. The $CO₂$ emitted from the process is compressed and dehydrated for transportation in the ACTL pipeline with no additional capture technology being used.

The CO₂ capture ratio for the Nutrien CO₂ stream is strictly a function of overall plant availability. The steadystate plant availability is anticipated to average 98% through the life of the facility, therefore the $CO₂$ capture ratio over the life of the facility is expected to be 98%. RCRU availability was 95.3% for 2022. Nutrien $CO₂$ delivery online time was 80.3%, excluding the scheduled turnaround at Nutrien's facilities that lasted 19.4 days during 2022.

1.6.1.2 NWR CRU and SCS

The CO₂ capture ratio for the combined NWR CRU and SCS will be a function of the fraction of formed CO₂ and plant availability. The cumulative steady-state compression plant availability for SCS is anticipated to average 98%, and the CO₂ removal efficiency of the Rectisol® is 97.1%. Therefore, the overall capture ratio through the life of the project is expected to be 95.2%. SCS online time, which is the product of availability due to internal factors, was 98.9% for 2022. NWR $CO₂$ delivery online time was 86.2% during 2022 excluding a scheduled turnaround which lasted 66.4 days.

1.6.2 Qualitative

1.6.2.1 Benchmarking Estimate

The benchmarking estimate for the $CO₂$ capture ratio is 98% for the RCRU, unchanged from the prior year.

The benchmarking estimate for the $CO₂$ capture ratio is 95.2% for the combined NWR CRU and SCS $CO₂$ stream, unchanged from the prior year.

1.7.1 Quantitative

1.7.1.1 RCRU

Annual availability for process units

The annual availability for the RCRU process units is listed below:

Table 5- Availability of Process Units

1.7.1.2 NWR Rectisol©

The gasifier/ Rectisol was out of service for 108 days in 2022. Of note, in 2022 NWR held a major full plant maintenance turnaround that lasted for 66 days in August and September to address required inspections, catalyst changes and maintenance items on all units. Following restart of the units, a leak in a vessel in the Shift section of the Gasifier unit necessitated a further 32-day repair. The leak was determined to be caused by stress corrosion cracking on a surge vessel in the shift reactor section. The immediate remedy taken was to retire the affected vessel and to replace it with a similar vessel while operating the unit in a modified manner. An extensive engineering review of metallurgy in the shift reactor section of the unit was undertaken and other piping changes will be made at the time of the next scheduled maintenance turnaround. Aside from these 2 major maintenance events, the Gasifier / Rectisol unit had 10 days of disrupted operations caused by trips such

as instrumentation or pump fouling. A reliability task force has shown good results including the elimination of external utility related trips and Gasifier burner life related downtime. As discussed in Section 1.6, $CO₂$ is not formed when the Gasifier is not in service, therefore refinery downtime will not result in increased $CO₂$ emissions.

1.7.1.3 NWR CRU and SCS

Annual availability for process units

The annual availability for the process units is listed below:

Table 6- Availability of NWR CRU and SCS

The availability of the CRU is lower than expected in 2022 due to a 32-day repair to a vessel in the shift reactor section of the gasifier unit in October and November. Trips which were caused by external factors (temporary loss of oxygen) were greatly reduced. The refinery executed a 66-day maintenance turnaround during which all process units were shutdown. The CRU comes down when the gasifier goes off-line but on a standalone basis is highly reliable. Anticipated reductions in gasifier trips will improve CRU availability.

1.7.2 Qualitative

1.7.2.1 RCRU

Rationale for estimated availability

There were no changes to the rationale for estimated availability for RCRU as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 1.7 of the 2020 detailed report.

1.7.2.2 NWR Rectisol©

Benchmark Estimate

The estimated benchmark for planned average availability is 92.6% over a four-year cycle.

Outage Scenarios

Three operating scenarios that result in full or partial curtailment of $CO₂$ deliveries and which may result in increased $CO₂$ emissions to the atmosphere have been identified:

Scenario 1 -- NWR CRU Trip

In the event of a curtailment of storage activities, the NWR CRU will trip off or reduce throughput and all or part of the CO₂ offgas will be vented to the atmosphere for the duration of the outage. In this scenario, the CO₂ capture ratio is directly impacted.

Scenario 2 - Rectisol[®] unit outage

In the event of an unplanned Rectisol® outage, $CO₂$ production will cease and deliveries to the ACTL will be curtailed. The capture ratio will be unaffected.

Scenario 3 – Gasifier or Methanation unit outage

In the event of a gasifier outage, production of syngas will shut down, the syngas in the system will be reduced and the CO₂ emitted is expected to be inconsequential. If the Methanation unit trips off, CO₂ may be sent to the NWR CRU at a reduced rate, and the $CO₂$ emitted is expected to be inconsequential. In this scenario, there is no impact to the $CO₂$ capture ratio.

1.7.2.3 NWR CRU and SCS

Rationale for estimated availability

There were no changes to the rationale for estimated availability for NWR CRU and SCS as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 1.7 of the 2020 detailed report.

1.8.1 Quantitative

1.8.1.1 RCRU

Emissions for 2022 attributable to the capture process are tabulated below. Monthly data can be found in Appendix iii.

Table 7- RCRU Emissions

There were no material miscellaneous emissions in 2022.

1.8.1.2 Quantities Water Disposal Extracted from Dehydration

The moisture extracted from the dehydration process is directed to the inlet knockout drum. All the produced water from the CO₂ stream is disposed of in a nearby deep injection well. The WCS SCADA system logged 86,380 m3 of water injected into the disposal well in 2022 produced from dehydrating the CO₂. Energy and emissions associated with the dehydration and injection processes are captured in the RCRU level figures.

1.8.1.3 Produced Water

The average amounts of produced water from the RCRU process is unchanged from 2020 and the measurement process thereto.

Figure 7- RCRU Water Disposal Volumes

Analysis of the water sample taken in 2022 is provided in *Appendix iv*. Sampling will be undertaken annually in accordance with the license requirements of the disposal well.

1.8.1.4 Any Unexpected Emissions

There have been no unexpected emissions during 2022.

1.8.2 NWR Rectisol©

1.8.2.1 Air Emissions

Under normal operating conditions there are no direct air emissions from the Rectisol® unit and NWR CRU as shown in Table 8.

Table 8- Contribution to Regional Criteria Air Contaminants

In the case of a $CO₂$ compression trip, the $CO₂$ offgas is vented to the atmosphere. In this backup scenario the expected air emissions (100 % case) are as shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Expected Non-CO₂ Air emissions in Event of CO₂ Compression Trip

1.8.2.2 Soils Emissions

The Rectisol[®] unit has no soils emissions. Topsoil will be stripped, salvaged, and stockpiled in a stable location prior to development. Appropriate erosion control measures, including vegetative cover on soil stockpiles, will be implemented to prevent wind and water erosion. Subsoil compaction may occur during construction and operation of the project. However, the impacts are localized and reversible through reclamation. In the event of an unplanned chemical release, spill response, containment and remediation measures will ensure that impacts on the sub-soil resource are localized and reversible.

1.8.2.3 Water Emissions

The Rectisol[®] unit has no water emissions. The impure water and sour water process streams are sent to the Gasifier's process water recovery unit and are either reused in the Gasifier's Gas Cooling unit or sent to the Refinery's Water Treatment unit.

1.8.3 NWR CRU

Emissions for 2022 attributable to the NWR CRU capture process are tabulated below. Monthly data can be found in Appendix iii.

P a g e | 33

Table 10- NWR CRU Emissions

Natural gas related emissions from the NWR CRU are attributable to a small amount of natural gas used in the refinery to provide steam for heating (indirect emissions). The majority of indirect emissions from the unit are from use of grid supplied power. There are $CO₂$ sensors throughout the facilities that read $CO₂$ levels and it is expected that fugitive emissions will be negligible.

1.8.4 Qualitative

Identify substances that may have environmental or HSE effects

There are no substances emitted from the Project's capture process that may have environmental or HSE effects.

Report properties and potential consequences of emissions from capture facility

Since there are no harmful substances emitted from the process, there exist no properties of such substances, nor are there potential consequences to be disclosed.

Report summarizing emissions and potential negative consequences for the environment

There are no direct emissions from the NWR CRU and SCS during operation and the only emissions from the RCRU are small quantities of non-condensable vapours that are extracted from the $CO₂$ stream during the $CO₂$ liquefaction process. These impurities originate in the process areas of the fertilizer plant from which the $CO₂$ stream was captured. This vent stream off the Low Temperature Separator is mainly comprised of Hydrogen, Nitrogen, and Oxygen that is mixed under various exit conditions with a small stream of $CO₂$. The $CO₂$ is used to dilute these compounds and provide a means of dispersion out the vent stack.

There have been no material changes to the plot plans for the Rectisol[©] unit, the CRUs or the SCS. Please refer to the 2019 report for this information.

1.10.1 Quantitative

An advantage of the Rectisol® process is that it produces extremely dry CO₂ off gas with water content less than 1 ppm wt., within the design specifications of the pipeline and storage facilities or for use in enhanced oil recovery operations. Since no dehydration is required at the NWR site, the description below is focused on the dehydration process at the Nutrien plant.

Description of the Drying Technology (Including Levels of Drying – Per Stage and Total)

There were no changes to the description of the Drying Technology for RCRU as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 1.10 of the 2020 detailed report. The average RCRU outlet CO₂ water content by month is shown below.

Figure 8- RCRU Outlet Water Content

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.
1.10.2 Qualitative

Rationale for chosen dehydration technology and level of drying required

There were no changes to the rationale for chosen dehydration technology and level of drying required for RCRU as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 1.10 of the 2020 detailed report.

1.11.1 Quantitative

1.11.1.1 Commercial Scale-up

The ACTL and CO₂-EOR and storage at Clive use commercially available technologies that have been used in various industries for decades. As such, there was no piloting of technology or scale up risk.

Detailed discussion is provided in the 2019 Knowledge Sharing report. In summary:

- Rectisol® is an acid gas removal process independently developed by Lurgi and Linde. The first units were installed in the 1950's and over 150 plants have been built as of 2015; Review, modeling, Heat Integration, and improved schemes of Rectisol®-based processes for $CO₂$ capture (polimi.it). As a mature acid gas separation and conditioning technology that has been in commercial operation around the world since the 1950s, the scale up methodology for Rectisol® is not relevant for carbon capture. The Nutrien source consists of pure $CO₂$ and water vapour as a by-product of the current process and is currently being vented. It utilizes proven and widely used dehydration technology to condition the gas for pipeline transport. Dehydration and compression are proven commercial processes; there is no scale-up risk associated with this source. Dehydration technology is further discussed in Section 1.10.
- Compression equipment used at the CRUs and SCS uses proven, commercially available technology.
- CO₂ EOR and pipeline transport are well understood and has been utilized safely for decades in North America. In the continental U.S. alone, injecting $CO₂$ for EOR has been a successful practice for nearly 50 years. As of 2012, it is estimated that $CO₂$ EOR operations in North America have injected up to 65 million tonnes per year of $CO₂$ through more than 7,200 $CO₂$ injection wells. Cumulative $CO₂$ injection in the United States is estimated at 800 to 900 million tonnes and annual incremental production at over 128 million barrels (Bridging the gap: an analysis and comparison of legal and regulatory frameworks for CO2-EOR and CO2-CCS - Global CCS Institute).

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

As this project uses proven, commercially available technology there are no current or upcoming pilot projects where a comparison could be made to the performance of the technology chosen for the ACTL.

 results and conclusions from the in-service inspections accidental events and damages to the pipeline system

operational data (fluid composition, monthly flow rate,

intervention, repair, and modifications

pressure, temperature)

Figure 9- ACTL Project Schematic

2.1.1 Results of Commissioning Phase

There were no changes to results of commissioning as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.1 of the 2020 detailed report.

2.1.2 Results of Operations Phase

The initial baseline internal inspection was completed on the 24" line from NWR CU to the SCS facility, no material anomalies were identified.

In parallel with the planned NWR turnaround in August 2022, WCS completed a turnaround of the SCS facility.

Following a full environmental survey of the ACTL right of way, WCS submitted a Post-Construction Reclamation Assessment (PRCA) to the AER as required under the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (EPEA) approval for the construction of ATCL.

In-service inspections on the ACTL include routine visual site inspections, ROW inspections for revegetation and natural hazards, maintenance oversight and health checks on the cathodic protection system. Routine inspections yielded no major concerns on the pipeline, though minor operational items were identified requiring

correction or action (actuator soft seal replacement, actuator hydraulic fitting maintenance, weed control, snow removal).

2.1.3 Accidental events and damages to the pipeline system

RCRU, Fortis Transformer Inspection

 As part of a Fortis transformer inspection, certain internal components were identified as having a risk of failure. Internal components were required to be replaced to promote reliability. The components were secured in August and installed, restoring the reliability of the transformer. This finding was not unique to this facility. Fortis identified several customers that require the change of internal components.

RCRU Electric Motor failure on P411 C02 Pump

 An electric motor pump at RCRU was discovered to be damaged following an equipment vibration switch being triggered. The electric motor required repair, causing the site to be offline for approximately six days, and was subsequently reinstalled. The vibration switch was upgraded and replaced with an active monitoring transmitter to allow operations personnel to set warning alarms, shut down parameters, and trend output data, with the expectation that this process will increase the protection and reliability of the pump.

2.1.4 Intervention, repair, and modifications

SCS Neutral Ground Resistor Improvement (NGR)

 SCS experienced a power interruption in February. Further investigation discovered that the Fortis main power supply was disrupted from the line side. High voltage technicians investigated further to find the NGR cabinet had become wet inside. The cabinet is mounted outside of the MCC building. Blowing snow had entered the cabinet via the vents on the underside and side of the cabinets. Due to the configuration of resistor boards being mounted horizontal in the cabinet, the accumulated snow melted causing a short. The cabinet was dried and modified to prevent future issues.

SCS Pressure Safety Valve (PSV) Failure

 SCS experienced four PSVs failures over two separate start-up procedures. For approximately three days, SCS was taken offline for the removal, refurbishments, and reinstallation of the PSVs. It was determined that the PSV's failed due to improper calibration by the service vendor used, the PSV's were set well below the desired set point.

RCRU Compressor Electric Motor Over Heating

• In August, WCS operations observed a compressor surge at RCRU and the system was taken offline as a precautionary measure. Investigation revealed that the compressor's electric motor stator was overheating due to high ambient temperatures combined with increased production rates from Nutrien. WCS operations reduced the building temperature with additional venting and fans and restarted the system with no further issues.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

RCRU Generator Fuel Line Leak

 WCS operations observed a fuel leak while performing inspections on the RCRU generator. The fuel return line to the fuel tank had cracked and produced a minor leak contained inside the engine compartment. The fuel line was upgraded to prevent any further issues.

ACTL Main Line Valve (MLV) 15 Pressure Switch Failure

 The Ledeen valve actuator pump motor at MLV 15 was found to be running and not building pressure. Investigation found hydraulic oil leaking from the high-pressure switch. The pressure switch was replaced with no further concern.

2.1.5 Operational data (fluid composition, monthly flow rate, pressure, temperature) ACTL's monthly average inlet and outlet pressure and temperature are presented below.

Figure 10- ACTL Pressure and Temperature

Monthly average deliveries of CO₂ to ACTL from NWR CRU-SCS and RCRU are presented below.

Fluid composition is provided in other sections.

Figure 11- Deliveries to ACTL

2.2.1 Quantitative

2.2.1.1 Data Comparison

There were no changes to the deviations and changes from the detailed design to operations as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2020 detailed report.

Deliveries to Clive (adjusted for $CO₂$ content) averaged approximately 2835 tonnes/day in 2022 with a peak monthly mass of 129,772 tonnes in July. Equivalent volumes (converted at 1.861 kg/m3 per Alberta greenhouse gas quantification methodologies. Version 2 - Open Government) are 1.52 E6m3/d and 69.7 E6m3.

2.2.2 Emergency Response

There were no changes to the description of the Emergency Response as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.3 Management of Change (MOC)

There were no changes to the description of the MOC as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.4 Incident Investigation

There were no changes to the description of the Incident Investigation as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.5 Hazard Assessment and Control (Abnormal Operational Conditions)

There were no changes to the description of the Hazard Assessment and Control as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.6 Risk Assessment

There were no changes to the description of the Risk Assessment as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.7 Audit and Review

There were no changes to the Audit and Review as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.2.8 Pipeline Integrated Management System (PIMS)

There were no changes to the description of PIMS as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

2.3.1 CO₂ Specifications for the Pipeline

There were no changes to the $CO₂$ specifications for the Pipeline as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 2.3 of the 2020 detailed report.

Analyses from monthly samples can be found in Appendix i. Monthly average deliveries and concentration of $CO₂$ from ACTL to Clive are shown in Section 3.8.1.

Anticipated annual average composition (% by volume or molar %) of the $CO₂$ stream (e.g., impurities) of the Nutrien CO₂ stream prior to processing in the case is shown below.

Table 11- NWR CRU Design Gas Composition

Actual gas analyses from the SCS are available in Appendix I and are considered representative of NWR CRU inlet composition as there is no gas conditioning through these components.

Table 12- RCRU Design Gas Composition

The general pipeline design parameters are based on a system that will transfer a product that is greater than 95% carbon dioxide, containing trace amounts of H₂S content smaller than 0.001 mol/kmol (<10ppm), and no other impurities.

2.3.2 Water Content

Water content of CO_2 entering the pipeline is not to exceed 10 lbs/mmscfd. CO_2 which registers a water content in excess of this value is indicative of a process deviation, and therefore the $CO₂$ is directed to vent until the deviation is resolved.

The pipeline system has a $CO₂$ specification and minimum $CO₂$ delivery pressure for all supply volumes. Thus, there are neither material fluctuations of composition over time, nor changes in operational process due to several sources. Also, since there are no pump stations in the current design, considerations surrounding changes to the $CO₂$ as it passes through pump stations is not applicable to the project.

2.3.3 Fluctuations of Composition

Composition of the $CO₂$ varies over time due to new sources or changes in operational process. Average composition data for the commingled $CO₂$ stream at the southern delivery point of ACTL is shown below.

Analyses of samples taken from the Nutrien and NWR sources are included in Appendix i.

Venting infrastructure is utilized primarily during operating maintenance activities and during start-up. Such vents are located prior to the pipeline tie-in and at various valve stations along the pipeline. There have been no specification deviation events that have resulted in product venting.

Figure 12 ACTL Gas Composition

2.3.4 Changes Through Pump Stations

There is no anticipation of changes in stream characteristics due to passage through pump stations. There are no pump stations in operation at this time.

P a g e | 49

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

2.3.5 Additives or Additional Chemicals

There are no additives or other chemicals used at this time.

2.3.6 Miscellaneous

There are no changes to detailed design or project specifications from the 2021 report. Commissioning, operations, maintenance, and inspection details are outlined in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the 2021 detailed report.

There is extensive discussion in Section 2.2 of the operational, maintenance, inspection and repair plans. These plans were informed by both the detailed design and as-built condition of the project. There are no material deviations to report between the two phases. The major components of this framework have been established following a plan-do-check-act and continuous improvement philosophy in accordance with the regulatory requirements of ACTL's governing bodies.

The Management of Change (MOC) procedure that will be followed should any changes to these plans be required is outlined in Section 2.2.3.

Emissions associated with transportation are largely attributable to power and natural gas use at the SCS. There are also minor amounts of emissions associated with fuel use by pipeline operators and power use for instrumentation at valve stations. WCS Operators conduct bi-weekly checks at all ACTL valve sites. Minor fittings required tightening through commissioning and no material fugitive emission sources have been detected through operations.

The majority of CO₂e emissions at the Sturgeon Compressor Station are attributable to power use, largely for compression. There is some minor natural gas use for process heat during startup in cold weather conditions.

Actual 2022 CO₂e emissions at the Sturgeon Compressor Station are shown below.

Table 13- SCS 2022 CO₂e Emissions

Monthly data can be found in Appendix iii.

The majority of $CO₂e$ emissions for the remainder of the ACTL are from fuel use by operators to maintain and monitor the pipeline route and valve stations. There is some minor power use for instrumentation at the valve stations. Fugitive Emissions from Transportation are estimated to be close to zero.

Actual 2022 CO₂e emissions from the ACTL pipeline are shown below.

Table 14- ACTL Misc. 2022 CO₂e Emissions

* Gasoline use for fleet vehicles for WCS

Monthly data can be found in Appendix iii.

There are no intermediary pump stations installed or planned at this time; there is no material energy consumption to report.

Energy use for SCS and ACTL in 2022 are summarized below. All inputs have been converted to GJ equivalent. Note that ACTL throughput here is based on delivery at Clive and will not match the sum of the RCRU and NWR CRU-SCS throughput due to the highly compressible nature of $CO₂$ in the pipeline creating variable amounts of pipeline storage.

Table 15- SCS and ACTL Misc. Energy Consumption * Gasoline use for fleet vehicles for WCS

Monthly data can be found in Appendix iii.

Integrity management process (risk assessment, inspection, maintenance programs, monitoring, testing, mitigations, interventions, repairs, contingency plans, etc.)

A full-scale operations maintenance and integrity management system, including risk assessment, inspection and maintenance programs, testing guidelines, management of change processes, and standard operating procedures has been developed by WCS following a plan-do-check-act methodology. It is discussed in Section 2.2.

Details of pipeline inspection, emergency response plans, WCS policy on pipeline safety and maintenance and operational controls and procedures can be found in the 2020 detailed report.

Screening criteria used for selection of the Clive reservoirs for CO₂ EOR and storage are reported in Section 3.1 of the 2019 detailed and previous knowledge sharing reports.

3.2.1 Capacity Calculated

There have been no changes to the calculated storage capacity of the Clive reservoirs during 2022. Enhance calculated a range of storage capacity in Section 3.2 of the 2019 and previous detailed reports as follows:

Replacement of produced oil in the Clive reservoir with $CO₂ = 8.9$ MT $CO₂$ Replacement of produced gas in the Clive reservoir with $CO₂ = 3.5$ MT $CO₂$

The total $CO₂$ storage capacity at Clive due to replacement of produced oil and gas is 12.4 MT.

If the current pressure of the Clive reservoir of 1,813 psig is increased to its original discovery pressure of 2,407 psig, the density of CO₂ increases from 382 kg/m3 to 579 kg/m3, or an increase of 51.6%. Thus, the CO₂ storage capacity of Clive is increased from 12.4 MT to 18.8 MT.

Enhance injected 1,034,722 tonnes of $CO₂$ at Clive in 2022. Added to the amounts injected in 2020 and 2021, remaining storage capacity through replacement of produced oil and gas would therefore be approximately 9.2 MT of CO2. If the reservoir pressure can be increased to discovery pressure, remaining storage would be 15.6 MT.

During 2022 Enhance continued to introduce further refinements to the geomodelling techniques used in characterizing the Clive Leduc reservoir and its hydraulic connection to the Bashaw platform. Enhance Energy built a much larger simulation model to manage the project's expansion Northward and to accurately capture the CO2 plumes movement and storage in the reservoir.

The movement of CO2 in the reservoir was as expected (Figure 13).

Figure 13- CO2 Distribution

A graphical depiction of the simulation models Average Reservoir Pressure is in Figure 14 below. Pressure propagates almost uniformly across the reservoir boundary, which confirms the high deliverability of the Leduc formation in the Clive field. The 2019 prediction shows good correlation with the updated model providing confidence that $CO₂$ is contained in the Leduc.

Figure 14 2019 vs 2023 Reservoir Pressure

Figure 15 History Match of Injection and Production

A history match of the 2022 Simulation Study (Figure 15) shows close agreement with field production and injection history based on injection and production cumulative volumes providing confidence for continued use of reservoir simulation as one of the methods used in the MMV program.

Criteria used for selection of the Clive reservoirs as a storage site are reported in Section 3.3 of the 2019 and previous detailed knowledge sharing reports.

The extensive screening and characterization used in selection of the Clive reservoirs for $CO₂$ EOR and storage are reported in the 2019 and previous knowledge sharing reports.

Additional studies were undertaken in 2020 and early 2021 to address the potential for $CO₂$ injection to cause stress changes that could cause tensile fracturing in the reservoir or cap rock and are reported in Section 3.4 of the 2020 detailed report.

3.5.1 Quantitative

Baseline activities for the current CO₂-EOR and storage area were undertaken in 2019 and reported in the 2019 knowledge sharing reports. Due to delays injecting CO₂ and the relatively small volumes injected in the first half of 2020, some of the 2020 program should also be considered as baseline as it is unlikely to have been influenced by the CO₂ injection. The 2020 program is discussed in the 2020 knowledge sharing report.

Enhance executed an expanded baseline and monitoring data collection program in 2022 in anticipation of expanding the $CO₂$ -EOR and storage area.

Figure 16 (reproduced from the MMV report, Appendix v) depicts soil gas sample points in the 2019-2020 program, new sites added in 2021 and the one temporary site sampled in 2022. Figure 17 (same source) shows groundwater monitoring points in the 2022 program.

Details of the baseline results from the expanded areas and ongoing monitoring of the current MMV area are discussed in Appendix v.

Figure 16 Expanded Soil Gas Sampling Area

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Figure 17- Expanded Groundwater Sampling Area

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Baseline monitoring of the injection horizons has been extensively discussed in Section 3.6 of the 2019 and previous detailed knowledge sharing reports. The 2019 report includes the MMV plan for the project that includes an extensive discussion of the geological suitability of the Clive reservoirs for CO₂ storage, risk analyses and program design.

The Clive reservoirs are not an exploration activity but mature producing oil reservoirs with over 50 years of pressure and production history including over 300 wellbore events. These reservoirs are extremely well understood from a geological and engineering perspective and are discussed in Section 3.7 of the 2019 and previous detailed knowledge sharing reports.

3.8.1 Quantitative

3.8.1.1 Injection Stream

The volume of gas injected at Clive is directly measured by an orifice meter at the header of the injection wells (the delivery meter) prior to tie in point of the recycle $CO₂$ stream. Recycle $CO₂$ volume is measured by the recycle meter and is not included in project volumes. The total volume of fresh $CO₂$ delivered to all $CO₂$ injection wells is taken as one measurement at the CO₂ delivery meter. An orifice meter provides continuous measurement of this data parameter.

The CO₂ concentration in the fresh CO₂ received at Clive is measured by a CO₂ analyzer at the inlet header system of the injection wells prior to the tie in point of the recycle $CO₂$ stream. The analyzer is installed immediately downstream of the delivery meter. The $CO₂$ concentration represents the $CO₂$ concentration of the comingled capture streams from NWR and Nutrien and does not include the recycled $CO₂$ stream. The $CO₂$ analyzer provides continuous inline monitoring of the concentration of fresh $CO₂$ being injected. A sample of gas is removed from the center of the pipeline using a sample probe. It is then reduced in pressure and conditioned prior to entering the $CO₂$ analyzer. The analyzer is a Servomex SpectraExact 2500 analyzer using infrared analysis technology and provides an output of percentage $CO₂$ on a volumetric basis. The process for calculating the net $CO₂$ is as follows:

- Net $CO₂$ is calculated every 15 minutes
- The local remote terminal unit (RTU) calculates the gross accumulated volume at the delivery meter over the previous 15 minutes.
- The 15-minute gross accumulated volume is multiplied by the $CO₂$ concentration taken from the analyzer when the calculation is completed to generate a 15-minute net accumulated volume.
- The net 15-minute volumes are summed over the course of the day to provide a daily total net $CO₂$ at the delivery meter.
- The volumes are converted to mass in the Enhance reporting system by multiplying times the density of $CO₂$ at standard temperature and pressure.

Analyzer CO₂ concentrations are checked against monthly grab samples taken at the delivery meter and analyzed at an accredited commercial laboratory. Analyses from the composite stream at Clive and from each $CO₂$ source (Nutrien and NWR) are included in Appendix i. These analyses are within specified ranges for delivery to the ACTL and injection at Clive. The grab samples, taken at a point in time at Clive do not precisely match the weighted average $CO₂$ calculation over a month and are used as a check against gross malfunction of the analyzer. Results are within expected ranges.

The calendar day average rate of fresh $CO₂$ injection in 2022 was over 2800 tonnes/day at an average concentration of 99.1%. The recycle compressor at Clive was commissioned in February 2021 allowing all production wells to be brought online. The DEXPRO™ unit (a proprietary dehydration technology) was commissioned concurrently to remove water vapour from the recycle gas. Recycle averaged 2300 tonnes/day at 88.0% CO₂. See Figures 18-20 that show fresh CO₂ injection rate and concentration, recycle CO₂ injection rate and concentration and total injection rate, respectively. Month-by-month data is tabulated in Appendix vi.

Figure 18 Clive Fresh $CO₂$ Injection

Figure 19 Clive Recycle CO₂ Injection

Figure 20 Clive Total CO₂ Injection

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

3.8.2 Qualitative

As the $CO₂$ delivered has met or exceeded delivery specifications, there are no material risks to report. The CRU's functioned as expected in 2022.

Enhance conducted extensive risk assessment work prior to beginning $CO₂$ injection that has been reported in 2019 and prior years. There were no trigger events recorded in 2022 and, therefore, there have been no updates to these risk assessments.

3.10.1 Quantitative

3.10.1.1 Well-Specific Injection Activity

Volumes, injection hours and average wellhead pressures of $CO₂$ injected are reported on a monthly basis in Appendix vi. Wellhead pressures are generally in the range of +/- 9500-9800 kPa which is within the expected range. The injection wells are fitted with orifice meters to measure injected volumes which are converted to tonnes.

The maximum per well injection rate was about 47,800 tonnes in September at the new 02/16-10-040-24W4/0 injection well. Water injection as part of a water-alternating-gas (WAG) cycles continued in 2022. Plots of CO₂, gas (the non-CO₂ component of the injection stream), water and injection hours are included in Appendix vii.

All production wells in the project are equipped with downhole temperature and pressure sensors that feed data to the SCADA system. Three of the injection wells are similarly equipped. Stable reservoir pressure measurements taken in the Leduc during 2022 show marginal change from the 2021 and 2020 surveys, as expected. Both fall-off tests from injection wells and static gradients from dedicated Leduc monitoring wells are used to verify average reservoir pressure in the Leduc during the EOR flood. Summary data from these pressure surveys has been added to Figure 21.

Detailed pressure records from these surveys have been filed with the AER.

A summary plot of Leduc pressure since pool discovery in 1953 shows current reservoir pressure is averaging 13.5 MPa as expected (Figure 21). Figure 14 shows forecast pressure changes from reservoir simulation compared to updated results; observed changes agree with the forecast, showing marginal increase. The Clive Leduc D-3A and Nisku D-2A pools were discovered in the 1950s and both had concurrent production of their

P a g e | 72

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.
solution and associated (gas cap) original gas in place. While both pools are pressure supported by the underlying Bashaw Platform aquifer, blowdown of 789 bcf from the Nevis gas pool in the 1960s and 70s led to a drop in pressure in all of the Bashaw Platform pools. The aquifer keeps the current pressures constant, and historical attempts to increase the reservoir pressure through water injection have not succeeded.

Figure 21- Clive D-3A (Leduc) and D-2A (Nisku) Pressure History

Enhance also conducts annual pressure surveys on dedicated Nisku observation wells to confirm that the Ireton shale is providing an effective barrier to CO₂ migration from the Leduc. Summary results are included in Figure 21. Downhole temperatures taken during these surveys also show no change confirming the integrity of the Ireton shale.

Figures 22, 23 and 24 show specific results for Leduc and Nisku pressure surveys in 2022 and the reservoir pressure forecast.

Figure 22 Leduc Pressure and Temperature 2022

Figure 23 Nisku Pressure Surveys

Figure 24 Clive Leduc Reservoir Pressure Forecast

Gas analyses from fresh CO₂ supplied by the ACTL are included in Appendix i. Gas analyses taken at the outlet of the DEXPRO[™] unit (i.e., the recycle gas composition) are included in Appendix i.

3.10.2 Storage Performance Forecast

The total CO₂ storage capacity at Clive is estimated at 18.8 MT of CO₂. (Please see section 3.2 for detailed calculations). Figure 25 provides a storage forecast based on the initial reservoir simulation conducted for the Project.

Figure 25 Clive Storage Prediction

3.10.3 Qualitative

3.10.3.1Operating Strategy/Pressure Management

The average reservoir pressure is expected to remain significantly below reservoir discovery pressure. This is confirmed by pressure data obtained in 2022.

3.10.4 Health, Safety and Environment ("HSE")

Enhance has an emergency response plan (ERP) that has been in place for several years in relationship to the operation of the Clive unit with respect to the production of oil and gas. This plan has been modified to incorporate the specific impacts of $CO₂$ within the operating area. This includes an emergency planning zone and emergency response plan that has been defined to encompass operations and to address accidental releases of CO2, along with a series of documented operating procedures and comprehensive personnel training.

Enhance's ERP is required and approved by the Alberta Energy Regulator per Directive 071. The plan was developed in conjunction with the AER, local government and emergency response personnel and residents within the emergency planning zone.

3.11.1 Quantitative

Enhance completed an updated MMV plan and submitted it to Alberta Energy in July 2019 that was approved in November 2019. Enhance views this as a "living document" to be updated as field data is captured and analyzed, and new monitoring techniques are developed.

Certain components of the measurement, monitoring and verification (MMV) work at the Clive were paused or deferred in 2020 to minimize having consultants travel to the area as a precautionary response to COVID-19. The full program was re-instated in 2021 and expanded in 2022 to collect baseline data for future CO_2 -EOR and storage development (see Figures 16 and 17).

Beginning in 2021 and continuing in 2022, additional isotope analyses on methane, ethane and sulfur have been added to provide enhanced attribution regarding the source of various gases:

- Groundwater Monitoring
	- o Three dedicating groundwater monitoring wells were successfully drilled and sampled in 2019.
	- \circ One additional dedicated monitoring well was drilled in 2021 and an existing water supply well at the Clive battery was added to the sampling program.
	- o A total of 69 summer and fall samples were successfully collected from the five dedicated and thirty-three landowner wells in 2022.
	- \circ The 2022 samples indicate conditions consistent with previous years and that are within the normal ranges expected for natural systems.
- Soil Gas Sampling
	- \circ A full program was undertaken in 2021 and the area expanded for baseline data collection as shown in Figure 16.
- \circ A total of 82 samples were successfully obtained in the summer and fall 2022 program (includes 9 blind duplicate samples for laboratory quality control).
- \circ None of these samples show evidence of loss of CO₂ containment.
- Coal Bed Methane (CBM)
	- o Enhance continues to collect monthly samples for gas composition at the 10-34-39-24W4 header that collects CBM gas from and area overlying the current CO₂-EOR area. The 04-15-040-24W4 header was added to the sampling program in 2021 to collect baseline data over the north portion of the Leduc pool prior to expansion of the $CO₂$ -EOR and storage area.
	- o Annual isotopic analysis is also done on samples from both locations.
	- \circ Monthly gas analysis is also done from the main CBM compressor located at the Clive battery that collects gas over a much larger area.
- Nisku and Leduc Monitoring Wells
	- o Alberta Energy Regulatory (AER) Directive 065 Approval No. 12832L requires Enhance to obtain gas samples and static reservoir pressures from dedicated Leduc and Nisku monitoring wells at Clive.
	- \circ Bottomhole pressure surveys have been obtained and are discussed in the Section 3.10.
	- o No anomalous results have been recorded.
- Source Gas
	- \circ Monthly gas compositions are taken at the Sturgeon Compressor, the RCRU and the delivery meter at Clive. Continuous $CO₂$ content is measured at Clive.
- Surface Casing Vent Flow (SCVF) Testing
	- o Two surveys were completed within the MMV area in 2020.
	- \circ Two additional surveys were completed in each of 2021 and 2022 bringing the total to seven (a baseline was done in 2019).
	- \circ No SCVF or abnormal pressures were noted within the CO₂ EOR and storage area.

Results of the program are discussed in detail in Appendix v. There were no trigger events noted to suggest containment issues.

3.11.2 Qualitative

All risk assessments for the Project show wellbores to be the only possible source for $CO₂$ migration. The two SCVF surveys conducted in each of 2020, 2021 and 2022 showed no evidence of wellbore related issues within the $CO₂$ EOR and storage area. Results of these surveys have been reported to the AER.

Enhance will continue to incorporate learnings from operating the Project and MMV data collection and interpretation into the ongoing MMV program.

P a g e | **79**

3.12.1 Quantitative

Data Capture Frequency:

Results of the 2022 program are reported Appendix v.

As of year-end 2022, Enhance has collected over 2000 data points for the MMV program. This data confirms that $CO₂$ remains contained within the Leduc formation. Some highlights of the program are noted below.

techniques, as identified in the MMV plan)

Soil Gas:

 Two sample programs were undertaken in 2022; summer and fall. The summer program completed 34 of a planned 38 samples as well as four "blind duplicate" samples for laboratory quality assurance (QA). The fall program obtained 38 of 39 planned samples from permanent probes plus one sample from a temporary probe and 5 QA samples. Results from these samples generally indicate conditions consistent with previous years and are within the normal ranges expected for natural systems.

P a g e | 80

However, two locations were noted where anomalous methane levels were detected in soil gases.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

- Analysis of stable and radiogenic carbon isotope results from one of the sites showed gas originating from underlying coal formations.
- Analyses of gas from the second site shows a suspected connection with gas originating from the lower Mannville Group as opposed to deeper Devonian formation where the $CO₂$ is being injected.
- The soil gas results confirm that there is no migration of injected $CO₂$ to the biosphere.

The ability to detect and characterize the source of anomalous methane levels demonstrates the utility of the Clive EOR baseline soil gas sampling approach and its potential to identify and characterize soil gases during the CO2 EOR and storage operation.

CBM Gas Composition:

- The presence of widespread CBM development in the area enabled monitoring for potential leakage over the entire MMV area.
- **•** CBM gas composition has remained stable indicating that injected $CO₂$ is remaining in the Leduc. The 12-12 location was added in 2021.

Figure 26 CBM Gas Composition

Carbon Isotope Analysis

 Stable carbon isotopes provide an opportunity to "fingerprint" source gas from the NWR and Nutrien facilities and differentiate it from native gas from the Nisku and Leduc (Devonian age) formations.

Groundwater Sampling

 Results from the water wells sampled in 2022 indicate conditions consistent with previous years and are within the normal ranges expected for natural systems.

3.12.2 Qualitative

Assessments and lessons learned are reported in Appendix v and will continue to evolve as Enhance continues ongoing analysis and continues to collect data in 2023.

3.13.1 Quantitative

3.13.1.1 Type/Purpose of Well

One additional horizontal CO₂ injection well was drilled at the Clive field in 2022 to expand the flood area and increase overall injection capacity for fresh $CO₂$ and recycle gas volumes. This brings the total to nine. Additional injection wells will be drilled in the future as the EOR and storage project expands. UWIs for the current injection wells are given below:

- 00/01-34-039-24W4/0
- 00/01-03-040-24W4/0
- 00/01-27-039-24W4/0
- 02/11-36-039-24W4/0
- 02/06-01-040-24W4/0
- 03/16-02-040-24W4/0
- 02/02-22-039-24W4/0
- 00/11-25-039-24W4/0
- 02/16-10-040-24W4/0 (new well)

Figure 27 Clive Injectors and Producers and AER Approval Area

The AER Approval area is outlined in blue with the expansion area shown in red. Existing injectors are shown in purple with a down arrow at the toe. Producers are shown in green. The new injector is highlighted with a yellow oval.

Drilling and completion records and logs for the new injector have been filed with the AER. The drilling and completion reports for the new injection wells are included in Appendix viii.

3.13.1.2 Trajectory and Position

The current development strategy utilizes horizontal and vertical wells. Approximate locations of the wells are shown in Figure 27.

P a g e | 84

3.13.1.3 Completion Intervals –Leduc Horizon

The new injector is completed in the Leduc horizon. Copies of the AER DDS submissions and geoSCOUT well tickets that include additional well details are included in Appendix viii.

3.13.1.4 Casing and Cement Type and Dimensions

See Appendix viii for details.

3.14.1 Quantitative

3.14.1.1 CO₂ Injection and Recycle Rates

Details of fresh and recycle injection rates are included in Appendix vi.

Plots of fresh and recycle rate and $CO₂$ content and total injection are shown in Section 3.8. Monthly data is tabulated in Table 16.

3.14.1.2 CO₂ Injected vs. Oil Produced

Figures 28-30 plot various $CO₂$ vs. oil production ratios for the project. These plots include production from two vertical wells within the EOR area that are being produced to assist with reservoir monitoring. Injection at the 02/16-10-40-24W4/0 well is excluded from these plots as this new well is located within the expanded EOR area. It is beginning CO₂ banking of an area to be developed with additional drilling.

Individual well production and injection plots are included in Appendix vii.

Figure 29 Monthly CO₂ Injected/Oil Produced

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Figure 30 Cumulative $CO₂$ Injection/Cumulative Oil Production

Table 16 Production and Injection

3.14.1.3Water Injection

Produced water is either reinjected into a dedicated water disposal well or used for a water alternating gas (WAG) EOR scheme, under which some of the produced water will be injected into the $CO₂$ injectors to improve reservoir conformance. WAG operations began in June 2021 on the 00/01-34-039-24W4/0 well. Wells 00/01-34- 039-24W4/0, 02/06-01-040-24W4/0 and 00/01-03-040-24W4/0 commenced WAG operations in 2022.

Individual well injection and production plots are included in Appendix vii.

3.15.1 Quantitative

3.15.1.1 Drilling Locations and Status of Injection

Drilling details for the 02/16-10-040-24W4/0 horizontal injection well drilled in 2022 are provided in Section 3.13 and Appendix viii.

AER Approval #12832L continues to require that some existing vertical wells be used as monitoring wells to collect fluid samples and monitor reservoir pressure. Results of the pressure surveys on these wells is shown in Figures 21-23.

3.16.1 Quantitative

Well tickets and AER DDS submissions for the horizontal injection well drilled in 2022 are included in Appendix viii. Due to the tight well control provided by existing vertical wells there have been no substantial changes to the site geological model described in Section 3.16 of the 2019 and previous detailed reports. There is extensive discussion of the Clive area geology included in the Measurement, Monitoring and Verification (MMV) Plan filed in conjunction with the 2019 knowledge sharing reports. See: Alberta Carbon Trunk Line project : knowledge sharing report, 2019 - Open Government. Directional surveys and logs of all project wells have been filed with the AER.

4.1.1 Quantitative

4.1.1.1 NWR

The NWR schedule of project milestones is shown below in Table 17. $CO₂$ capture began in Q1 2020 with the startup of the gasifier operations and Milestone # 4 in Q2 with the declaration of commercial operation.

Table 17- Schedule of Project Milestones NWR

4.1.1.2 Enhance and Wolf Carbon Solutions

There were no changes to the Project Schedule for Enhance and WCS as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 4.1 of the 2020 detailed report. All facilities completed their respective inservice dates in 2020.

4.2.1 Quantitative

4.2.1.1 Enhance and WCS

There were no changes to the non-confidential list of stakeholders as reported in previous knowledge sharing documents. Please refer to Section 4.2 of the 2020 detailed report. Enhance's stakeholder communications focus in 2022 was on landowners directly impacted by construction and drilling activities, and the 2022 MMV program. A planned public open house in October was cancelled due to poor weather conditions making travel unsafe.

4.2.1.2 NWR

Details of past communications efforts can be found in Section 4.2 and of the 2020 and previous versions of this report.

Occasional public newsletters are posted to company websites providing general updated information, and general information related to Carbon Capture plans – note that newsletters are on the NWR website (https://nwrsturgeonrefinery.com).

NWR is also a participant in multi-stakeholder committees facilitated by Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (AEPA) related to Cumulative Effects Management in Alberta generally, and the Industrial Heartland area specifically. Most applicable is the Air Management Framework, which NWR has participated in since the framework committee's inception in 2007. Stakeholders who are represented include the federal, provincial, and municipal governments, with participation by their environmental staff experts, as well as NGO's such as Pembina Institute and Toxics Watch, and representatives of companies with facilities within the Industrial Heartland area. CCS is one of the topics discussed, along with emissions of NOx, SOx, ozone and PM2.5.

Non-Confidential List of Stakeholders

NWR continues to maintain and expand its contact list and is fully committed to continuing the existing program of stakeholder dialogue and public consultation.

NWR also participated and contributed significantly to the development of "The Water Management Framework for the Industrial Heartland and Capital Region" as part of a multi-stakeholder group including AESRD, local industry, municipalities and the North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance. This group continues to work with AEPA on developing water criteria for the region.

Ongoing Consultation and Knowledge Sharing

Enhance, WCS and NWR have undertaken the following knowledge sharing activities in the 2022 calendar year.

Presentations to technical and general public audiences that speak to the ACTL Project and the carbon capture technology at NWR:

WCS:

Table 18- WCS Presentations

NWR: 2022 Schedule of Site Tours and Knowledge Sharing Presentations

P a g e | 94

Table 19- NWR Tours and Presentations

Enhance:

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 95

Table 20- Enhance Tours and Presentations

Copies of presentations will be made available upon request.

Committee Participation by NWR:

Canadian Fuels Association (CFA) – Environmental, Climate Change and Fuels Committees Alberta Environment and Protected Areas - Air Management Framework Committee Fort Air Partnership - Technical Working Group

Media Outreach for Public Education Purposes:

Enhance, WCS and NWR have worked with local, national and international journalists to educate them about the benefits of CCS. Copies of media stories will be made available upon request.

Input, forecast and reported values for the cost/tonne calculation have been completed using the methodology specified by the Province and are reported in the following pages. Estimates from 2021 have been replaced with actual costs with the exception of operating costs for the Rectisol unit.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 100

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

* As Nutrien CO2 recovery facility and the North West Rectisol & CO2 compression facilities work in parallel, the individual costs and percent of the total cost per tonne of these units do not add up to the total CAPEX capture activities, total CAPEX capture facility components, and the total OPEX capture.

P a g e | 101

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Cost per tonne is discussed in Section 10 of the 2022 summary report.

P a g e | 102 © 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Notes: Funding amounts shown above are in \$MM

Table 21- Government Funding Schedule

Funding to 2022 represents approximately 39% of forecast total Project costs. Government funding efficiency is reported below.

*Note: The social cost of carbon is a measure in dollars of the long-term damage done by a ton of carbon dioxide emissions in a given year as determined by the U.S EPA and has been pre-populated (see the following link). https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-

content/uploads/2021/02/TechnicalSupportDocument_SocialCostofCarbonMethaneNitrousOxide.pdf?source=email

4.5.1 Total Project and Components

Table 22- Total Project CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

Table 23- RCRU CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

Table 24- NWR CRU CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

Table 25- SCS CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

Table 26- ACTL Misc. CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

* Gasoline use for fleet vehicles for WCS

Table 27- Clive CO₂ EOR and Storage CO₂e Produced by Energy Source

Power use contributed to over 98% of Project total CO_{2e} emissions in 2022.

Monthly data for the Project components can be found in Appendix iii.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 104

WCS's estimates full-year fugitive CO_{2e} emissions at its RCRU, SCS, and NWR CRU sites at 250 tonnes which is in line with previous estimates based on overall throughput during 2022. This amount is estimated based on operational facility losses and is not included in the tables above as the EOR protocol considers fugitives only at the storage site.

Enhance conducted extensive monitoring for fugitives at Clive in 2020 and concluded that there were none. All fittings on the injection system were checked for leaks during commissioning and again in August. Operations personnel also conduct ongoing visual (leaking high pressure $CO₂$ creates a frost coating at the leak point) and audible leak checks daily as they perform routine maintenance and inspections. A leak detection survey was performed at the Clive battery by TNT Electric and Controls on December 7, 2020, using a FLIR GF320 camera. The following areas were surveyed:

- Treater building
- Recycle Compressor
- Tank Farm
- FWKO Building
- QA Building
- VRU Compressor
- Water Injection Building
- Booster Compressor
- Inlet Header Area and pipe rack
- Line Heater

No leakage of any fresh injected or recycled CO₂ was detected.

TNT also performed leak checks at the three pads from which the horizontal injectors are drilled (06-02-040- 24W4, 15-26-039-24W4 and 15-35-039-24W4). Wellheads, metering buildings and pipeline risers were inspected. No leaks were detected. Recycle gas is being blended into the injection stream as of October 2020; the H2S content in this stream (which naturally occurs in the natural gas from the Leduc formation) will enhance leak detection on the injection system due to the strong odour from the H_2S .

Operational monitoring, using H2S detectors located throughout the facility and olfactory detection by operations personnel, continued in 2022. No leaks were noted.

4.5.2 NWR Rectisol®

The calculated yearly $CO₂$ emissions from the NWR Rectisol® unit are shown in Table 28.

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 105

Table 28- Calculated Annual CO₂ Emissions from Rectisol® Unit for 2022

Notes:

- 1. Based on 2022 environmental filing. This is sum of $CO₂$ to Wolf + venting via stack + $CO₂$ in Claus gas + $CO₂$ in sour water
- 2. This is based on prorating data from a month with minimal venting (July) and refinery at near full capacity. Deduction for 92.6% reliability and 55 days of 2022 TA is included. This is assumed to be better than using design data or budget data (budget provides only export target)
- 3. None per lab analysis
- 4. Based on actual flow and lab analysis
- 5. Actual sour water flow used, and previous years factor used, no analysis available
- 6. This is estimated as captured + vented CO_2 in Claus gas. CO_2 in Claus gas is not considered as available for capture
- 7. This is $CO₂$ vented via $CO₂$ stack
- 8. This is CO_2 vented via stack + CO_2 via Claus gas+ CO_2 venting via sour water

4.6.1 Quantitative

 $CO₂$ avoided for each component of the Project is noted below. ACTL pipeline emissions totaling 90 tonnes in 2022 have been allocated to the CRU's and SCS based on throughput. The baseline emissions avoided in the individual tables are not additive and are based on $CO₂$ captured (per the EOR Protocol) but a project total is also included. The project total uses tonnes of $CO₂$ injected at Clive which does not equal the sum of throughput at the CRUs due to storage in the ACTL.

4.6.1.1 RCRU

The $CO₂$ emissions avoided at the Nutrien site are summarized in the table below. Project emissions are those directly associated with the RCRU plus allocated ACTL emissions.

Table 29- Emissions Avoided at Nutrien

4.6.1.2 NWR CRU-SCS

The estimated NWR CRU-SCS avoided CO₂ emissions described in Section 4.5 are shown in the table below. Project emissions are those directly associated with the NWR CRU and SCS plus allocated ACTL emissions.

Table 30- Emissions Avoided at NWR

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

4.6.1.3 Clive EOR and Storage

Baseline emissions are the mass injected at Clive in 2022 and do not match the sum of RCRU and NWR CRU-SCS baseline emissions due to storage in the ACTL. Project emissions are those directly associated with Clive storage operations.

Table 31- Emissions Avoided at Clive

4.6.1.4 ACTL Project

The total estimated avoided $CO₂$ emissions described in Section 4.5 are shown in the table below. Project emissions include direct emissions at RCRU, NWR CRU and SCS, Clive and ACTL miscellaneous.

Table 32- Total Emissions Avoided for the ACTL Project

4.6.2 Qualitative

4.6.2.1 Nutrien

The rationale for determining avoided $CO₂$ emissions is comparison between the project scenario, which includes carbon capture, and the baseline scenario, which does not include carbon capture and where $CO₂$ emissions are vented to the atmosphere.

4.6.2.2 NWR

The rationale for determining avoided $CO₂$ emissions is comparison between the project scenario, which includes carbon capture, and the baseline scenario, which does not include carbon capture and where $CO₂$ emissions are vented to the atmosphere.

A list of applicable laws, regulations, standards and rules for the construction phases of the project can be found in Section 5.1 of the 2020 detailed knowledge sharing report.

The project partners will continue to follow such laws, regulations, standards and rules (or as they are amended) for any further development. Such activity will be primarily related to expansion of the $CO₂$ EOR and storage project at Clive.

No unusual hurdles were encountered throughout the application and approval process for the overall project. NWR:

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Enhance/WCS:

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

P a g e | 113 © 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

The project partners will continue to re-apply for any required consents/permits that may expire and for any consents/permits required for expansions (primarily related to expansion of the CO2 EOR and storage project at Clive).

6.1.1 Enhance-WCS

6.1.1.1 Operating Cost

Actual operating costs for 2022 have been provided in the below tables. The major cost for the compression facilities is the required power for compression of the CO₂ from very low pressure to ACTL line pressure.

Table 33- Enhance/WCS 2022 and 2023 Operating Costs

6.1.1.2 Capital Costs

CAPEX

Table 34 - Enhance/WCS Capital Costs

Costs spent on the system through the end of 2022 are shown above. The existing CRU's, SCS and pipeline are complete; no further CAPEX is expected. Work is underway to tie-in the Nutrien Plant #1 CO₂ supply to the RCRU as contemplated in the original Project Funding Proposal. This project entails installation of an electrically driven blower and associated inlet and outlet piping to move CO₂ rich off-gas from Plant #1 to the existing RCRU. Currently installed dehydration and compression equipment at the RCRU does not require modification based

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions Inc. © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

on expected output from the existing Nutrien supply and the added Plant #1 volumes. The project is scheduled to be completed in 2023. Costs for this work are shown as a separate line item.

Plot plans, process flow diagrams, heat and material balance and project schedule are included in Appendix ix.

Additional CAPEX will be spent at Clive as the $CO₂$ EOR and storage area expands with future development.

Canadian Content

Significant amount of capital was sourced from Canada. See Section 6 of the 2020 detailed report for more specifics. Parties continue to utilize local resources whenever possible for operations and maintenance.

6.1.1.3 NWR Rectisol®

NWR Rectisol® Unit

The Rectisol[®] unit co-produces H₂, CO₂ and H₂S product streams as part of a highly integrated design complex in an industrial greenfield setting. While the CAPEX and OPEX cost estimates for the Rectisol® unit are useful for informational purposes, it would be inappropriate for use in benchmarking or direct comparison against other carbon capture technologies with unrelated objectives or in brownfield applications.

CAPEX

The Rectisol® cost at YE 2022 is shown in Table 35.

Table 35 Rectisol® CAPEX at YE 2020

Canadian Content

The Rectisol unit was built in modules which were imported to Canada and transported to site. The construction, commissioning, and startup elements of the capital cost breakdown above were all awarded to local Canadian companies including its primary contractor in these areas (PCL) although many other local contractors contributed to this activity.

OPEX

The operating cost of the Rectisol® unit is provided for informational purposes and should not be used for comparing or benchmarking against other CCS projects.

OPEX

Actual OPEX for 2022 is shown in Table 36 following.

Table 36- 2022 and 2023 Rectisol OPEX

No industry benchmarks are available, as the CCS industry is still in its preliminary stages and commercial agreements for capture, transport and storage are considered commercially confidential. Therefore, revenue cannot be presented in terms of industry benchmarks at this time. It is not possible to predict when or if an open commercial market will develop that would allow benchmarking.

Enhance and NWR have received \$63mm of Federal funding through the ecoETI and CEF programs to date. NWR and Enhance have received \$326mm of Provincial funding under the ACTL CCS agreement to YE 2022. A total of \$169mm remains to be disbursed to NWR and Enhance as annual payments under the Remaining Collective Funding provisions of the Provincial funding agreement. Payments are calculated based on net CO2 stored in the preceding year. NWR received \$3.81 mm and Enhance received \$11.44 mm in 2022 based on net CO2 stored from the start of Commercial Operations in 2020. The Project also received \$3.05 mm funding in 2022 through the Provincial Sector-specific Industrial Energy Efficiency (SIEE) Program to partially offset costs of the Nutrien Plant #1 tie-in.

At present, the only other potential revenue source is $CO₂$ storage credits available through the Alberta Emission Offset System (https://www.alberta.ca/alberta-emission-offset-system.aspx). Revenue generated through the offset credits from the Project are commercial confidential.

Approximately 937,000 tonnes of $CO₂$ credits have been serialized for the period January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022.

APPENDIX I- ACTL Project Gas Analyses *Submitted on March 31,*

2023

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

 $\mathbf{1}$

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

05003372A

Operator Name

 $235.6 -$

 $68.9 98.6 - 7$

 $150.9 -$

 $196.0 216.4 -$ 235.6 -

100.

136.

169.34

 $C₉$

138.33; 144.

Well Name

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

View or download your data online at webfluids.agatlabs.com

0.0000

0.00000

0.00000

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.
EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

 $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$

169.34

 $C₉$

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

0.00000

0.00000

0.0000

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

 $\overline{1}$

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

AGAT

04000880A

Operator Name

Well Name

RCRF 4-17 CO2

 $(^{\circ}C)$ $36.2+$ $68.9+$ $98.6+$ $125.8+$ $150.9+$ $174.3+$ $196.0+$ $216.4+$

 $(^{\circ}C)$

 $(^{\circ}C)$ 49.28 68.73 71.83 80.06 80.78 99.24 100.94 110.61 136.16 138.33; 139.

144.42

169.34

 $C₉$

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

 $\mathbf{1}$

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

o-Xylene

1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

0.00000

0.00000

0.0000

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

⊥ ⊥

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

43.7

Total Sample

WDMS Data Verification Check

Exceeds normal limits: CO2, H2

Calculated Vapour Pressure Gas Compressibility 3.73 0.9978 $C₅+(kPa)$ @ 15 °C & 101.325 kPa

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

View or download your data online at webfluids.agatlabs.com

114.2

 $C₇ + Fraction$

GAS ANALYSIS

 \sim

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Version: 1

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

 \bot

GAS ANALYSIS

Disclaimer: The result in this report has been confirmed by a duplicate run.

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual
GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

 \bot

GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

EXTENDED GAS ANALYSIS

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

PROPERTIES OF C6+ FRACTION

Results relate to only items tested. Analysis and associated calculations are based on GPA 2261, GPA 2286, GPA 2145, AGA #5, and TP-17.

Sampling performed by AGAT Laboratories is done according to Field Sampling Procedure Manual

APPENDIX II- Redwater CO² Recovery Unit Process Flow

Submitted on March 31, 2023

Redwater CO² Recovery Unit Compressor

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

2023

ACTL Project Components- Capture, Transport and Utilization

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

NOTES:

1) CO2 throughput at CRUs does not equal throughput on ACTL or Clive due to storage of compressible CO2 in the ACTL

2) Fuel use by ACTL operators assigned to ACTL misc. Power use in ACTL misc is used at valve stations.

3) A small amount of natural gas (8 GJ/mo) and power (20 MW-hrs/mo) use at the NWR CRU is based on an engineering study for equipment that is not sub-metered.

NOTES:

1) CO2 throughput at CRUs does not equal throughput on ACTL or Clive due to storage of compressible CO2 in the ACTL

2) Fuel use by ACTL operators assigned to ACTL misc. Power use in ACTL misc is used at valve stations.

3) A small amount of natural gas (8 GJ/mo) and power (20 MW-hrs/mo) use at the NWR CRU is based on an engineering study for equipment that is not sub-metered.

APPENDIX IV- Nutrien Disposal Well Water Analysis Submitted on March 31,

2023

Nutrien CO² Recovery Unit

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Your P.O. #: WCS-01020 Your Project #: EEI WJ WELL Your C.O.C. #: 1 of 1

Attention: DAN IRWIN

WOLF CARBON SOLUTIONS INC. 500, 520 - 3RD AVE SW CALGARY, AB CANADA T2P 0R3

> **Report Date: 2022/12/30** Report #: R3283752 Version: 1 - Final

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

BUREAU VERITAS JOB #: C2A0424

Received: 2022/12/22, 06:00

Sample Matrix: Water # Samples Received: 1

Remarks:

Bureau Veritas is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 for specific parameters on scopes of accreditation. Unless otherwise noted, procedures used by Bureau Veritas are based upon recognized Provincial, Federal or US method compendia such as CCME, MELCC, EPA, APHA.

All work recorded herein has been done in accordance with procedures and practices ordinarily exercised by professionals in Bureau Veritas' profession using accepted testing methodologies, quality assurance and quality control procedures (except where otherwise agreed by the client and Bureau Veritas in writing). All data is in statistical control and has met quality control and method performance criteria unless otherwise noted. All method blanks are reported; unless indicated otherwise, associated sample data are not blank corrected. Where applicable, unless otherwise noted, Measurement Uncertainty has not been accounted for when stating conformity to the referenced standard.

Bureau Veritas liability is limited to the actual cost of the requested analyses, unless otherwise agreed in writing. There is no other warranty expressed or implied. Bureau Veritas has been retained to provide analysis of samples provided by the Client using the testing methodology referenced in this report. Interpretation and use of test results are the sole responsibility of the Client and are not within the scope of services provided by Bureau Veritas, unless otherwise agreed in writing. Bureau Veritas is not responsible for the accuracy or any data impacts, that result from the information provided by the customer or their agent.

Solid sample results, except biota, are based on dry weight unless otherwise indicated. Organic analyses are not recovery corrected except for isotope dilution methods.

Results relate to samples tested. When sampling is not conducted by Bureau Veritas, results relate to the supplied samples tested.

Page 1 of 8

Your P.O. #: WCS-01020 Your Project #: EEI WJ WELL Your C.O.C. #: 1 of 1

Attention: DAN IRWIN

WOLF CARBON SOLUTIONS INC. 500, 520 - 3RD AVE SW CALGARY, AB CANADA T2P 0R3

> **Report Date: 2022/12/30** Report #: R3283752 Version: 1 - Final

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

BUREAU VERITAS JOB #: C2A0424

Received: 2022/12/22, 06:00

This Certificate shall not be reproduced except in full, without the written approval of the laboratory.

Reference Method suffix "m" indicates test methods incorporate validated modifications from specific reference methods to improve performance.

* RPDs calculated using raw data. The rounding of final results may result in the apparent difference.

(1) Dissolved > Total Imbalance: When applicable, Dissolved and Total results were reviewed and data quality meets acceptable levels unless otherwise noted.

(2) The CCME method requires pH to be analysed within 15 minutes of sampling and therefore field analysis is required for compliance. All Laboratory pH analyses in this report are reported past the CCME holding time. Bureau Veritas endeavours to analyze samples as soon as possible after receipt.

Bureau Veritas 30 Dec 2022 14:08:48

Please direct all questions regarding this Certificate of Analysis to: Customer Solutions, Western Canada Customer Experience Team Email: customersolutionswest@bureauveritas.com Phone# (403) 291-3077

==

This report has been generated and distributed using a secure automated process.

Bureau Veritas has procedures in place to guard against improper use of the electronic signature and have the required "signatories", as per ISO/IEC 17025, signing the reports. For Service Group specific validation, please refer to the Validation Signatures page if included, otherwise available by request. For Department specific Analyst/Supervisor validation names, please refer to the Test Summary section if included, otherwise available by request. This report is authorized by Scott Cantwell, General Manager responsible for Alberta Environmental laboratory operations.

RESULTS OF CHEMICAL ANALYSES OF WATER

N/A = Not Applicable

ELEMENTS BY ATOMIC SPECTROSCOPY (WATER)

GENERAL COMMENTS

QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT

QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT(CONT'D)

N/A = Not Applicable

Duplicate: Paired analysis of a separate portion of the same sample. Used to evaluate the variance in the measurement.

Matrix Spike: A sample to which a known amount of the analyte of interest has been added. Used to evaluate sample matrix interference.

Spiked Blank: A blank matrix sample to which a known amount of the analyte, usually from a second source, has been added. Used to evaluate method accuracy.

Method Blank: A blank matrix containing all reagents used in the analytical procedure. Used to identify laboratory contamination.

NC (Matrix Spike): The recovery in the matrix spike was not calculated. The relative difference between the concentration in the parent sample and the spike amount was too small to permit a reliable recovery calculation (matrix spike concentration was less than the native sample concentration)

NC (Duplicate RPD): The duplicate RPD was not calculated. The concentration in the sample and/or duplicate was too low to permit a reliable RPD calculation (absolute difference <= 2x RDL).

VALIDATION SIGNATURE PAGE

The analytical data and all QC contained in this report were reviewed and validated by:

Suwan (Sze Yeung) Fock, B.Sc., Scientific Specialist

Automated Statchk

Bureau Veritas has procedures in place to guard against improper use of the electronic signature and have the required "signatories", as per ISO/IEC 17025, signing the reports. For Service Group specific validation, please refer to the Validation Signatures page if included, otherwise available by request. For Department specific Analyst/Supervisor validation names, please refer to the Test Summary section if included, otherwise available by request. This report is authorized by {0}, {1} responsible for {2} {3} laboratory operations.

APPENDIX V- Clive Measurement, Monitoring and Verification Report

Submitted on March 31, 2023

Monitoring, Measurement & Verification Plan Guiding Principles

- Protect the public and other lessees by ensuring $CO₂$ containment
- Provide public assurance $CO₂$ is confined to the Leduc reservoir
- " Tailor monitoring and measurement techniques to the EOR site specifics
- **Ensure early warning using proven methods in the event leakage occurs**
- Locate and remediate the source of leakage if it were to occur
- Meet or exceed regulatory requirements
- Provide assurance of long-term safe storage of $CO₂$

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Clive CO2 Injection & Enhanced Oil Recovery Project

MMV Soil & Groundwater Monitoring 2022 Annual Report

Prepared for Enhance Energy Inc.

Integrated Sustainability 23 March 2023

WATER | WASTE | ENERGY

Disclaimer

The information presented in this document was compiled and interpreted exclusively for the purposes stated in Section 1 of the document. Integrated Sustainability provided this document for Enhance Energy Inc. solely for the purpose noted above.

Integrated Sustainability has exercised reasonable skill, care, and diligence to assess the information acquired during the preparation of this document but makes no guarantees or warranties as to the accuracy or completeness of this information. The information contained in this document is based upon, and limited by, the circumstances and conditions acknowledged herein, and upon information available at the time of its preparation. The information provided by others is believed to be accurate but cannot be guaranteed.

Integrated Sustainability does not accept any responsibility for the use of this document for any purpose other than that stated in Section 1 and does not accept responsibility to any third party for the use in whole or in part of the contents of this document. Any alternative use, including that by a third party, or any reliance on, or *decisions based on this document, is the responsibility of the alternative user or third party.*

Any questions concerning the information, or its interpretation should be directed to Emily Guzman.

Document Revision History

Table of Contents

Tables within Text

Figures within Text

Tables

Figures

Appendices

APPENDIX 1: ADDITIONAL GAS ANALYSIS APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM METHODOLOGY & SAMPLING SCHEDULES APPENDIX 3: SOIL GAS PROBE NETWORKS & TEMPORAL TREND CHARTS APPENDIX 4: SOIL GAS PROBE LITHOLOGY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Enhance Energy Inc. (Enhance) currently operates an enhanced oil recovery project near the town of Clive, Alberta. The solvent used is carbon dioxide (CO2) sourced from two facilities located in Sturgeon County northeast of Edmonton, Alberta. The $CO₂$ is transported via pipeline to Enhance's facility where it is injected into existing wells completed in the Leduc Formation. The injection zone is located at a depth of roughly 1,800 m to 1,900 m below ground level.

Enhance prepared a Measurement, Monitoring, and Verification (MMV) plan for monitoring this CO2 injection operation. This plan includes routine measurement gases in the bedrock formations (Geosphere) within the Leduc Formation and Nisku Formation, located above the Ireton caprock, as well as shallower formations hosting CBM (coal bed methane) intervals. Enhance has conducted regular production well (Geosphere), groundwater (Hydrosphere), and soil gas (Biosphere) monitoring in the areas since 2019. Samples of the local Atmosphere have also been collected as part of the program.

Results of monitoring associated with the Leduc wells indicates an increase in $CO₂$ concentrations since initiation of injection activities in March 2020. Conversely, no changes have been noted in the overlying Nisku Formation or other shallower bedrock formations. This is direct evidence that the $CO₂$ containment is being achieved.

With respect to the Hydrosphere, groundwater sampling has not yielded any changes due to operations in the area. Elevated $CO₂$ and $CH₄$ values have been detected in some wells, as well as various types of bacteria (in >70% of the wells assessed). This has resulted in iron and manganese concentrations above the current Canadian drinking water guidelines at several locations. The presence of bacteria in water wells is not uncommon and is typically related to lack of well maintenance. Stable isotopes of carbon in CO2 and CH_4 fractions ($\delta^{13}C_{CO2}$ and $\delta^{13}C_{CH4}$, respectively), as well as sulphur in the sulphate present in the water $(\delta^{34}S_{SO4})$, indicate conditions favourable for bacterially-mediated sulphatereduction and methanogenesis via CO2 reduction. However, contributions from coal (known to be present in the shallow bedrock) cannot be ruled out.

As for Biosphere monitoring, the majority of soil gas probe locations continue to yield results that fall within established baseline conditions. Two exceptions remain where anomalous CH4 detections occur – the 12-25 locations and 14-23 location.

The 12-25 soil gas monitoring location has consistently yielded the highest CH4 concentrations in the study area since monitoring began. Minor detections (a few ppm) of hydrogen sulphide (H₂S) have also been noted. The presence of H₂S is a concern given the potential connection with deeper Devonian intervals, like the Leduc Formation. Forensic analysis using stable carbon and sulphur, as well as radiogenic carbon, isotopes indicates that the anomalous CH4 readings are consistent with a deeper hydrocarbon source of thermogenic origin (based on δ¹³C_{CH4} values). Measurement for δ¹³Cco2 and $\delta^{13}C_2H_6$ also support a connection with gas originating from the lower Mannville Group, again confirming that the injected CO₂ is remaining intact.

With respect to the 14-23 location, the CH₄ detected there appears to be related to gas originating from underlying coal deposits. Coalbed methane production does occur in the area indicating the presence of this source gas. This conclusion is based on the lack of detectable C2H6 and H2S values, typically associated with deeper hydrocarbon sources, and a previously measured δ^{13} C_{CH4} value (in the fall of 2021) consistent with a biogenic source.

Based on the Geosphere, Hydrosphere, and Biosphere monitoring completed to date it is clear that the CO2 being injected into the Leduc Formation by Enhance is achieving the goal of containment.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

Enhance Energy Inc. (Enhance) is an Alberta-based company that specializes in enhanced oil recovery (EOR) using the injection of carbon dioxide (CO2). Enhance operates the Clive Project (the Project) located in Lacombe County, Alberta and about 30 km northeast of the City of Red Deer.

Enhance receives captured carbon dioxide (CO2) from two sources via the Alberta Carbon Trunk Line - Nutrien Ltd. (Nutrien) and Northwest Redwater Partnership (NWR). The CO2 is injected into the Leduc Formation at a depth of roughly 1,800 m to 1,900 m below ground surface (mbgs). The Leduc Formation is capped by the Ireton Shale, a tight formation separating the Leduc Formation from overlying formations, including the Nisku Formation, other Mannville and Colorado Group shales, siltstones, and sandstones, the shallower (and coal-bearing) Horseshoe Canyon formation, and unconsolidated glacial deposits and surficial soils blanketing the area.

Enhance developed a Monitoring, Measurement & Verification (MMV) plan in 2019 and has been following that since then. The monitoring that supports this plan has been purposely designed to ensure containment of injected CO2 by assessing conditions in the Geosphere (deeper bedrock formations), the Hydrosphere (nearer surface freshwater aquifers) and the Biosphere (shallow surficial deposits). Field programs completed during 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 have developed a useful baseline of soil gas and groundwater quality conditions across the project area to identify any trends in conditions that may suggest a CO₂ containment breach.

1.2 Scope of Report

This report represents the fourth edition of the MMV baseline monitoring program. The key objectives are as follows:

- Identify key chemical characteristics of the injected $CO₂$ compared to other bedrock formation gases (including Nisku, Mannville and Horseshoe Canyon production wells).
- Summarize results of the most recent field campaigns (summer and fall 2022).
- Assess temporal trends of monitoring data to determine if any changes outside of anticipated baseline conditions is evident.
- Investigate anomalous conditions detected in the soil and/or groundwater and assess the source and cause of such detections using geochemical forensics (i.e. gas composition and isotopic signatures).
- Document the findings of the 2022 program and update understanding of the baseline conditions in the Geo-, Hydro-, and Biospheres against which $CO₂$ containment is confirmed.

1.3 Changes to MMV program

Some modifications and refinements were made to the monitoring portion of the MMV program in 2022. These included:

- The removal of four soil gas sample locations, as per direction from Enhance, as sufficient baseline data has been collected.
- A change in soil gas sampling frequency at 13 locations, as these locations were sampled once during the 2022 program as per direction from Enhance and are approaching sufficient baseline data collection.
- All soil gas samples were analyzed for carbon isotopes (δ^{13} Cco2) as per direction from Enhance.
- The addition of two more landowners water wells to the existing annual schedule for groundwater sampling and analysis.
- A change in groundwater sampling frequency at the Enhance monitoring wells located at 10-35-039-24 W4M, as the monitoring wells were only sampled in the summer of the 2022 program as directed by Enhance as sufficient baseline data has been collected.
- The addition of one soil gas probe at 08-09-040-24 W4M.

2 GEOSPHERE MONITORING

2.1 Purpose

Monitoring of the Geosphere, or the deeper bedrock formations forming the $CO₂$ injection zone (i.e. Leduc Formation) and overlying intervals represents the first line of defense in ensuring CO2 containment. Monitoring of the gas compositions in those intervals is critical to identifying changes in injection zone from the $CO₂$ introduced, and more importantly identify that it is remaining contained as evidenced by lack of change in the overlying formations.

2.2 Monitoring infrastructure

Enhance's Project extends from the southern half of Township 41, Range 24 West of the 4th Meridian, just east of Clive, AB down to the northern half of Township 39, Range 24 W4M. The location of the active MMV area is shown in Figure 1. This represents an area of roughly 18 sections of land or about 50 km2 that is mainly used for crop production. Of course, oil and gas development also occurs in the area, as well as the current $CO₂$ injection scheme. Several private residences are also located throughout the area.

Enhance has been monitoring gases in the bedrock formations across the study area since 2019. This has included existing gas production wells completed in various formations including the Leduc, Nisku, Mannville Group and coalbed methane (CBM) completed in Horseshoe Canyon Formation. The data from these existing production wells forms the basis of comparison to confirm containment of $CO₂$ injected into the Leduc Formation.

Figure A. **Configuration of monitoring in the Nisku Formation to ensure containment of CO2 injected into the Leduc Formation.**

(Note: purple = $CO₂$; red = $CH₄$ and other related natural gases)

Figure A provides a schematic of the configuration of monitoring in the Nisku Formation above the Leduc injection interval and the presence of the Ireton Formation caprock. It is evident from this configuration of wells that any $CO₂$ that may migrate from the Leduc zone would first be detected in the Nisku wells.

2.3 Monitoring Activities

To facilitate evaluation of the Geosphere environment, gases from a number of operating oil and gas wells in the area as well as the injected $CO₂$ have been collected analyzed over the years for gas composition, stable and radiogenic isotopes of carbon, and recently stable sulphur (a good indicator of Devonian influence). The database developed to date has allowed similarities and difference to be established between each interval, which has proven extremely useful in determining sources when anomalous detections are made.

All samples were collected into SUMMA cannisters, provided by AGAT Laboratories (AGAT) and delivered to AGAT's Red Deer laboratory. Gases were collected from established sampling ports on the various gas wells and CO₂ injection equipment to

ensure isolation from atmospheric air contamination. Locations of where samples were taken are shown in Figure 2.

2.3.1 Injected CO2

Concentrations

Enhance measures the composition of the gases that they are injecting as part of the Clive Project on a monthly basis at three different sample points. The gases in question are received from Nutrien and NWR and comprises 95-100 mole% CO2 with a minor component of methane (up to 20 ppm or so).

Isotopic Characteristics (Stable & Radiogenic)

Stable carbon isotope values for the $CO₂$ received from Nutrien are quite unique in character (δ^{13} Cco₂ = -42 ‰ to -41‰) compared to the CO₂ received from the NWR facility $(\delta^{13}C_{CO2} = -27\%)$ to -25‰). Measurement of the combined stream injected down into the Leduc formation yielded a value of -29.2‰ in 2021. This value indicates a greater contribution of $CO₂$ from the NWR source as opposed to $CO₂$ received from the Nutrien facility.

2.3.2 Formation Gases

Composition

Gas compositions from the Leduc Formation, the overlying Nisku Formation, Mannville and CBM wells in the immediate vicinity of the EOR project have been measured to identify any changes from expected values, particularly with respect to CO2 in the Nisku. Detection of an increasing trend of this acid gas at any given location would be an indication of a possible breach of the Ireton Formation caprock.

Gas monitoring results provided by Enhance indicate that differing compositions of gas occur for the various formations being assessed as part of this program. Table A provides a summary of the differences in some of the major gas components for each Geosphere interval:

One of the most notable differences in gas composition is the concentration of hydrogen sulphide (H2S) in the Nisku and Leduc formations. The sour nature of the gases sourced from those formations provides a useful diagnostic to detect leakage from those intervals to shallower horizons, and hence a possible breach of $CO₂$ containment. However, the detection of measurable H₂S is not, by itself, an indicator of a $CO₂$ breach given that the gas could migrate upward from the Nisku Formation if a suitable pathway, or pathways, exists (the most notable being a compromised well bore). As such additional evidence is required to attribute a source.

Isotopic Characteristics

Isotopes of various elements comprising subsurface gases can be extremely useful in determining the source and types of physical, chemical, and biological processes that may have altered it from its original composition. Isotopes of carbon in the $CO₂$ and methane (CH₄) gas fractions, and stable sulphur in the H₂S (or resulting sulphate [SO₄] molecule following oxidation) are particularly helpful in this regard.

Enhance has collected a considerable amount of data on the isotopic composition of various gas fractions from bedrock formations beneath the operating area, including the injected CO2. Table B summarized these compositions, highlighting their similarities and differences.

Table B. Comparison of isotope compositions in various gas fractions and related formations

Note: -- denotes that isotope compositions have not been measured. F14C_{co2} values for the Mannville and CBM intervals are also assumed to be low (i.e. <0.002, or essentially zero indicating ages greater than 50,000 years).

Sulphurous gases contained in Devonian formations of the Alberta Basin have uniquely positive $\delta^{34}S$ values and are therefore useful to identify migration of deeper gases up into shallower groundwater or soil intervals. $\delta^{34}S$ values measured in the Nisku and Leduc samples range from 9.4‰ to 17‰. In contrast, shallower groundwater (i.e. upper 30 m) in the central portion of Alberta has been shown to have $\delta^{34}S$ values ranging from -10.3‰ to 0.1‰, with an average of 5.4‰ (Cheung et al. 2010). Fennell and Bentley (1996) similarly found that shallow soils in the Alberta Plains area could have baseline $\delta^{34}S$ values

of the soluble and organic sulphur in the soil horizons ranging from -20‰ to -5‰ and associated groundwater values averaging around -15‰.

A completed listing of historical gas composition and isotope measurements for the various bedrock intervals assessed, as well as the CO2 being injected, is provided in Appendix 1.

2.4 Data Trends

Figure B provides a temporal history of mole% CO2 measurements in various Nisku and Leduc wells located in the MMV area. The start of CO₂ injection occurred around March 2020 and has continued since that time. The impact to CO₂ levels in the Leduc interval is obvious after the commencement of operations. The Nisku interval, however, shows no sign of change from baseline CO₂ values. This is direct evidence that CO₂ containment is remaining intact.

Figure B. Time Series Plot of in CO2 within the Nisku and Leduc formations.

3 HYDROSPHERE MONITORING

3.1 Purpose

Hydrosphere monitoring is equally important to ensuring $CO₂$ containment in the underlying formations and represented the second line of defence in the effort. If a detection for leaked CO2 is made in the deeper Geosphere intervals this does not necessarily mean that the shallower intervals are at risk. The considerable thickness of the lower permeability formation as well as aquifer intervals that could intercept this $CO₂$ is significant. Nevertheless, monitoring of this intermediate to shallower interval of the bedrock formations is critical in the assessment of $CO₂$ containment.

Hydrosphere monitoring in 2022 consisted of two groundwater sampling programs occurring in summer and fall. This included major and trace element chemistry as well dissolved gas composition.

3.2 Monitoring infrastructure

Enhance's current monitoring well network consists of the following:

- Five dedicated monitoring wells associated with the Project, as follows:
	- − Three located near Enhance's existing 10-35-039-24 W4M well pad.
	- − One water supply/monitoring well at Enhance's main facility located in 04-15-040-24 W4M.
	- One dedicated well installed at the 12-25-039-24W4 location to investigate consistently anomalous soil gas readings for CH4.
- **Thirty-four (34) private landowner water wells.**

Locations of the Project and landowner water wells across the study area are shown on Figure 3.

3.3 Monitoring activities

The 2022 summer and fall sampling programs occurred during the months of June and September. Table C summarizes the number of samples collected, as well as duplicates to assess data integrity.

Table C. Groundwater Samples Collected During Each Campaign

Prior to accessing private water wells, the owners were contacted for consent. Sampling was not conducted at properties where the landowner could not be contacted during the duration of both sampling events, or where there was no power to the well as confirmed by the landowner(s). All sample collection and handling activities conducted by Integrated Sustainability followed the established methodology for the program. Details of this methodology are provided in Appendix 2.

3.4 Data Evaluation

Groundwater sampling results are included in the following tables:

- Table 1A Field Measured Parameters
- Table 1B General, Major Ions, Nutrients
- Table 2 Groundwater Analytical Results: Dissolved Metals
- Table 3 Groundwater Analytical Results: Isotopic Abundance
- Table 4 Microbiological Parameters

The groundwater in the study area can be described as fresh, low mineralization (Total dissolved solid = 518 ± 158 mg/L), alkaline (pH = 8.3 ± 0.3), and very hard (203 \pm 140 mg/L as CaCO3) water, with a few exceptions. Most of the samples collected are dominated by calcium and bicarbonate ions except for naturally softened groundwaters, which are dominated by sodium and bicarbonate ions.

Table D provides a summary of groundwater quality in 2022 with the range of values noted for various constituents of interest, bacterial concentrations and isotopic compositions. Comparisons have also been made to established drinking water guidelines as well as selected criteria, and percentage exceedances thereof.

Table D. Summary of selected groundwater parameters, assessment criteria, and % exceedances of assessment criteria

Note: SFB = slime forming bacteria; IRB = iron reducing bacteria; SRB = sulphate reducing bacteria

The presence of dissolved gases was confirmed in nine samples collected as part of the 2022 program, which yielded $CO₂$ concentrations from 1 to 22,700 ppmv and CH₄ concentrations from 26 to 44,100 ppmv. The wells yielding the highest values are as follows:

 $CO₂$:

- Land Owner 30: 12,400 ppmv
- Land Owner 1: 6070 ppmv
- Land Owner 29: 22,700 ppmv
- Land Owner 22: 18,500 ppmv

CH4:

- Land Owner 24: 44,100 ppmv
- Land Owner 30: 26 ppmv
- Land Owner 1: 56 ppmv
- Land Owner 29: 418 ppmv

No detections of ethane (C₂H₆) or H₂S were documented, suggesting a more natural origin versus a deeper hydrocarbon source. Measurements of associated δ^{13} C_{DIC} values ranged from -15.0‰ to -11.1‰ (median = -12.6‰), consistent with values expected for CO2 hydration and conversion to bicarbonate (HCO $_3$) and/or carbonate (CO $_3$ 2 \cdot) ions in mixed open and closed-system conditions (Clark and Fritz 1997).

Additional testing of eleven wells for $\delta^{34}S_{SO4}$ yielded values ranging from -9.6‰ to 2.2‰ (median = -0.3‰). The range is consistent with waters sourced from upper bedrock intervals and soils beneath central Alberta (Cheung et al. 2010; Fennell and Bentley 1998).

Figure C. Comparison of $\delta^{34}S_{504}$ and Sulphate Values

Figure C shows a comparison of $\delta^{34}S_{SO4}$ values and SO_4 concentrations. Although the data is somewhat limited (due to only a few measurements of $\delta^{34}S_{\text{SO-4}}$) the plots does show a trend towards higher $\delta^{34}S_{\text{SO4}}$ values when SO_4 concentrations are lower. This relationship is consistent with sulphate reduction and is not surprising considering the presence of sulphate-reducing bacteria in many of the wells (70% or more), as well as notable $CO₂$ and CH4 levels in some. This would also explain the elevated iron and manganese values as well, which occur in about 30 to 40% of the sampled collected. Iron- and manganesereduction reactions occurs before sulphate-reduction, which is subsequently followed by methanogenesis.

Figure D. Comparison of $\delta^{13}C_{CH4}$ and $\delta^{13}C_{CO2}$ Values.

When δ^{13} C_{CH4} and δ^{13} C_{CO2} values are compared (Figure D) a positive relationship is noted. The upward trend is consistent with $CO₂$ reduction, which is one explanation for the presence of CH4 in some of the water wells. Another is the degassing of methane from coal in the underlying bedrock deposits. It is more than likely that a combination of these two source pathways is occurring.

3.5 Data Trends

The number of sampling events that have been completed to date now allows an assessment of trends to be conducted, at least for wells with a sufficient number of readings (n = 4 or more). Of the parameters assessed the only ones to exhibit statisticallysignificant trends (at least 95% confidence and more than 10% change per year) are:

- pH (↑)
- Chloride(↓)
- Fluoride (↑)
- Nitrate (as N)(↑)
- Aluminum (1)
- Cadmium (↑)
- Copper (~)
- Lead (↓)
- Lithium (1)
- Manganese (↓)
- Phosphorous (↑)
- Silicon (↑)
- \blacksquare Tin (↑)
- Uranium (↓)
- Zinc (↓)

The arrows indicate the direction of change for each identified parameter, while the "~" symbol indicates variable trends (i.e. some increasing and some decreasing). It is important to note that each parameter trend identified is only related to a small number of wells (4 or less) and no systemic influence is obvious, particularly as it may relate to CO2 injection activities. These temporal changes are interpreted to be more a result of local well conditions than anything else.

Temporal trend charts for selected indicators (i.e. pH, TDS, Chloride, and δ^{13} CCO₂) are provided shown in Figures 9 to 12. Review of the charts indicates a general lack of change for the wells being monitored as part of this MMV program.

4 BIOSPHERE AND ATMOSPHERE MONITORING

4.1 Purpose

The 2022 soil gas monitoring program was conducted by Integrated Sustainability (to fulfill the objectives outlined on page 55 of the Alberta Energy-approved MMV Plan (Enhance 2019) with revisions as discussed in Section 1.3. The program consisted of two soil gas sampling campaigns during the summer (Q2) and fall (Q3) periods.

The overall purpose of the program was to continue defining the baseline conditions for soil gases in the Project area, identify any anomalies or departures from expected baseline conditions, and investigate the source and cause of detected anomalies using the comprehensive database of gas composition and carbon isotope data generated by Enhance since commencement of monitoring in 2019.

4.2 Monitoring Infrastructure

The soil gas probe (SGP) network consists of one or more sampling probes installed at the surface location of hydrocarbon production wells located the MMV area. The network includes:

- Thirty-two (32) existing locations.
- Eighteen (18) new locations added at the start of the summer 2021 sampling program.
- One (1) location added to the fall 2022 sampling program.

The location of the SGP locations are shown in Figure 4. The SGP network now extends across the entire Project area and is providing understanding of the spatial variability in values that can be expected.

4.3 Monitoring Activities

4.3.1 Soil Gases

Two soil gas sampling events occurred during the following months:

- Summer sampling was conducted in late-June
- Fall sampling was conducted in late-September

During both events, samples were collected from existing soil gas probes where possible, and atmospheric and blind-duplicate samples were collected for quality assurance/quality control purposes. Table E summarized the number of soil gas sample collected in 2022.

Some additional soil gas samples were collected at locations with elevated CH4 concentrations, as determined through historic data or in-situ field monitoring results, to further investigate the source and cause of those detections. Sample locations are included in the analytical schedule for soil gas samples included in Appendix 2.

Table E. Soil Gas Samples Collected

Note: * indicates the installation of additional soil gas probe

The soil gas sampling program consisted of the following activities:

- **Soil Gas Probe Sampling**
- Atmospheric Gas Sampling
- Installation of an additional Soil Gas Probe and Sampling

Soil gas sampling results are included in the following table:

Table 5 - Soil Gas Analytical Results: Menthane Isotope Abundance

Activities conducted followed Integrated Sustainability's Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) included in Appendix 2 and are summarized in the following sub-sections. Additional details relating to the lithology encountered during the soil gas probe installation by Integrated Sustainability is provided in Appendix 4.

4.3.2 Atmospheric gases

Four atmospheric gas samples were collected during each sampling program to provide information on ambient atmospheric conditions. The atmospheric samples were collected over eight hours near a SGP on the same lease area and were subject to a similar suite of analysis. Samples were collected from the following locations:

- 11-35-39-24 W4
- 12-25-39-24 W4
- 06-28-40-24 W4
- 06-08-41-24 W4

4.4 Data Evaluation

Under natural and normal conditions, soil $CO₂$ is sourced from the biological weathering and oxidation of organic carbon associated with residual plant matter or other sources of organic carbon in the soil (e.g. coal). When present, soil microbes oxidize organic matter converting it into $CO₂$ and water via the following reaction:

$$
CH_2O + O_2 \rightarrow CO_2 + H_2O
$$

As a result, soil gas CO2 concentrations can become significantly elevated compared to atmospheric values measured in the study area (median = 412 ppmv). As noted in Table F, the range of CO2 measured during the 2022 monitoring program ranged from 2,070 to 85,400 ppmv (median = 17,100 ppmv).

Methane values, on the other hand, tend not to be very high in the soil environment unless the appropriate conditions occur. Atmospheric values measured in the study area since commissioning of the MMV monitoring program have been on the order of 1.8 ppmv. When conditions are significantly anaerobic $CO₂$ can be reduced to $CH₄$ by soil microbes. This typically occurs in highly reducing environments, like organic-rich wetland areas. The following reactions describe the transformations:

$$
CH_4 + 2O_2 \rightarrow CO_2 + 2H_2O
$$

$$
CH_4 + 2H_2O \rightarrow CO_2 + 4H_2
$$

Methane that is present in the soil can also oxidize back to $CO₂$ resulting in changes in its chemical composition.

Isotopes of carbon are quite useful in determining the source of soil gas $CO₂$ and CH₄, much like the production gases and groundwater gases. Typical δ^{13} Cco₂ values for the study area are expected to be on the order of -23‰ given the type of vegetation in Alberta (Clark and Fritz 1997). In comparison, measured δ^{13} Cco₂ values in the local atmosphere yielded a median value of -8.4‰, consistent with the global atmospheric average of around -8.2‰ (NOAA, Global Monitoring Laboratory 2022).

When soil moisture is present some of the $CO₂$ will react with the water to produce carbonate (CO 3^2) and bicarbonate (HCO 3) ions, depending on the prevailing pH conditions. When this occurs δ^{13} C_{DIC} values can be expected to be around -14‰, and about a 9‰ enrichment from the source carbon (Clark and Fritz 1997).

Carbon-14 is another helpful isotope to decipher the source of soil gas CO₂ values. Measurements are often expressed as a fraction from 1 to 0, with atmospheric F14C values on the order of 1.000. The median atmospheric value measured to date in the study has been 1.003. Deeper sources of CO₂, on the other had, will tend to have very low to immeasurable F14C values because of the radioactive decay process. Given the half-life of Carbon-14 (5,730 years) the method is useful for age-dating samples that are less than 40,000 years. As such older sources of CO2, like deeper hydrocarbon gases emanating from petroleum reservoirs or coal layers, will tend to have F14C values that are below laboratory detection levels. Values measured in Leduc, Nisku, Mannville, and CBM samples submitted by Enhance thus far have generally been below laboratory detection levels (<0.002), or radioactively "dead".

Figure E. Comparison of Field-Measured Versus Lab-Measured CO2.

As part of the MMV monitoring protocol, samples of soil gases are measured both in the field and in the laboratory. These field measurements are used to guide the program and facilitate any refinements that may help with post-sampling assessment activities. Figure E shows a comparison between the field- and laboratory-measured CO₂ values, in relation to the 1:1 line. The comparison is reasonable, for the most part, with field-measured $CO₂$ tending to read higher than laboratory measurements, particularly at the more elevated concentrations.

Despite the departure between field- and lab-measured $CO₂$ values, laboratory measured values of all parameters assessment have been relied on through this report as they have been developed by experienced, certified and/or accredited laboratories. A summary of soil gas composition variability and isotopic character, as measured in 2022, is provided in Table F. The range of values, as well as the median and 95th percentile values, have been provided for context.

Table F. Summary of Soil Gas and Atmospheric Gas Composition and Isotopic Measurements for 2022 Collected Data

The spatial distribution of soil gas parameter values, both in the spring/summer (green symbols) and fall (red symbols) seasons is provided in Figures 5 to 8. Since commissioning of the MMV program it has been discovered that a seasonal trend in CO2

values occurs in the study area, with higher values typically occurring in the summer months and lower values occurring in the fall. This is consistent with more vigorous microbial respiration processes occurring during the active growing season. As such, all soil gas CO2 measurements were found to be within the expected range of natural variability.

As for soil gas CH4, only two locations yielded concentrations well in excess of atmospheric values, those being 12-25 and 14-23. The 12-25 location has historically had elevated CH4 values, and those recoded during 2022 are no different with the range being 9,780 to 23,100 ppmv. The suspected source is a nearby gas well. As for 14-23, this location has similarly yielded elevated CH4 values in the past, but at much less concentrations compared to 12-25 (i.e. 11 to 21 ppmv for breathing air analysis). Unlike the 12-25 location, the detection of CH4 at the 14-23 location has no obvious source associated with it.

Concentrations of $CO₂$ and $CH₄$ measured during the 2022 sampling programs are plotted in Figure F, along with other possible source gases responsible for the elevated values. The two identified locations have been noted.

Figure F. Soil Gas Measurements for CO2 and CH4 Versus Other Gas Sources.

Figure G shows a graph of $CO₂$ versus δ^{13} Cco₂ values for the soil gas samples collected in 2022 plus Geosphere gas samples collected as part of the program. Both the 12-25 and 14-23 locations have been highlighted in different coloured symbols for reference. What's most evident is that none of the soil gas samples exhibit δ^{13} Cco₂ values consistent with either a deeper hydrocarbon source, and more importantly the injected CO2. One exception is the 16-09 location, which is identified with a label in that figure.

Figure G. Comparison of $CO₂$ Concentrations and δ^{13} Cco₂ for Soil Gases and **Various Other Gas Samples.**

There are a number of mechanisms that can lead to anomalous $\delta^{13}C_{CO2}$ values. These include:

- Reduction of plant-derived $CO₂$ to methane by microbial processes
- CO2 reaction with soil water to form bicarbonate and/or carbonate ions
- Mixing of natural soil gases with isotopically heavier CO2 migrating up from deeper bedrock formations
- The upward migration of $CO₂$ from coal deposits or degassing of coal fragments incorporated in surficial deposits

It is important to note that the 16-09 location did not yield a CH4 value greater than baseline values, and certainly not anywhere close to the injected $CO₂ - a$ clear indication that some other source or mechanism is responsible. In fact, none of the soil gas

monitoring locations indicate δ^{13} Cco₂ values close to the injected CO₂ further supporting containment of that gas in the Leduc Formation.

Figure H shows the relationship between F14C $_{CO2}$ and δ^{13} C $_{CO2}$ values. Once again the soil gas measurements for the 12-25 and 14-23 locations have been highlighted. Also highlighted is the 16-09 location, previously identified, and one other location that stands out from the rest of the measurements (i.e. 05-36).

It is evident that the majority of soil measurement in 2022 yield $F14C_{CO2}$ and $\delta^{13}C_{CO2}$ value in the range consistent with expected baseline condition. The 12-25 and 14-23 location do, however, exhibit much lower F14Cco₂ values (i.e. <0.5) indicating an influence from an older source of CO2. The some goes for the 05-36 location, but not the 16-09 location. Regardless of this discovery, the lower F14C $_{CO2}$ values at 12-25, 14-23 and 05-36 do not align with the deeper sources gases also plotted (including the injected CO2), and neither do the δ¹³Cco₂ values. As such, a different source or mechanism is influencing the soil gases at those three locations.

Other soil gas probes \odot 12-25 \odot 14-23 \square Mannville \square Nisku \square Leduc \lozenge Injected CO2(avg.)

Figure H. Comparison of **F14C**_{CO2} and δ^{13} C_{CO2} for Soil Gases and Other **Potential Sources.**

It is clear that most of the soil gas samples exhibit F14Cco₂ fraction greater than 0.6. Those with lower values are either being influenced from a deeper, older source of gas, like the

Mannville, or from coal. Given the results described in previous section it appears that both influences may be occurring.

Assessment of the isotopic composition of the ethane fraction in hydrocarbon gases $(i.e. \delta^{13}C_2_{H6})$ has proven helpful in attributing sources related to differing formations. For example, δ^{13} C_{C2H6} values for gases originating from deeper Mannville formations have been found to be less isotopically negative than gases originating from shallower Colorado group formations (e.g. -30‰ versus -40‰). When compared to δ^{13} CcH4 measurements this can also help identify likely sources.

Figure I provides a comparison of differing source gases and the 12-25 location with measurable C2H6 fraction with measured CH4 values. Based on this assessment the likely source of CH4 values at the 12-25 location is the deeper Mannville formations.

Figure I. Comparison of $\delta^{13}C_{CH4}$ and $\delta^{13}C_{C2H6}$ to determine the source of **anomalous CH4 readings at the 12-25 location.**

4.5 Data trends

Now that a significant amount of baseline data has been collected for this MMV program a review of trends in soil gas results can be conducted. Figures 1 to 5 in Appendix 3 show four "data" assessment areas and locations of respective the SGPs. Temporal trends charts for the SGPs in each data area are also provided in Figures 13 to 16 of Appendix 3

relating to CO₂, CH₄, δ¹³C_{cO2} and F14C_{cO2}. Also included are atmospheric values and lines framing the range of baseline conditions (based on a 95% confidence interval of the respective datasets). The region has been separated into four areas (i.e. North 1, South Data, North 2, and North 3) to make the graphs more legible and decipherable.

Trends statistics have also been calculated to enhance the data evaluation process. The Mann-Kendall (Mann 1945; Kendall 1975) and Theil-Sen's slope estimator (Sen 1968; Theil 1950) methods have been used to identify statistically-significant trends and their magnitude of change. Tables G to I summarizes the results.

Table G. Filtered CO2 Trend Results, Probability > 95% and Normalized Slope >

Table H. Filtered CH4 Trend Results, Probability > 95% and Normalized Slope > ± 10%/Year

Table I. Filtered δ¹³C_{co2} Trend Results, Probability > 95% And Normalized Slope **> ± 10%/Year**

No entries for Filtered F14CCO2 Trend Results, Probability > 95% And Normalized Slope > ± 10%/Year

Most of the soil gas measurements taken since commissioning of the MMV program have remained within the defined baseline conditions, with the exception of a few locations showing concentrations of mostly CO₂ and CH₄ occasionally falling outside of established ranges. This applies mainly to 14-23, 11-26, and 12-25 in the North 1 data area and 04-01 in the South data area. Future monitoring will refine understanding of the range of natural variability and temporal changes in soil gas composition and isotopic character. So far, however, there has been no evidence of a sustained change in conditions indicating a possible influence from a CO₂ containment breach. This finding is consistent with monitoring results for the Geosphere and Hydrosphere indicating that the injected $CO₂$ is intact.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 2022 MMV monitoring program included the monitoring of various bedrock formations, local water wells, and soil gas probe (SGP) locations.

The analysis performed included gas composition (either as mole % or ppmv) including O_2 , N₂, CO₂, CH₄, and other gases, stable isotopes for carbon (δ^{13} Cco₂, δ^{13} C_{CH4}, and δ ¹³C_{C2H6}, among others), stable sulphur (δ ³⁴S of H₂S_(g) and SO₄ in water), and radiogenic carbon, as a fraction of modern carbon-14 ($F14C_{CO2}$). The following conclusions are drawn based on the data collected:

Geosphere Monitoring:

- Lack of increasing CO₂ concentrations in the overlying Nisku Formation (and other shallower bedrock intervals) indicates that the Ireton Formation caprock is structurally intact and keeping the injected $CO₂$ in place.
- Evidence provided by other bedrock monitoring wells supports the conclusion that that CO2 being injected into the Leduc Formation remains secured in that interval.
- Compositional and isotopic fingerprinting of the various bedrock formation gases has provided a useful database for forensic investigation of any anomalous groundwater and soil gas detections.

Hydrosphere Monitoring:

- Groundwater sampled from the domestic wells around the Clive EOR Project is typical of bedrock waters in Alberta, with low mineralization, alkaline conditions, and generally elevated hardness.
- No major anomalies were noted for parameters currently listed in the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality (2022). Notable exceptions include some instances of elevated iron and manganese, likely due to local well conditions (i.e. reducing).
- Many of the water wells have detectable concentrations of iron-reducing, sulphatereducing, and slime-forming bacteria. This is typical for older wells that have not been maintained by disinfection (e.g. shock chlorination).
- Dissolved gases were identified in nine samples collected in 2022, with CO₂ values as high as 22,700 ppmv and CH₄ values up to 44,100 ppmv. No detections for C_2H_6 or H₂S were made.
- The highest CH4 values was measured in Land Owner 24's well, which also had levels of SO4, Fe, and Mn below detection and a confirmed presence of sulphate-reducing bacteria. These observations, along with a δ^{13} Cco₂ value of -19‰ and δ^{13} C_{CH4} of -84‰, suggest that methanogenic conditions in that well are responsible.
- \bullet δ^{13} C_{DIC} values measured in the samples collected are consistent with natural mineralization of soil organic carbon followed by conversion of the dissolved $CO₂(g)$ to carbonate-based ions (HCO $_3$ and CO $_3$ ²). There is no evidence to support a deeper hydrocarbon influence.
- Assessment of the data collected since 2019 indicates that a number of trends in measured parameters are occurring. This, however, is only happening in a small number of wells (4 or less), with none of the parameters linking back to the CO2 injection activities. These trends are therefore believed to be an artifact of the wells themselves.

Biosphere Monitoring:

 All of SGP monitoring locations assessed in 2022, with the exception of two (12-25 and 14-23), exhibit soil gas CO₂ values within the established baseline for the area.

- Seasonal variation in soil gas $CO₂$ levels is evident, and expected, with higher values occurring during the spring/summer months. Increased soil respiration processes during the active growing season are the likely reason.
- The source of anomalous CO2 and CH4 values at the 12-25 locations is still believed to be linked to gas originating from the Lower Mannville formations. This is based on the gas composition and isotopic evidence gathered to date.
- The source of anomalous CH4 at the 14-23 locations is less clear, but from a previous δ ¹³C_{CH4} measurement (-69.4‰) it is more aligned with a biogenic source or gas originating from local coal as opposed to a deeper hydrocarbon source.
- Assessment of data shows that most SGP locations are exhibiting naturally fluctuating conditions. Of the locations identified with statistically-significant trends, most are showing declining $CO₂$ levels, and a small number (three) are exhibiting slight increases in CH4 levels (<0.5 ppmv/year). With respect to isotopes, an increasing δ ¹³Cco₂ trend is evident at the 12-25 location (3‰/year), while no trends are noted for $F14C_{CO2}$.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2022 field program marks the fourth year of soil gas and groundwater sampling in support of Enhance's Clive MMV plan. Based on results obtained to date the following suggestions are provided to ensure timely detection of any anomalies that might be linked to $CO₂$ injection:

- Future expansions of the program should target an average of two to three baseline soil gas sampling locations per section of MMV area added. This will provide the necessary spatial assessment to capture the range of natural variability in gases and help identify any anomalies that may occur in the future.
- Continued sampling for dissolved gases and their related carbon isotopes in water wells around the project is recommended to provide the necessary information to decouple project-related effects from natural conditions.
- Detections of H2S during the soil gas or groundwater sampling programs should be confirmed with stable sulphur isotopes to determine the possible source and cause. This will require a suitable concentration of free phase H_2S gas. If the H_2S concentrations are too low to facilitate a suitable sample collection, assessment of the shallow groundwater for $\delta^{34}S_{SO4}$ would help resolve these detections.
- Continued analysis of gas samples from hydrocarbon production wells in the MMV area for gas composition and isotopic character would be beneficial to frame the range of variability and assist with source attribution efforts (when, or if, needed).
- Soil gas sampling programs are recommended to switch to the GEM5000 or similar for the collection of field measured soil gas concentrations. This is due of the frequency of malfunction of the Los Gatos Ultraportable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer (UGGA) requiring repair service during the 2019, 2021 and 2022 field programs. During the

periods of equipment malfunction, a suitable backup has not been available. The GEM5000 was used successful during the 2021 and 2022 field programs providing an accurate identification of locations with increased methane concentrations. The range of methane analysis for the instruments is as follows:

- − **GEM5000**: 0% to 100% by volume and measures methane concentrations as low as 0.1%. Accuracy is +/-0.3% within the 0%-5% range. That means it can measure from approximately 1000 ppm to 1,000,000 ppm and the accuracy is +/- 3000 ppm below 50,000 ppm.
- UGGA: 0 to 500 ppm by volume and measures methane concentrations as low as 0.001 ppm.

While range of measurement for methane is reduced when using the GEM5000 the laboratory measurements are unchanged with a detection limit of 1 ppm and represent the primary method of data analysis.

7 CLOSURE

Integrated Sustainability would like to thank Enhance Energy Inc. for the opportunity to support the Clive CO₂ injection MMV program. We trust that this report meets your needs and expectations. If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Integrated Sustainability

Principal Hydrogeologist & Geochemist

Ian Grant, M.Sc., P.Geo Senior Hydrogeologist

8 REFERENCES

Cheung K., Klassen P., Mayer B., Goodarzi F., and Aravena R. (2010). Major ion and isotope geochemistry of fluids and gases from coalbed methane and shallow groundwater wells in Alberta, Canada. Applied Geochemistry, 25, p. 1307 – 1329.

Clark, I. and Fritz, P., 1997. Environmental Isotopes in Hydrogeology. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, ISBN 1-56670-249-6, 343 pp.

Enhance Energy Inc., 2019. Clive Leduc Field Monitoring, Measurement & Verification Plan. Prepared for the Alberta Energy Regulator, 109 pp.

Fennell J. and Bentley L.R., 1998. Distribution of sulphate and organic carbon in a prairie till setting: Natural versus industrial sources. Water Resources Research, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 1781-1794.

Global Monitoring Laboratory. 2022. The Data: What 13C Tells Us. The Global View. Retrieved from:<https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/isotopes/c13tellsus.html>

Golder Associated Ltd., 2021a. 2019/2020 Clive Soil Gas Baseline Report: Enhance Clive CO2 Enhanced Oil Recovery Project. Submitted to Enhance Energy Inc., March 12, 2021, 65 pp.

Golder Associated Ltd., 2021b. 2019/2020 Groundwater Baseline Report: Enhance Clive CO2 Enhanced Oil Recovery Project. Submitted to Enhance Energy Inc., March 23, 2021, 23 pp.

Jones D., Gordon S., Mayer B., Hitz M., and Blyth A., 2009. The Free Gas Sampling Standard Operating Procedure for Baseline Water Well Testing. Prepared for Alberta Research Council Inc. for Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, March 31, 2009

Kendall M.G. (1975). Rank Correlation Methods 4th ed. Charles Griffin, London.

Mann H.B. (1945). Nonparametric tests against trend. Econometrica 13 pp. 245-259.

Muehlenbachs K. and Rowe, D., 1999. Isotopic fingerprints of shallow gases in the Western Canadian sedimentary basin: tools for remediation of leaky heavy oil wells. Organic Geochemistry, 30, pp. 861-871.

Sen P.K. (1968). Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall's tau. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc., 63 pp. 1379-1389.

Theil H. (1950). A rank-invariant method of linear and polynomial regression analysis. Proc. Koninalijke Nederlandse Akademie Van Wetenschatpen A53 part 3, pp. 1397-1412.

Tables

CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: B

Enhance Energy **Date: February 9, 2022**

CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: B

Enhance Energy **Date: February 9, 2022**

CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: B

Enhance Energy **Date: February 9, 2022**

CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: B

Enhance Energy **Date: February 9, 2022**

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. **Date:** 09-Feb-23 Rev: A Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Table 1B: Water Analytical Results: General, Major Ions and Nutrients

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. **Date:** 09-Feb-23 Rev: A Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Table 1B: Water Analytical Results: General, Major Ions and Nutrients

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. **Date:** 09-Feb-23 Rev: A Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Table 1B: Water Analytical Results: General, Major Ions and Nutrients

Table 1B: Water Analytical Results: General, Major Ions and Nutrients

Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Client Name: Enhance Energy **Project Manager:** Emily Guzman **Prover Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Date: February 9, 2023 Rev #:** A

Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 **Date:** February 9, 2023

Client Name: Enhance Energy **Project Manager:** Emily Guzman **Prover Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Date: February 9, 2023 Rev #:** A

Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 **Example 2018** February 9, 2023

Client Name: Enhance Energy **Project Manager:** Emily Guzman **Prover Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Date: February 9, 2023 Rev #:** A

Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 **Date:** February 9, 2023

Client Name: Enhance Energy **Project Manager:** Emily Guzman **Prover Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 Date: February 9, 2023 Rev #:** A Project Number: CP22-EEI-22-00 **Date:** February 9, 2023

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project Number: CP22-EEI-01-00

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project: CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: A

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc.

Date February 9, 2023

UL2 - Development 7-Oct-19 - - - - - - UL2 - Development 22-Jul-20 9000 - 27000 - 27000 - 27000 UL2 - Development 22-Jul-20 2200 - - < 1 - - UL2 - Development 27-Oct-20 2200 Present Absent < 1 - - UL2 - Development 15-Jun-21 - - - - - - UL2 - Development 5-Oct-21 2200 - 115000 - 440000 High

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project: CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: A

Date February 9, 2023

Landowner 3 **6-Oct-21** 2200 - < 1 - 13000 Medium

Client Name: Enhance Energy Inc. Project: CP22-EEI-01-00 Rev: A

Notes 1. - in detail data row(s) denotes parameter not analyzed.

Figures

Saved: 2/28/2023 8:03:51 AM

Saved: 2/28/2023 8:07:03 AM

Saved: 2/28/2023 8:07:23 AM

CO2_Spring_and_Fall_2022_Rev0.mxd,

Saved: 2/28/2023 8:07:47 AM

Notes:

Notes:

Notes:

Notes:

Appendices

Appendix 1: Additional Gas Analysis

André E. Lalonde AMS Laboratory Radiocarbon Laboratory www.ams.uottawa.ca **Analysis Report**

Isotope Analysis Summary

Isotope Analysis Summary

Operator: Enhance Energy Analyst: Karlis Muehlenbachs, U of A 780-492-2827

Sulphur Isotope Summary

Operator: Enhance Energy **Analyst: S. Taylor** Analyst: S. Taylor

Appendix 2: Program Methodology & Sampling Schedules

HYDROSPHERE SAMPLING

The following procedures were conducted while sampling the Project monitoring wells:

- 1) Measurement of water level within each monitoring well
- 2) Water intake for bladder pump placed at mid-point of well screen and purged at low flow. Water quality parameters and water level readings recorded
- 3) Upon stabilization of water quality parameters, representative water sample collected using clean sampling methods and field filtration, where necessary
- 4) Chemical preservatives were added, where necessary, and water samples were placed in ice-filled contained for transport to laboratory

The following procedures were conducted while sampling landowner water wells. Further details are provided in Appendix 1.

- 1) Suitable connection point, upstream of any water treatment systems, was located and used for sample collection.
- 2) Water was purged through a FT gas separator unit for approximately 20 minutes and discharged to the ground, or as directed by landowners. Water quality parameters were monitored and recorded during purging.
- 3) Upon stabilization of water quality parameters, a representative water sample was collected using clean sampling methods and field filtration, where necessary.
- 4) Using the FT unit, any observed gas released from solution was collected with a Tedlar® sampling bag and sent for analysis following the Alberta Research Council guideline (Jones et. al. 2009).
- 5) Chemical preservatives were added, where necessary, and water samples placed in ice-filled contained for transport to laboratory.

Groundwater samples from Enhance's three Project monitoring wells were collected using a low flow sampling method, reducing the need for large purge volumes.

Sample Processing & Laboratory Analysis

Once collected, groundwater samples were placed in coolers with ice and shipped to AGAT Laboratories in Red Deer, Alberta on the same day they were sampled. Where necessary, AGAT distributed samples to additional third-party laboratories following similar Chain of Custody procedures.

Tables A and B summarizes where various samples were shipped. Where gas was observed in sufficient volumes in the FT gas separator, free gas samples collected in Tedlar® sampling bags were submitted for analysis of gas composition from AGAT, and dissolved gas samples collected in septum vials were submitted for analysis of gas composition from the University of Calgary.

Table B Gas in Groundwater Sample Laboratory Analysis

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)

Following sample collection, standard Chain of Custody procedures were followed for sample preservation and transportation to an accredited third-party laboratory.

To verify the integrity of results, QA/QC measures taken include:

- Collection of blind-duplicate samples, representing 10% of overall samples
- Analysis of laboratory ion balance, with a general acceptable limit of ±10%
- Calculation of the Relative Percent Difference (RPD) between sample and blindduplicate results, with an acceptable limit of ±20%

BIOSPHERE SAMPLING

Soil Gas Probe Installation and Sampling

Prior to installation of the temporary soil gas probe, a ground disturbance sweep was conducted through Alberta One-Call to identify and avoid underground facilities or infrastructure.

The temporary soil gas probe was installed using a drive point piezometer, fitted with a screen. The piezometers were installed at a depth of approximately 1.5 mbgs. Using Integrated Sustainability's SOP for Soil Gas Probe Installation, the following procedure was conducted.

- 1) Dutch auger used to excavate soil to intended depth
- 2) Probe with suitable sample tubing was placed at depth
- 3) Probe tip and screen were backfilled using filter sand
- 4) Alternating layers of bentonite chips and filter sand used for remaining backfill

Following installation of the piezometer and screen:

- 1) Installation of a compression fitting and ball valve onto sample tubing
- 2) Leak check of soil gas probe using helium to verify subsurface installation and surface connections are sealed

In the summer and fall sample programs, methane $[CH₄]$ and carbon dioxide $[CO₂]$ in soil gases were monitored in-situ pre- and post-sample using a Los Gatos Ultraportable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer (UGGA).

During the summer and fall sampling program, the UGGA experienced a major failure, necessitating the use of a Landtec GEM5000 gas analyzer as backup and in conjunction with the UGGA for the remainder of the program. The GEM5000 range for methane is 0% to 100% by volume and measures methane concentrations as low as 0.1%. Accuracy is +/-0.3% within the 0%-5% range. That means it can measure from approximately 1000 ppm to 1,000,000 ppm and the accuracy is +/- 3000 ppm below 50,000 ppm.

Using Integrated Sustainability's SOP for Soil Gas Sampling, the following procedure was conducted.

- 1) Well purged using gas analyzer. Continuous in-situ gas readings observed and recorded
- 2) Upon stable readings, gas sample was collected using pre-evacuated SUMMA cannisters, pre-evacuated Bottle-Vac® amber glass bottles, or Tedlar® sampling bag
- 3) Post-sample in-situ gas reading recorded

The temporary soil gas probe installed at 08-09-040-24 W4M was removed after sampling.

Table C summarizes the laboratories that completed soil gas analysis collected for the Project.

Table C Soil Gas Laboratory Analysis

Sample Analysis

Soil gases were sampled and analyzed for trace gas composition, hydrocarbon content, stable isotope composition, and radioactive isotope composition. Samples for trace gas composition and hydrocarbon content analysis were conducted by AGAT Laboratories, where the following parameters were included:

- **Dxygen**
- Nitrogen
- Methane
- **Carbon Monoxide**
- **Carbon Dioxide**
- **Volatile Non-Methane Hydrocarbons**
- **•** Volatile Halogenated Hydrocarbons
- \blacksquare C₁ to C₆ Hydrocarbons

Samples for stable carbon isotope analysis were conducted by Dr. Karlis Muehlenbachs (1999) at the University of Alberta, where analysis included the carbon-13 content of CO2 $(\delta^{13}C_{CO2})$ and CH₄ $(\delta^{13}C_{CH4})$.

Samples for radioactive carbon isotope analysis were conducted by the Andre E. Lalonde AMS Laboratory at the University of Ottawa, where analysis included the carbon-14 content of CO2 (and where possible CH4) through a fraction of modern radiocarbon.

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)

Following sample collection, standard Chain of Custody procedures were followed for sample preservation and transportation to AGAT Laboratories in Red Deer, Alberta. Where necessary, AGAT distributed soil gas samples to additional third-party laboratories following similar Chain of Custody procedures. Samples collected in the fall or radiocarbon analysis were transported directly to the third-party lab.

To verify the integrity of results, the following QA/QC measures taken include:

- Collection of five blind-duplicate samples, representing 8% to 9% of overall samples.
- Comparing in-situ soil gas concentrations to laboratory results to confirm accuracy and precision of field measurements and laboratory results.
- **Conducting helium leak checks to verify well integrity prior to collection of soil gas.**
- Collection of atmospheric gas samples to verify ambient gas concentrations and compare to soil gas results.

SOIL AND GROUNDWATER ANALYTICAL SCHEDULES

The following tables provide a listing of groundwater and soil gas probe locations investigated during the spring/summer and fall 2022 sampling campaigns, including the types of analysis to be performed.

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. **Project Number:** CP22-EI-01-00 **Date:** March 21, 2023 Rev: 1

2022 Fall Groundwater Sampling Analytical Schedule

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. **Project Number:** CP22-EI-01-00 **Date:** March 21, 2023 Rev: 1

2022 Soil Gas Sampling Analytical Schedule

Client Name: Enhance Energy Ltd. Project Number: CP22-EI-01-00 Rev: 1

Date: March 21, 2023

Total 38 \sim 38 \sim 38 \sim 38 \sim 38 \sim 4 \sim 4 \sim

GE-SOP-0018: SOIL GAS PROBE INSTALLATION

PURPOSE OF TASK

This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) provides guidelines for the manual installation of a soil gas probe with two methods:

- Method A installation with an auger
- Method B installation with a drive point hammer

Employers must ensure that workers are trained and experienced in completing this task. Soil gas probes may be installed in unconsolidated or consolidated material if the well annuls can be sealed.

Soil gas samples should not be collected if groundwater has entered the sampling equipment, as this may damage the analysis equipment and invalidate the soil gas sample collected. Therefor soil gas probes should be installed above the observed or expected static groundwater elevation. If groundwater is encountered while drilling, the probe location should be properly abandoned and an alternate location should be selected.

REQUIRED MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

- 1) Manual slide hammer for drive point piezometer
- 2) Drive point piezometer tip and screen
- 3) Riser extensions and couplings to reach the required depth of the piezometer.
	- Piezometer screens and extensions referred to as "casing"
- 4) ¼" Piezometer tubing (length suitable to reach the required depth and extend above ground surface). Teflon tubing suitable for soil sampling should be used. Silicon tubing should be avoided where possible.
	- Referred to as "tubing"
- 5) Wrench to tighten drive point piezometer, swage lock nut and bolts
- 6) Drive head by-pass assembly for drive point piezometer
	- Includes: drive head, drive extension and tubing by-pass
- 7) Piezometer drive hammer
- 8) ¼" Ball valve (Brass or stainless steel are suitable)
- 9) ¼" Swage locks (Brass or stainless steel are suitable)

GE-SOP-000XX Page 1 of 4 Rev B 18 October 2021

- 10) 10-20 filter sand
- 11) Bentonite chips or pellets
- 12) Large water container (to hydrate bentonite)
- 13) Helium gas with discharge fitting
- 14) Helium detector
- 15) Helium shroud
- 16) Dutch auger, handle, and extension
- 17) Shovel
- 18) Well Casing (Road Box)

OPTION A STANDARD WORK PROCEDURE: DUTCH AUGER

Steps to complete this task are as follows:

- 1) Verify all ground disturbance sweeps have been completed and verify that the ground disturbance permitting is valid for the selected drilling location. Drill only in the location identified within the ground disturbance permit.
- 2) The location of the soil probe will be installed where all ground disturbance specifications are met and meet all requirements (e.g. minimum distance from any pipelines in the area)
- 3) Place the corkscrew tip of the auger on the ground surface and press firmly on the handles.
- 4) While pressing down, rotate the handles in a clockwise motion.
- 5) Continue this until the top of the auger head is at ground surface (should have descended approximately 6")
- 6) Pull the auger straight up to remove soil. Replace in the borehole and continue to auger to the proposed installation depth.
- 7) Record the depth range and describe the soil sample as completely as possible (grain size distribution, colour, odour, oxidation/mineralization, plasticity, stiffness, etc.)
- 8) Drop the tape measure into the hole to verify the true depth of the hole and evaluate for sloughed material.
- 9) If auger refusal is reached, move over approximately 50 cm and reattempt the hole. Do not log the soil until the original depth of refusal is reached. If refusal occurs again, make a note in the field notebook (refusal may be the result of bedrock). If not, continue logging the hole (as refusal was likely the result of a large piece of gravel). At least 3 attempts should be made at each location. Confirm with project requirements if a shallower borehole is acceptable. If possible, install using the drive point hammer at the point of refusal (Option B).

- 10) Measure and cut the piezometer tubing to the proposed installation depth, plus an additional 0.5 m (2 ft)
- 11) Loosen the compression fitting, insert the piezometer tubing with the ferrules into the drive point screen, and tighten 1/4 turn past finger tight to properly secure the tubing in the fitting.
- 12) Hold the tubing to prevent it from turning, slide the extensions over the tubing and tighten it firmly onto the piezometer drive point screen.
- 13) Slide a coupling over the tubing and tighten firmly onto the previous extension pipe and tighten, slide the next extension pipe over the tubing and tighten securely to the other end of the coupling and tighten. Repeat until the desired length has been achieved. The piezometer extension should end below ground surface so the road box may be placed over the well.
- 14) Place piezometer set up in the hole and hold straight, the top of the extension pipe shall be flush with the ground surface.
- 15) Backfill the screened portion of the drive point piezometer tip with the 10-20 filter sand at least 10 cm above the screened portion of the piezometer to facilitate unimpeded flow of soil gasses into the piezometer. The remainder of the pilot hole is to be backfilled with alternating layers of bentonite chips and 10-20 filter sand. This is to prevent short-circuiting of atmospheric air to the piezometer.
- 16) Continue to installation of ball valve and fittings section.

OPTION B STANDARD WORK PROCEDURE: DRIVE POINT PIEZOMETER

Steps to complete this task are as follows:

- 1) Verify all ground disturbance sweeps have been completed and verify that the ground disturbance permitting is valid for the selected drilling location. Drill only in the location identified within the ground disturbance permit.
- 2) The location of the soil probe will be installed where all ground disturbance specifications are met and meet all requirements (e.g. minimum distance from any pipelines in the area)
- 3) Measure and cut the piezometer tubing to the proposed installation depth, plus an additional 0.5 m (2 ft)
- 4) Loosen the compression fitting, insert the piezometer tubing with the ferrules into the drive point screen, and tighten 1/4 turn past finger tight to properly secure the tubing in the fitting.
- 5) Hold the tubing to prevent it from turning, slide the extensions over the tubing and tighten it firmly onto the piezometer drive point screen.
- 6) Thread the tubing through the drive head by-pass assembly and place on top screw on to the piezometer casing and tighten to finger tight.

- 7) Slide the manual slide hammer over the drive head and hammer the device until approximately 15 cm (6") of the extension pipe below the tubing bypass remains above the ground.
- 8) Remove the hammer and remove the drive head assembly, hold the tubing to prevent it from turning.
- 9) Slide a coupling over the tubing and tighten firmly onto the previous extension pipe, slide the next extension pipe over the tubing and tighten securely.
- 10) Repeat steps 5 to 8 till the sampling depth has been reached.
- 11) Continue to installation of ball valve and fittings section.

INSTALLATION OF BALL VALVE AND FITTINGS

- 1) Wrap all threads of the fittings with Teflon tape and connect and tighten all parts of the fitting assembly, swage lock-ball valve-swage lock.
- 2) Loosen and remove the nut and ferrule of one end of the fitting, and slide the nut and ferrule assembly on to the sampling tube.
- 3) Place the sampling tube to connect to the ball valve fitting, and tighten the nut and ferrule to the fitting assembly, tighten 1-1/4 turn past finger tight.
- 4) The setup will be leak checked with helium gas to verify there is no short-circuiting of atmospheric air into the gas line through the fittings at surface or through the well annulus.
- 5) Install the service box (flush mount) over the casing and fill void spaces with native material or bentonite.
- 6) The brass valve assembly will remain in the well casing for protection, when placing the fitting and sampling tube within the casing, make sure the sampling tube does not get bent or kinked.
- 7) The casing will be labeled with the location ID and GPS coordinates recorded for future sampling.

LEAK CHECK WITH HELIUM GAS

- 1) The helium shroud should have at least 3 valve connections:
- 2) 1 connection with 1/4" tubing to connect to the fitting assembly of the soil gas well
- 3) 1 connection open to the bucket
- 4) 1 connection to inject helium gas
- 5) All fittings should be equipped with masterflex tubing to use with the helium detector wand.
- 6) Loosen the nut and ferrule assembly from the fitting assembly on the outflow end of the ball valve.
- 7) Slide the nut and ferrule assembly to the ¼" tubing of the helium shroud, and connect to the fitting assembly, tighten 1-1/4 turn past finger tight.

GE-SOP-000XX Page 4 of 4 Rev B 18 October 2021

- 8) Open the valve and place the helium shroud over the sampling port, all fittings should be within the helium shroud. Verify all valves on the helium shroud are closed.
- 9) Using the helium detector measure the following parameters:
- 10) Measure and record the atmospheric helium values
- 11) Place the helium detector wand into the masterflex tubing for the connection to the soil gas well, open the valve measure and record the helium values, and close the valve.
- 12) Place the helium detector wand into the masterflex tubing for the connection to the bucket, open the valve measure and record the helium values, and close the valve.
- 13) Place the helium gas cannister discharge to the helium gas injection fitting of the helium shroud. Verify the sampling port and bucket fittings are closed, open the helium injection fitting valve and discharge helium into the fitting. A 1-2 second burst of helium is sufficient to detect a leak in the fitting. Close the valve.
- 14) Using the helium detector measure the following parameters:
- 15) Measure and record the atmospheric helium values
- 16) Place the helium detector wand into the masterflex tubing for the connection to the soil gas well, open the valve measure and record the helium values, and close the valve.
- 17) Place the helium detector wand into the masterflex tubing for the connection to the bucket, open the valve measure and record the helium values, and close the valve.
- 18) The helium detector should pick up values of helium in the bucket, and the readings to the soil gas well should not detect any helium.
- 19) If helium is detected in the soil gas well, check and re-tighten all fittings and repeat steps 1 through 7
- 20) If helium is detected in the soil gas well, after checking and re-tightening all fittings, the fitting assembly may be compromised, and a new fitting assembly may be required to be installed. Assemble a new fitting and re-test
- 21) If the helium detector does not pick up helium values from the soil gas well, but helium is detected in the bucket, the fitting assembly is deemed leak proof.
- 22) Remove the ¼" tubing from the fitting assembly, re-connect the nut and install a new ferrule for future sampling, and place the assembly in the well casing.
- 23) Place the cover on the well casing, and tighten bolts to verify the casing is sealed.

Purpose: To provide information on standard work practices.

GE-SOP-0006: MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION

PURPOSE OF TASK

The purpose of this procedure is to describe the methods for a groundwater monitoring well installation. It describes designs, procedures, and materials that are used to construct a monitoring well that will produce accurate groundwater level measurements and representative groundwater samples.

REQUIRED MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

- Monitoring well construction materials: casing, screen, sand (filter) pack and seal materials
- Measuring tape
- Water level tape
- Soil sampling equipment (see GE-SOP-0004 for further requirements)
- Sample trays or vials
- Field log book (including borehole logging forms)

STANDARD WORK PROCEDURE

Requirements for monitoring well installations are site-specific, and will depend on the soil, bedrock and groundwater conditions encountered in the field, the goals of the investigation program, and the availability and limitations of drilling equipment and installation materials.

Clients may also have monitoring well specifications that differ from the design specifications presented in this procedure. It is up to the field hydrogeologist to ensure design specifications meet both client and regulatory requirements.

Monitoring Well Design

The following are general guidelines for installation of monitoring wells that have been drilled in overburden (soils) or shallow bedrock. Before drilling begins, the conceptual well design and drilling method should be identified and reviewed by a qualified hydrogeologist to determine whether deviations from these general guidelines are appropriate.

Monitoring well design (including well depth and screen length) should be determined based on geological and hydrogeological site observation, objectives of the groundwater sampling

GE-SOP-0006 Page 1 of 4 Rev 0

program and presence of DNAPL/LNAPL. Nested monitoring wells may be installed to monitor several depth intervals within an aquifer.

Typical monitoring well designs include (but are not limited to):

- Water table wells (screened across the water table) including anticipated seasonal fluctuations.
- Well screens (up to 1.5 m in length) installed below the water table, but across, within or at the base of a water-bearing zone.

The steps involved in a monitoring well installation include:

Plan and prepare for drilling and monitoring well installation (see also GE-SOP-0006)

- Review the drilling and sampling plan, as well as any relevant information pertaining to subsurface conditions at the planned drilling locations, such as soil and groundwater conditions, type, degree and extent of contamination.
- Determine the appropriate type of drilling rig, soil sample collection and well installations.
- Plan the design of each monitoring well installation, based on the conceptual site model and objectives of the sampling/monitoring program.
- **Perform ground disturbance procedures (i.e. utility locates).**
- Prepare HSE Management Plan (as required) and Waste Management Plan (as required).
- **Schedule and book drilling contractor. Confirm expected subsurface conditions,** depths of monitoring well installations and estimated quantities/types of materials that should be brought to site, including:
	- Type and length of casing & type and length of screen
	- End-caps or j-plugs
	- Sand and sealing material
	- Cement (if required)
	- Flush-mount or stick-up protective surface completions
	- Supply of potable water (whether provided by client or by drilling contractor)

Perform ground disturbance (utility locates)

- Mark all borehole locations so that ground disturbance can be undertaken.
- Clear sub-surface and above-ground utilities (e.g. power lines) prior to starting drilling program.
- Ensure sufficient clearance between drilling mast and overhead power lines. Minimum safe work distances for each province shall be used.
- Manual (hand) or vac truck excavation may be required prior to commencing drilling.

Standard Operating Procedure

 If the planned borehole location(s) interferes with utilities, an alternative location should be selected and cleared.

Drill the borehole and collect/log the soil samples

- Commence drilling of the borehole. As drilling advances, samples brought to the surface should be examined, logged and representative samples collected for screening and/or laboratory analysis (as required).
- A borehole log should be filled in as completely as possible. All depths should be measured to metres below ground surface (mbgs). Information should include, but not be limited to:
	- Site identification and borehole numbers
	- Type of rig used, casing or auger diameter, bit type (if applicable) and rate of advance
	- Depth (intervals) from which samples were collected and a description of each sample (see borehole log form)
	- Moisture content of the sample immediately upon recovery
	- Any significant groundwater observation
- See also GE-SOP-0017 for additional work procedures with respect to soil drilling and sample collection.

Design the monitoring well

- Consult with a qualified hydrogeologist to determine the final design for the monitoring well, including:
	- Length of the screen interval
	- Interval of the screened section (based on borehole lithology)
	- Sand pack interval (minimum depth of sand pack)

Install the monitoring well (screen and unscreened intervals)

- The monitoring well (casing, screen and bottom cap) should be lowered into the borehole until it reaches the bottom of the borehole (at its design depth).
- Measure the height of the well casing above the ground to the nearest cm and record it in the field log book.

Note: Determine the zone with the most moisture for screen placement. Rule of thumb is to place the middle of the screen within the wettest zone. Never have a screen or sand pack cross multiple lithology units.

Note: If the borehole has sloughed in substantially, have the drill operator go back into the borehole and attempt a clean-out. If the borehole is open to the bottom, determine if the borehole needs to be backfilled to capture the screened interval. If backfilling is required, backfill with bentonite or sand. Backfill with sand if the bottom of the borehole is in the same unit as the screened interval. If the borehole needs to be backfilled

Standard Operating Procedure

through multiple lithologies, use bentonite. When backfilling with bentonite, stop about 0.3 m from the bottom of the desired screen depth. Use sand to backfill the final 0.3m to the bottom of the screen. This prevents damage to the screen.

Install the sand (filter) pack and annular seal materials

- Calculate the volume of sand material needed to fill the annulus to the required height.
- **Ensure the monitoring well is centered in the borehole.**
- Measure the depth to the bottom of the hole and record the measurement. Keep the measuring tape in the hole while adding the filter sand.
- Pour filter sand in slowly to avoid bridging the annulus until the required amount of sand has been added (approximately 0.3 to 0.5 m above the top of the screen).
- Measure and record final depth to the top of the sand pack when finished.
- The seal material should be placed in the same manner as the filter sand.
- Calculate the volume of seal material required to provide a seal length of approximately 0.6 to 1 m above the sand pack.
- Measure and record final depth to the top of the seal material when finished.

Place fill above seal (if appropriate)

 If the top of the seal does not correspond to the ground surface, the remainder of the annular space should be sealed to within 0.5 m of ground surface using either cement, a bentonite grout slurry or uncontaminated material from the site (as appropriate).

Install the surface seal and protective casing

- The upper 0.5 m of the borehole should be sealed to prevent surface water from entering the borehole.
- An appropriate surface casing (e.g. a lockable stick-up completion or flush mounted surface casing) should be installed based on site conditions.

Survey the monitoring well location.

 All monitoring wells at the site should be surveyed in to measure elevation of the ground surface and top of well casing at each well location. Well surveys should be accurate to within 0.1 cm (i.e. GPS coordinates are not accurate enough).

Troubleshooting

 Contact project manager or senior hydrogeologist if there are issues with the borehole sloughing in or the annulus bridges during well construction.

REFERENCES

USEPA, 1996. Standard Operating Procedures 2048 – Monitor Well Installation.

GE-SOP-0006 Page 4 of 4 Rev 0

Purpose: To provide information on standard operating procedure.

GE-SOP-000X: SOIL GAS SAMPLING

PURPOSE OF TASK

This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) provides guidelines for the sampling of soil gas (methane, and carbon dioxide) in-situ using a Los Gatos Ultraportable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer (GGA) and collecting samples with pre-evacuated (SUMMA) cannisters and/or Wheaton bottle samples.

REQUIRED MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

- 1) Tedlar Bags
- 2) Summa Cannister and/or Glass bottle samples
- 3) Vacuum Gauge
- 4) Flow Regulator
- 5) Los Gatos Ultraportable Greenhouse Gas Analyzer (GGA)
	- VNC application on phone or tablet to view readings
	- Connect wifi signal to GGA on tablet or phone
	- VNC application configure to connect to the GGA
- 6) ¼" diameter Teflon tubing
- 7) $9/16"$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ " wrenches
- 8) Chameleon fitting for Glass sample bottles
- 9) Chain of Custody paper work (COC)
- 10) Field notebook

STANDARD WORK PROCEDURE FOR SOIL GAS SAMPLING

Employers must ensure that workers are trained and experienced in completing this task. Steps to complete this task are as follows:

Soil Gas Sample Collection with Summa Cannister

1) Inspect Summa Cannister to check for mechanical integrity. Verify the vacuum in the cannister is greater than 25 in Hg with the vacuum gauges, if the cannister vacuum is less than 25 in Hg, ambient air may have leaked into the cannister, and the sample may be compromised.

Standard Operating Procedure

- 2) Confirm the Summa cannister valve is closed
- 3) Remove the brass cap and attach the gauge
- 4) Attach brass cap to the side of gauge tee fitting to ensure a closed train.
- 5) Open and close valve quickly (seconds) and read vacuum on the gauge. Record the initial vacuum reading and Summa cannister serial number in field notebook/notes
- 6) Verify the cannister valve is closed
- 7) Attach the ¼" Teflon tubing to the existing soil gas sampling fitting on the outlet side of the valve, the Teflon tubing should be attached to the fitting with a compression fitting and nut. The compression fitting should be tightened to the manufacturers specification (ex. 1-1/4 turn for Swagelock branded compression fittings)
- 8) The Teflon tubing will be connected to the GGA, and open the valve of the soil sampling fitting
- 9) Purge the sampler of stagnant air through the GGA. The methane and carbon dioxide concentrations will be monitored till the stable concentrations are read, typically within 1 to 3 minutes
- 10) Record all concentrations in the field notebook and/or field sheets
- 11) Once stable concentrations have been read and recorded, close the valve of the soil sampling fitting and disconnect the 1/4" Teflon tubing from the GGA, and connect the tubing to the flow regulator and vacuum gauge of the Summa cannister with a compression fitting and nut. The compression fitting should be tightened to the manufacturers specification (ex. 1-1/4 turn for Swagelock branded compression fittings) The SUMMA Cannister shall remain closed.
- 12) If using a flow controller, set the flow controller to the specifications of the Summa cannister.
- 13) Open the valve from the soil gas sampling fitting
- 14) Open the valve to the Summa cannister to begin collecting the soil gas sample
- 15) Monitor the vacuum gauge on the Summa cannister, and close the valve when the gauge is reading between -5 in Hg and -3 in Hg (unless otherwise instructed by the laboratory)
- 16) Close the valve from the soil gas sampling fitting
- 17) Disconnect the ¼" tubing from the Summa cannister, and record all readings
- 18) Record the final vacuum of the cannister in the field notebook/notes
- 19) Fill out cannister sample tag and verify the sample tag matches what is recorded on the COC.
- 20) Return the cannister to the box and fill out the COC.
- 21) Repeat steps 1 through 21 if collecting additional Summa cannister samples

Page 2 of 4 \vert Rev B 02 Sep 2021

Standard Operating Procedure

22) If collecting additional samples using the glass sample bottles, continue to step 23

Soil Gas Sample Collection with Glass Sample Bottle

- 23) Inspect glass sample bottle and microvalve fitting to check for mechanical integrity. Verify the vacuum in the cannister is greater than 25 in Hg with the microvalve vacuum gauge, if the cannister vacuum is less than 25 in Hg, ambient air may have leaked into the cannister, and the sample may be compromised
- 24) Connect the female end of the microvalve vacuum gauge to the microvalve fitting on the glass sample bottle and record the initial vacuum reading and glass sample bottle serial number in the field notebook/notes.
- 25) Attach the ¼" Teflon tubing from the outlet end of the soil gas sampling fitting to the inlet end of the Chameleon fitting
- 26) Connect the female microvalve connection end of the Chameleon to the male end of the microvalve on the glass sampling bottle
- 27) Open the valve from the soil gas sampling fitting to begin sampling
- 28) Monitor the vacuum gauge on the Chameleon fitting, and disconnect the fitting when the vacuum gauge reads 0 in Hg (unless otherwise stated by the laboratory)
- 29) Close the valve from the soil gas sampling fitting
- 30) Record the final vacuum of the glass sample bottle in the field notebook/notes
- 31) Fill out glass sample bottle tag and verify the sample tag matches what is recorded on the COC
- 32) Return the glass sample bottle to the box and fill out the COC

Recording Final Gas Readings

- 33) Connect the ¼ tubing to the GGA to collect additional post-purge of the in-situ sampling for methane and carbon dioxide
- 34) Open the soil gas sampling fitting valve and record final values for methane and carbon dioxide concentrations
- 35) Close the soil gas sampling fitting and disconnect the ¼" tubing from the GGA
- 36) Disconnect the ¼" tubing and compression fitting from the soil gas sampling fitting, verify the valve has been closed and return the fitting to the manhole
- 37) Close up manhole, and clean up all materials from Site

TECHNICAL REFERENCES

<https://www.eurofinsus.com/media/161448/guide-to-air-sampling-analysis-2014-06-> 27_revised-logos.pdf

Appendix 3: Soil Gas Probe Networks & Temporal Trend Charts

Saved: 2/27/2023 3:13:05 PM

Saved: 2/27/2023 3:14:47 PM

Saved: 2/6/2023 4:09:35 PM

Saved: 2/6/2023 4:17:28 PM

asRev0.mxd

Appendix 4: Soil Gas Probe Lithology

APPENDIX VI- Clive CO² Injection Reports Submitted on March 31,

2023

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Date: 1/1/2022 to 1/31/2022

Date: 2/1/2022 to 2/28/2022

Date: 3/1/2022 to 3/31/2022

Date: 4/1/2022 to 4/30/2022

Date: 5/1/2022 to 5/31/2022

Date: 6/1/2022 to 6/30/2022

Date: 7/1/2022 to 7/31/2022

Date: 8/1/2022 to 8/31/2022

Date: 9/1/2022 to 9/30/2022

Date: 10/1/2022 to 10/31/2022

Date: 11/1/2022 to 11/30/2022

Date: 12/1/2022 to 12/31/2022

APPENDIX VII- Clive Injection and Production Well Charts

Submitted on March 31, 2023

1Clive Injection and Production Wells and AER Approval Area

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

100/10-35-039-24W4/00 ENHANCEENERGY CLIVE 10-35-39-24 Pumping Crude Oil

Field: CLIVE (0224) Pool: D-3 A (0720001) Unit: Clive D-3a Unit No. 1

APPENDIX VIII- Clive Injection Well Drilling and Completion Records

Submitted on March 31, 2023

¹Clive CO² Injection Well Schematic

© 2023, North West Redwater Partnership © 2023, Wolf Carbon Solutions © 2023, Enhance Energy Inc. All rights reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

Well Drilling Completion Data Submission Report

Well Drilling Completion Data Submission Report

CASING 2

View Well Drilling Completion Data

L

킈

CB (3.5 – 2127.3m), TEMPL (0.0 – 2192.0m), GR (646.0 – 1923.2m)

Location

Formation Tops

No IP Tests, Core Summary, Oil Zone Pressure Tests, AOFPs/Pressure Tests or DSTs/Formation Tests reported.

Note: Locational information is presented using the NAD 83 datum.

Copyright © 1991-2023, geoLOGIC systems ltd. example 2011 and Page 1

APPENDIX IX- Plant #1 Tie-In Design Materials

Submitted on March 31, 2023

Redwater CO² Recovery Unit

reserved. See NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT & PROPRIETARY RIGHTS included herein for additional terms.

 $\overline{7}$

 $8⁸$

 $\overline{4}$

<u>PLAN - MISC SUPPORTS</u> $\frac{1}{8}$ " = 1'-0" (FOR GRID ELEVATIONS SEE DWG ELEV-0010 & 0011) L4 = L4x4x³/₈

 $5⁵$

 $\overline{2}$

W6x25

 $3⁵$

KEY PLAN /41 / 40 ... N5500' N5000' [™] DRAWING **GENERAL NOTES:** 1. ALL COORDINATES, DIMENSIONS AND ELEVATIONS ARE IN FEET AND INCHES. 2. ALL EXISTING INFORMATION, COORDINATES, DIMENSIONS AND ELEVATIONS HAVE ID. BEEN DERIVED FROM LASER SCAN 19-051_Nutrien Rack COMPLETED BY MIRACAD TECHNOLOGIES INC. IN AUGUST 2019. ALL EXISTING ELEVATIONS AND DIMENSIONS SHALL BE FIELD CHECKED BY CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. ALL WORK SHALL BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING NUTRIEN SPECIFICATIONS UNO: $-EP-4-5-1$ STRUCTURAL STEEL $-EP$ 10-3-1 SHOP AND FIELD COATING - IHM-CHM-03.04.01 LEAD MANAGEMENT PROGRAM 5. ALL STEEL SHALL BE CARBON STEEL UNO. 6. FOR CARBON STEEL GENERAL NOTES SEE DWG. 07-S-D-22904-01. 7. ALL STEEL SHALL BE PRIMED AND PAINTED. A) SHOP APPLICATION - SURFACE PREPARATION: AS PER MANUFACTURER SPECIFIED REQUIREMENTS - B

Enhance Nutrien Plant 1 Blower Heat and Material Balance Mar 21 2023

Configuration of Plant 1 tie-in may vary based on final design

Enhance Nutrien Plant 1 BlowerFacility Block DiagramMarch 21 2023