PATERSON GROUP

Geotechnical Investigation

Proposed Multi-Storey Building

384 Arlington Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for Ottawa Korean Church LP
c/o Windmill Developments

Report PG6263-1 dated July 28, 2022

Table of Contents

PAGE

1.0 Introduction 1
2.0 Proposed Development 1
3.0 Method of Investigation 2
3.1 Field Investigation 2
3.2 Field Survey 3
3.3 Laboratory Review 3
4.0 Observations 4
4.1 Surface Conditions 4
4.2 Subsurface Profile 4
4.3 Groundwater 5
5.0 Discussion 6
5.1 Geotechnical Assessment 6
5.2 Site Grading and Preparation 6
5.3 Foundation Design 8
5.4 Design for Earthquakes 9
5.5 Basement Floor Slab 9
5.6 Basement Wall 10
5.7 Rock Anchor Design 11
5.8 Pavement Design 14
6.0 Design and Construction Precautions 17
6.1 Foundation Drainage and Backfill 17
6.2 Protection of Footings Against Frost Action 20
6.3 Excavation Side Slopes 21
6.4 Pipe Bedding and Backfill 23
6.5 Groundwater Control 23
6.6 Winter Construction 24
7.0 Recommendations 26
8.0 Statement of Limitations 27

Appendices

Appendix 1 Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets
Symbols and Terms

Appendix 2 Figure 1 – Key Plan
Figure 2 – Podium Deck to Foundation Wall Drainage System Tie-In
Figure 3 – Waterproofing System for Elevator
Drawing PG6263-1 - Test Hole Location Plan

1.0 Introduction

Paterson Group (Paterson) was commissioned by Windmill Development on behalf of Ottawa Korean Church LP to conduct a geotechnical investigation for the proposed development to be located at 384 Arlington Avenue, in the City of Ottawa, Ontario (refer to Figure 1 - Key Plan in Appendix 2 of this report).

The objectives of the geotechnical investigation were to:

- Determine the subsoil and groundwater conditions at this site by means of boreholes.
- Provide geotechnical recommendations pertaining to the design of the proposed development including construction considerations which may affect the design.

The following report has been prepared specifically and solely for the aforementioned project which is described herein. It contains our findings and includes geotechnical recommendations pertaining to the design and construction of the subject development as they are understood at the time of writing this report.

Investigating the presence or potential presence of contamination on the subject property was not part of the scope of work of the present investigation. Therefore, the present report does not address environmental issues.

2.0 Proposed Development

Based on the available drawings, it is understood that the proposed development will consist of a multi-storey residential building with 2 levels of underground parking. Further, it is understood that the footprint of the underground parking levels will occupy the majority of the subject site.

Landscaped margins are expected at finished grades surrounding the proposed building. The subject site is expected to be municipally serviced.

It is anticipated that existing building, with the exception of the building façade in the northwest corner, is to be demolished to allow for construction of the proposed development.

3.0 Method of Investigation

3.1 Field Investigation

Field Program

The field program for the geotechnical investigation was carried out on between July 7 and 8, 2022, and consisted of advancing a total of 3 boreholes, to a maximum depth of 10.6 m below the existing grade. The borehole locations were distributed in a manner to provide general coverage of the subject site, taking into consideration underground services and available access. The approximate locations of the boreholes are shown on Drawing PG6263-1 - Test Hole Location Plan included in Appendix 2.

The boreholes were advanced using a low-clearance track-mounted drill rig operated by a two-person crew. All fieldwork was conducted under the full-time supervision of Paterson personnel under the direction of a senior engineer. The drilling procedure consisted of augering to the required depths at the selected borehole locations, and sampling and testing the overburden and rock core.

Sampling and In Situ Testing

Soil samples were collected from the boreholes using two different techniques, namely, sampled directly from the auger flights (AU) or collected using a 50 mm diameter split- spoon (SS) sampler. Rock cores (RC) were obtained using a 47.6 mm inside diameter coring equipment. All samples were visually inspected and initially classified on site and subsequently placed in sealed plastic bags. All samples were transported to our laboratory for further examination and classification. The depths at which the auger and split spoon and rock core samples were recovered from the boreholes are shown as AU, SS and RC respectively, on the Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets in Appendix 1.

A Standard Penetration Test (SPT) was conducted in conjunction with the recovery of the split spoon samples. The SPT results are recorded as "N" values on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets. The "N" value is the number of blows required to drive the split spoon sampler 300 mm into the soil after a 150 mm initial penetration using a 63.5 kg hammer falling from a height of 760 mm.

Bedrock samples were recovered from all boreholes using a core barrel and diamond drilling techniques. A recovery value and a Rock Quality Designation (RQD) value were calculated for each drilled section (core run) of bedrock and are shown on the borehole logs. The recovery value is the ratio, in percentage, of the length of the bedrock sample recovered over the length of the drilled section (core run). The RQD value is the ratio, in percentage, of the total length of intact rock pieces longer than 100 mm in one core run over the length of the core run. These values are indicative of the quality of the bedrock.

The subsurface conditions observed in the boreholes were recorded in detail in the field. The soil profiles are logged on the Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets in Appendix 1 of this report.

Groundwater

Monitoring wells were installed at boreholes BH 1-22 and BH 2-22, and a standpipe piezometer was outfitted at borehole BH 3-22 in order to permit monitoring of the groundwater levels. Groundwater level observations are discussed in Section 4.3 and are presented in the Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets in Appendix 1.

Sample Storage

All samples from the current investigation will be stored in the laboratory for a period of one month after issuance of this report. They will then be discarded unless we are otherwise directed.

3.2 Field Survey

The borehole locations were selected by Paterson to provide general coverage of the subject site, taking into consideration the existing site features and underground utilities. The borehole locations, and the ground surface elevation at each borehole location, were surveyed by Paterson using a handheld GPS with respect to a geodetic datum. The locations of the boreholes and ground surface elevation at each borehole location are present on Drawing PG6263-1 - Test Hole Location Plan in Appendix 2.

3.3 Laboratory Review

Soil and bedrock samples were recovered from the subject site and visually examined in our laboratory to review the results of the field logging. All samples will be stored in the laboratory for 1 month after this report is completed. They will then be discarded unless otherwise directed.

4.0 Observations

4.1 Surface Conditions

The northern half of the subject site is currently occupied by existing church buildings. The remainder of the site consists of asphalt-paved parking areas.

The subject site is bordered to the north by Arlington Avenue, to the east by Arthur Lane North, to the south by Raymond Street and to the west by Bell Street North. The ground surface across the site is generally flat and at grade with the adjacent roadways at geodetic elevation 72.5 to 78 m.

4.2 Subsurface Profile

Overburden

Generally, the subsurface profile at the subject site consists of asphaltic concrete which is underlain by an approximate 0.7 to 1.8 m thickness of fill which is further underlain by bedrock. The fill was generally observed to consist of crushed stone, transitioning to a brown silty sand with gravel, crushed stone, and traces of brick, concrete and clay.

A glacial till layer was observed underlying the fill at borehole BH 1-22 and was observed to consist of a dense, brown silty sand with gravel, cobbles and boulders.

Bedrock

Practical refusal to augering was encountered on the bedrock surface at approximate depths ranging from 0.7 to 2.2 m. The bedrock was cored at all boreholes and, based on the recovered rock core, was observed to consist of good to excellent quality of grey limestone. The bedrock was cored to a maximum depth of about 10.6 m below the existing ground surface.

Based on available geological mapping, the bedrock in the subject area consists of limestone and shale interbedded of Verulam Formation with an overburden drift thickness of 1 to 2 m.

Reference should be made to the Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets in Appendix 1 for details of the soil profile encountered at each borehole location.

4.3 Groundwater

The groundwater level was measured at the monitoring wells and piezometer on July 22, 2022. The observed groundwater levels are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 - Summary of Groundwater Level Readings

Test Hole Number	Ground Surface Elevation (m)	Groundwater Level (m)	Groundwater Elevation (m)	Recording Date
BH 1-22*	72.70	2.14	70.56	July 22, 2022
BH 2-22*	72.81	2.12	70.69	July 22, 2022
BH 3-22	72.40	1.60	70.80	July 22, 2022

Note: Ground surface elevations at borehole locations are referenced to a geodetic datum.
* Denotes Groundwater Monitoring Well

It should be noted that the groundwater levels could be influenced by surface water infiltrating the backfilled boreholes. The long-term groundwater levels can also be estimated based on the observed colour, moisture content and consistency of the recovered soil samples.

Based on these observations, the long-term groundwater levels are expected to range between approximately 2.0 to 2.5 m below ground surface. However, it should be noted that groundwater levels are subject to seasonal fluctuations, therefore, the groundwater levels could vary at the time of construction.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 Geotechnical Assessment

From a geotechnical perspective, the subject site is considered suitable for the proposed development. The proposed multi-storey building is recommended to be founded on conventional spread footings placed on a clean, surface sounded shale/limestone bedrock.

Bedrock removal will be required to complete the underground parking levels.

The above and other considerations are further discussed in the following sections.

5.2 Site Grading and Preparation

Stripping Depth

Topsoil and fill, such as those containing organic or deleterious material, should be stripped from under any buildings, paved areas, pipe bedding and other settlement sensitive structures. Due to the relatively shallow depth to bedrock and the expected founding level for the proposed multi-storey building, all existing overburden material should be excavated from within the proposed building's footprint.

Existing foundation walls and other construction debris should be completely removed from the proposed building perimeter. Under paved area, existing construction remnants, such as foundation walls should be excavated to a minimum of 1 m below final grade.

Bedrock Removal

Bedrock removal can be accomplished by hoe ramming where the bedrock is weathered and/or where only small quantities of the bedrock need to be removed. Sound bedrock may be removed by line drilling in conjunction with controlled blasting and/or hoe ramming.

Prior to considering blasting operations, the blasting effects on the existing services, buildings, and other structures should be addressed. A pre-blast or pre-construction survey of the existing structures located in the proximity of the blasting operations should be carried out prior to commencing site activities. The extent of the survey should be determined by the blasting consultant and should be sufficient to respond to any inquiries or claims related to the blasting operations.

As a general guideline, peak particle velocity (measured at the structures) should not exceed 25 mm/s during the blasting program to reduce the risks of damage to the existing structures.

The blasting operations must be planned and conducted under the supervision of a licensed professional engineer who is also an experienced blasting consultant.

Vibration Considerations

Construction operations are also the cause of vibrations, and possibly, sources of nuisance to the community. Therefore, means to reduce the vibration levels should be incorporated in the construction operations to maintain, as much as possible, a cooperative environment with the residents.

The following construction equipment could be a source of vibrations: piling rig, hoe ram, compactor, dozer, crane, truck traffic, etc. Vibrations, whether caused by blasting operations or by construction operations, could be the cause of the source of detrimental vibrations on the nearby buildings and structures. Therefore, it is recommended that all vibrations be limited.

Two parameters are used to determine the permissible vibrations, namely, the maximum peak particle velocity and the frequency. For low frequency vibrations, the maximum allowable peak particle velocity is less than that for high frequency vibrations. As a guideline, the peak particle velocity should be less than 15 mm/s between frequencies of 4 to 12 Hz, and 50 mm/s above a frequency of 40 Hz (interpolate between 12 and 40 Hz).

It should be noted that these guidelines are for today's construction standards. Considering that these guidelines are above perceptible human level and, in some cases, could be very disturbing to some people, it is recommended that a pre-construction survey be completed to minimize the risks of claims during or following the construction of the proposed building.

Bedrock Excavation Face Reinforcement

Horizontal rock anchors, shotcrete and/or chain link fencing connected to the excavation face may be required at specific locations to prevent bedrock pop-outs, especially in areas where bedrock fractures are conducive to the failure of the bedrock surface. The requirement for bedrock excavation face reinforcement will be evaluated during the excavation operations.

Fill Placement

Engineered fill placed for grading beneath the proposed building, where required, should consist of clean imported granular fill, such as Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS) Granular A or Granular B Type II or blast rock fill approved by the geotechnical consultant. This material should be tested and approved prior to delivery to the site. The fill should be placed in lifts no greater than 300 mm thick and compacted using suitable compaction equipment for the lift thickness. Fill placed beneath the buildings and paved areas should be compacted to at least 98% of the material's standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).

Non-specified existing fill, along with site-excavated soil, can be used as general landscaping fill where settlement of the ground surface is of minor concern. This material should be spread in thin lifts and at least compacted by the tracks of the spreading equipment to minimize voids. If this material is to be used to build up the subgrade level for areas to be paved, it should be compacted in thin lifts to at least 95% of the material's SPMDD.

If excavated rock is to be used as fill, it should be suitably fragmented to produce a well-graded material with a maximum particle size of 300 mm. Where the fill is open graded, a blinding layer of finer granular fill and/or a woven geotextile may be required to prevent adjacent finer materials from migrating into the voids, with associated loss of ground and settlements. This can be assessed at the time of construction. Site-generated blast rock fill should be compacted using a suitably sized smooth drum vibratory roller when considered for placement.

Under winter conditions, if snow and ice is present within the blast rock fill below future basement slabs, then settlement of the fill should be expected and support of a future basement slab and/or temporary supports for slab pours will be negatively impacted and could undergo settlement during spring and summer time conditions. The geotechnical consultant should complete periodic inspections during fill placement to ensure that snow and ice quantities are minimized.

5.3 Foundation Design

Footings supported directly on clean, surface sounded limestone bedrock can be designed using a factored bearing resistance value at Ultimate Limit States (ULS) of **2,500 kPa**. A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the bearing resistance value at ULS.

A clean, surface-sounded bedrock bearing surface should be free of loose materials, and have no near surface seams, voids, fissures or open joints which can be detected from surface sounding with a rock hammer.

Footings supported directly on clean, surface sounded bedrock, designed for the bearing resistance values provided above will be subject to negligible post-construction total and differential settlements.

Lateral Support

The bearing medium under footing-supported structures is required to be provided with adequate lateral support with respect to excavations and different foundation levels. Adequate lateral support is provided to a sound bedrock bearing medium when a plane extending horizontally and vertically from the footing perimeter at a minimum of 1H:6V (or shallower) passing through sound bedrock or a material of the same or higher capacity as the bedrock, such as concrete. A soil bearing medium, or a heavily fractured, weathered bedrock bearing medium will require a lateral support zone of 1H:1V (or shallower).

5.4 Design for Earthquakes

The site class for seismic site response can be taken as **Class C**. If a higher seismic site class (Class A or B) is required for the proposed buildings which are founded on or within 3 m of the bedrock surface, a site specific shear wave velocity test may be completed to accurately determine the applicable seismic site classification for foundation design of the proposed building, as presented in Table 4.1.8.4.A of the Ontario Building Code (OBC) 2012.

5.5 Basement Floor Slab

For the proposed development, all overburden soil will be removed from the building footprint, leaving the bedrock as the founding medium for the basement floor slab. It is anticipated that the basement area for the proposed building will be mostly parking and the recommended pavement structures noted in Subsection 5.8 will be applicable. However, if storage or other uses of the lower level will involve the construction of a concrete floor slab, the upper 200 mm of sub-slab fill is recommended to consist of 19 mm clear crushed stone.

Any soft areas in the basement slab subgrade should be removed and backfilled with appropriate backfill material prior to placing fill. OPSS Granular A or Granular B Type II, with a maximum particle size of 50 mm, are recommended for backfilling below the floor slab.

All backfill material within the footprint of the proposed building should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose layers and compacted to a minimum of 98% of the SPMDD.

In consideration of the groundwater conditions at the site, a sub-slab drainage system, consisting of lines of perforated drainage pipe subdrains connected to a positive outlet, should be provided in the subfloor fill under the lower basement floor. This is discussed further in Subsection 6.1.

5.6 Basement Wall

There are several combinations of backfill materials and retained soils that could be applicable for the basement walls of the proposed building. However, the conditions can be well-represented by assuming the retained soil consists of a material with an angle of internal friction of 30 degrees and a drained unit weight of 20 kN/m^3 (effective unit weight 13 kN/m^3).

However, the majority of the basement walls of the proposed multi-storey building are to be poured against a composite drainage blanket, which will be placed against the exposed bedrock face, for which a nominal coefficient of at-rest earth pressure of 0.05 is recommended in conjunction with a bulk unit weight of 24.5 kN/m^3 (effective 15.5 kN/m^3). Further, a seismic earth pressure component will not be applicable for the foundation walls which are poured against the bedrock face. It is expected that the seismic earth pressure will be transferred to the underground floor slabs which should be designed to accommodate these pressures. A hydrostatic groundwater pressure should be added for the portion below the groundwater level.

Lateral Earth Pressures

The static horizontal earth pressure (p_o) can be calculated using a triangular earth pressure distribution equal to $K_o \cdot \gamma \cdot H$ where:

K_o = at-rest earth pressure coefficient of the applicable retained soil (0.5)
γ = unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m^3)
H = height of the wall (m)

An additional pressure having a magnitude equal to $K_o \cdot q$ and acting on the entire height of the wall should be added to the above diagram for any surcharge loading, q (kPa), that may be placed at ground surface adjacent to the wall. The surcharge pressure will only be applicable for static analyses and should not be used in conjunction with the seismic loading case.

Actual earth pressures could be higher than the "at-rest" case if care is not exercised during the compaction of the backfill materials to maintain a minimum separation of 0.3 m from the walls with the compaction equipment.

Seismic Earth Pressures

The total seismic force (P_{AE}) includes both the earth force component (P_o) and the seismic component (ΔP_{AE}).
The seismic earth force (ΔP_{AE}) can be calculated using $0.375 \cdot a_c \cdot H^2/g$ where:

$a_c = (1.45-a_{max}/g)a_{max}$
γ = unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m^3)
H= height of the wall (m)
g = gravity, 9.81 m/s^2

The peak ground acceleration, (a_{max}), for the Ottawa area is 0.32g according to OBC 2012. Note that the vertical seismic coefficient is assumed to be zero.
The earth force component (P_o) under seismic conditions can be calculated using $P_o = .5\ K_o\ \gamma\ H^2$, where K = 0.5 for the soil conditions noted above.

The total earth force (P_{AE}) is considered to act at a height, h (m), from the base of the wall, where:

$h = \{P_o \cdot (H/3) + \Delta P_{AE} \cdot (0.6 \cdot H)\}/P_{AE}$

The earth forces calculated are unfactored. For the ULS case, the earth loads should be factored as live loads, as per OBC 2012.

5.7 Rock Anchor Design

Overview of Anchor Features

The geotechnical design of grouted rock anchors in sedimentary bedrock is based upon two possible failure modes. The anchor can fail either by shear failure along the grout/rock interface or a 60 to 90 degree pullout of rock cone with the apex of the cone near the middle of the bonded length of the anchor. Interaction may develop between the failure cones of anchors that are relatively close to one another resulting in a total group capacity smaller than the sum of the load capacity of each individual anchor.

A third failure mode of shear failure along the grout/steel interface should be reviewed by the structural engineer to ensure all typical failure modes have been reviewed.

The centre to centre spacing between bond lengths should at least four (4) times the diameter of the anchor holes and greater than one fifth (1/5) of the total anchor length or a minimum of 1.2 m to decrease the group influence effects. Anchors in close proximity to each other are recommended to be grouted at the same time to ensure any fractures or voids are completely in0filled and grout fluid does not flow from one hole to an adjacent empty one.

The anchor should be provided with a bonded length (fixed length) at the base of the anchor which will provide the anchor capacity, as well an unbonded length (free length) between the rock surface and the top of the bonded length.

Permanent anchors should be provided with corrosion protection. As a minimum, the entire drill hole should be filled with cementious grout. The free anchor length is provided by installing a plastic sleeve to act as a bond break, with the sleeve filled with grout or a corrosion inhibiting mastic.

Double corrosion protection can be provided with factory assembled systems, such as those available from Dywidag Systems or Williams Form Engineering Corp. Recognizing the importance of the anchors for the long-term performance of the foundation of the proposed building, the rock anchors for this project are recommended to be provided with double corrosion protection.

Grout to Rock Bond

The Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual recommends a maximum allowable grout to rock bond stress (for sound rock) of 1/30 of the unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of either the grout or rock (but less than 1.3 MPa) for an anchor of minimum length (depth) of 3 m. Generally, the UCS of limestone ranges between about 50 and 80 MPa, which is stronger than most routine grouts. A factored tensile grout to rock bond resistance value at ULS of **1.0 MPa**, incorporating a resistance factor of 0.3, can be calculated. A minimum grout strength of 40 MPa is recommended.

Rock Cone Uplift

As discussed previously, the geotechnical capacity of the rock anchors depends on the dimensions of the rock anchors and the configuration of the anchorage system. Based on existing bedrock information, a Rock Mass Rating (RMR) of 65 was assigned to the bedrock, and Hoek and Brown parameters (m and s) were taken as 0.575 and 0.00293, respectively.

Recommended Rock Anchor Lengths

Parameters used to calculate rock anchor lengths are provided in Table 2 below:

Table 2 - Parameters used in Rock Anchor Review	
Grout to Rock Bond Strength - Factored at ULS	1.0 MPa
Compressive Strength - Grout	40 MPa
Rock Mass Rating (RMR) - Good quality Limestone Hoek and Brown parameters	65 m=0.575 and s=0.00293
Unconfined compressive strength - Limestone bedrock	50 MPa
Unit weight - Submerged Bedrock	15.5 kN/m^3
Apex angle of failure cone	60^o
Apex of failure cone	mid-point of fixed anchor length

The fixed anchor length will depend on the diameter of the drill holes. Recommended anchor lengths for a 75 mm and 125 mm diameter hole are provided in Table 3 below. The factored tensile resistance values given in Table 3 are based on a single anchor with no group influence effects. A detailed analysis of the anchorage system, including potential group influence effects, could be provided once the details of the loading for the proposed building are determined.

Table 3 - Recommended Rock Anchor Lengths - Grouted Rock Anchor

Diameter of Drill Hole (mm)	Anchor Lengths (m)			Factored Tensile Resistance (kN)
	Bonded Length	Unbonded Length	Total Length	
75	2.0	0.7	2.7	475
	2.5	0.7	3.2	600
	3.0	0.6	3.6	700
	4.3	0.3	4.6	1000
125	1.7	1.2	2.9	650
	2.0	1.2	3.2	800
	2.6	1.2	3.8	1000
	3.3	1.2	4.4	1250

Other considerations

The anchor drill holes should be within 1.5 to 2 times the rock anchor tendon diameter, inspected by geotechnical personnel and should be flushed clean prior to grouting. A tremie tube is recommended to place grout from the bottom of the anchor holes. Compressive strength testing is recommended to be completed for the rock anchor grout. A set of grout cubes should be tested for each day that grout is prepared.

The geotechnical capacity of each rock anchor should be proof tested at the time of construction. More information on testing can be provided upon request. Compressive strength testing is recommended to be completed for the rock anchor grout.

5.8 Pavement Design

Podium Deck Area

It is anticipated that the podium deck structure will be provided car only parking areas, access lanes, fire truck lanes and loading areas. Based on the concrete slab subgrade, the pavement structure indicated in the following page may be considered for design purposes:

Table 4 - Recommended Pavement Structure - Car-Only Parking Areas (Podium Deck)

Thickness (mm)	Material Description
50	**Wear Course** - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
200**	**Base** - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
See Below*	**Thermal Break*** - Rigid insulation (See Paragraph Below)
n/a	**Waterproofing Membrane and IKO Protection Board**
SUBGRADE – Reinforced Concrete Podium Deck *If specified by others, not required from a geotechnical perspective **Thickness is dependent on grade of insulation as noted in proceeding paragraph	

Table 5 - Recommended Pavement Structure – Access Lane, Fire Truck Lane, Ramp and Heavy Truck Parking Areas (Podium Deck)

Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	**Wear Course** - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	**Wear Course** - HL-8 or Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
300**	**Base** - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
See Below*	**Thermal Break*** - Rigid insulation (See Paragraph Below)
n/a	**Waterproofing Membrane and IKO Protection Board**
SUBGRADE – Reinforced Concrete Podium Deck *If specified by others, not required from a geotechnical perspective **Thickness is dependent on grade of insulation as noted in proceeding paragraph	

The transition between the pavement structure over the podium deck subgrade and soil subgrade beyond the footprint of the podium deck is recommended to be transitioned to match the pavement structures provided in the following section. For this transition, a 5H:1V is recommended between the two subgrade surfaces. Further, the base layer thickness should be increased to a minimum thickness of 500 mm below the top of the podium slab a minimum of 1.5 m from the face of the foundation wall prior to providing the recommended taper.

Should the proposed podium deck be specified to be provided a thermal break by the use of a layer of rigid insulation below the pavement structure, its placement within the pavement structure is recommended to be as per the above-noted tables. The layer of rigid insulation is recommended to consist of a DOW Chemical High-Load 100 (HI-100), High-Load 60 (HI-60) or High Load (HI-40). The pavement structures base layer thickness will be dependent on the grade of insulation considered for this project and should be reassessed by the geotechnical consultant once pertinent design details have been prepared.

The higher grades of insulation have more resistance to deformation under wheel-loading and require less granular cover to avoid being crushing by vehicular loading. It should be noted that SM (Styrofoam) rigid insulation is not considered suitable for this application.

Pavement Structure Over Overburden

Beyond the podium deck, the following pavement structures may be considered for car only parking and heavy traffic areas. The subgrade material will consist of glacial till and bedrock throughout the exterior and lowest basement level of the subject site, respectively. The proposed pavement structures are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6 - Recommended Pavement Structure - Car-Only Parking Areas

Thickness (mm)	Material Description
50	**Wear Course** - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
150	**BASE** - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
300	**SUBBASE** - OPSS Granular B Type II
SUBGRADE - Either in situ soils, bedrock or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil or bedrock	

Table 7 - Recommended Pavement Structure - Heavy-Truck Traffic and Loading Areas

Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	**Wear Course** - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	**Binder Course** - HL-8 or Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
150	**BASE** - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
450	**SUBBASE** - OPSS Granular B Type II
SUBGRADE - Either in situ soils, bedrock or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil or bedrock	

Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 58-34 asphalt cement should be used for this project. If soft spots develop in the subgrade during compaction or due to construction traffic, the affected areas should be excavated and replaced with OPSS Granular B Type II material.

The pavement granular base and subbase should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick lifts and compacted to a minimum of 100% of the material's SPMDD using suitable compaction equipment

6.0 Design and Construction Precautions

6.1 Foundation Drainage and Backfill

Foundation Drainage

It is anticipated that the portion of the proposed building foundation walls located below the long-term groundwater table will be blind poured and placed against a groundwater infiltration control system. Also, a perimeter foundation drainage system will be required as a secondary system to account for any groundwater which comes in contact with the proposed building's foundation walls.

For the groundwater infiltration control system for the foundation walls, the following is recommended:

- ❑ Line drill the excavation perimeter (usually at 150 to 200 mm spacing).
- ❑ Mechanical bedrock removal along the foundation walls can be undertaken up to 150 mm from the finished vertical excavation face.
- ❑ Grind the bedrock surface up to the outer face of the line drill holes to ensure a satisfactory surface for the below grade foundation drainage system.
- ❑ If bedrock overbreaks occur, shotcrete these areas to fill in cavities and to smooth out angular features at the bedrock surface, as required based on site inspection by Paterson.
- ❑ Place a suitable waterproofing membrane (such as Tremco Paraseal or approved equivalent) against the prepared bedrock surface. The membrane liner should extend from 7 m below existing grade down to footing level.
- ❑ Place a composite drainage layer, such as Delta Drain 6000 or equivalent, over the membrane (as a secondary system). The composite drainage layer should extend from finished grade to underside of footing level.
- ❑ Pour foundation wall against the composite drainage system.

It is recommended that 100 mm diameter sleeves at 3 m centres be cast in the footing or at the foundation wall/footing interface to allow the infiltration of any water that breaches the waterproofing system to flow to an interior perimeter drainage pipe. The perimeter drainage pipe should direct water to sump pit(s) within the lower basement area.

Elevators and any other pits located below the underslab drainage system should be waterproofed. A full waterproofing detail for the foundation walls and the mechanical pits can be provided by Paterson, if required.

Transition from Foundation Wall to Podium Deck

It is anticipated that a 2-ply modified bitumen membrane or similar hot-applied waterproofing membrane product will be placed across the exterior surface of the concrete deck. It is recommended to extend this membrane vertically down the foundation wall and a minimum of 300 mm below the construction joint between the foundation wall and podium deck slab.

- Where a double-sided pour is considered for the top segment of the foundation wall, it is recommended to extend the podium deck waterproofing membrane vertically down the foundation wall and a minimum of 300 mm below the construction joint between the foundation wall and podium deck slab. Further, the bottom-most endlap of the waterproofing membrane extending over the drainage board should be installed loosely against the drainage board layer to mitigate heat associated with welding the rubber membrane from damaging the drainage layer. The loosely installed layer of membrane should overlap the top of the drainage board layer by a minimum of 300 mm.

- Should the top segment of the foundation wall be blind-cast against a shoring system or bedrock, the waterproofing membrane should be vertically installed and extended over the temporary shoring face or bedrock prior to the placement of the P1 foundation wall and podium deck slab. Following installation of the podium deck slab, the waterproofing membrane can be overlapped onto the podium deck surface and installed accordingly to manufacturer's specifications.

- Where a podium deck will not be provided with a horizontal application as described above, the top edge of the drainage board should be sealed by a liquid membrane to mitigate the migration of water between the foundation wall and drainage board layer.

Reference should be made to Figure 2 – Podium Deck to Foundation Wall Drainage System Tie-In Detail in Appendix 2.

Underslab Drainage System

An underslab drainage system is recommended to control water infiltration below the underground parking level slab. For preliminary design purposes, it is recommended that 150 mm perforated pipes be placed at approximate 6 m centres underlying the underground parking level slab. The spacing of the underslab drainage system should be confirmed by the geotechnical consultant at the time of completing the excavation when water infiltration can be better assessed.

Foundation Backfill

Above the bedrock surface, backfill against the exterior sides of the foundation walls should consist of free-draining, non-frost susceptible granular materials such as clean sand or OPSS Granular B Type I material.

Elevator Pit Waterproofing System

To accommodate the elevator shaft within the lower level of the proposed structure, it is expected that the associated concrete base slabs will be extended below the basement floor slab. It is therefore expected that additional bedrock removal below the building's perimeter strip footings will be required to accommodate the elevator shaft. In addition, it is expected that the elevator shaft may extend below the invert level of the underfloor drainage system and will thus be theoretically designed under submerged conditions.

- It is recommended to cast the elevator shaft base slab tight against the bedrock excavation sidewalls and use the bedrock surface as the formwork. This would create a watertight boundary between the bedrock surface and the top of the concrete slab. If consideration is given to forming the perimeter of the slab, Paterson should be notified prior to preparing the bedrock excavation for the placement of rebar and formwork as the bedrock surface would be required to be covered with an additional waterproofing membrane.

- A continuous PVC waterstop such as Southern waterstop 14RCB or equivalent should be installed within the interface between the concrete base slab below the elevator shaft foundation walls and the elevator shaft walls.

- Once the concrete slab and elevator pit sidewalls are poured in place, it is recommended that a waterproofing membrane, such as Colphene Torch'n Stick (or approved other) be applied to the exterior of the elevator pit sidewalls and horizontally over the exterior side of the elevator slab in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. It is recommended to extend the membrane a minimum of 600 mm horizontally beyond the exterior face of the elevator shaft.

- A protection board should be placed over the waterproofing membrane to protect the waterproofing membrane from damage during backfilling operations. The area between the elevator pit and bedrock excavation face should be in-filled with lean concrete, OPSS Granular B Type II or OPSS Granular A crushed stone.

- The foundation wall of the elevator shaft should host a PVC sleeve to allow any water trapped within the interior side of the structures to be discharged to the associated sump pump. The opening should be properly sealed with suitable membrane and mastic products to prevent water from entering the subject structure.

- It should be noted that a waterproofed concrete (with Xypex Additive, or equivalent) is recommended to be incorporated in the concrete mix design for the elevator base slab and shaft walls. **However, this is considered optional and is not considered a substitute for the above-noted waterproofing products.**

Reference should be made to Figure 3 – Elevator Waterproofing Detail in Appendix 2 for specific details of the waterproofing recommendations pertaining to the elevator shaft as described herein.

Sidewalks and Walkways

Backfill material below sidewalk and walkway subgrade areas or other settlement sensitive structures which are not adjacent to the buildings should consist of free-draining, non-frost susceptible material.

This material should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to at least 98% of its SPMDD under dry and above freezing conditions.

6.2 Protection of Footings Against Frost Action

Perimeter footings of heated structures are recommended to be insulated against the deleterious effects of frost action. A minimum 1.5 m thick soil cover, or an equivalent combination of soil cover and foundation insulation should be provided in this regard.

Other exterior unheated footings, such as isolated piers, are more prone to deleterious movement associated with frost action than the exterior walls of the structure, and require additional protection, such as soil cover of 2.1 m, or an equivalent combination of soil cover and foundation insulation

However, the footings for the proposed multi-storey building are generally expected to be located within the bedrock, thus, does not require protection against frost action due to the founding depth. Unheated structures such as access ramp may require insulation for protection against the deleterious effects of frost action.

6.3 Excavation Side Slopes

The side slopes of excavations in the overburden materials should either be cut back at acceptable slopes or should be retained by shoring systems from the start of the excavation until the structure is backfilled.

Unsupported Excavations

The subsoil at this site is considered to be mainly a Type 2 and 3 soil according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act and Regulations for Construction Projects. Excavated soil should not be stockpiled directly at the top of excavations and heavy equipment should be kept away from the excavation sides.

Slopes in excess of 3 m in height should be periodically inspected by the geotechnical consultant in order to detect if the slopes are exhibiting signs of distress.

A trench box is recommended to protect personnel working in trenches with steep or vertical sides. It is expected that services will be installed by “cut and cover” methods and excavations will not be left open for extended periods of time.

Bedrock Stabilization

Excavation side slopes in sound bedrock can be carried out using almost vertical side walls. A minimum 1 m horizontal ledge should be left between the bottom of the overburden excavation and the top of the bedrock surface to provide an area to allow for potential sloughing or to provide a stable base for the overburden shoring system.

Horizontal rock anchors may be required at specific locations to prevent pop-outs of the bedrock, especially in areas where bedrock fractures are conducive to the failure of the bedrock surface.

The requirement for horizontal rock anchors should be evaluated during the excavation operations and should be discussed with the structural engineer during the design stage.

Temporary Shoring

Due to the expected depth of excavation to accommodate the underground parking and the proximity of the proposed multi-storey building to surrounding boundaries, temporary shoring may be required to support the overburden soils. The design and approval of the shoring system will be the responsibility of the shoring contractor and the shoring designer who is a licensed professional engineer and is hired by the shoring contractor. It is the responsibility of the shoring contractor to ensure that the temporary shoring is in compliance with safety requirements, designed to avoid any damage to adjacent structures and include dewatering control measures.

In the event that subsurface conditions differ from the approved design during the actual installation, it is the responsibility of the shoring contractor to commission the required experts to re-assess the design and implement the required changes.

The designer should also take into account the impact of a significant precipitation event and designate design measures to ensure that a precipitation event will not negatively impact the shoring system or soils supported by the system. Any changes to the approved shoring design system should be reported immediately to the owner's structural designer prior to implementation.

The temporary shoring system may consist of a soldier pipe and lagging system which could be cantilevered, anchored or braced. The shoring system is recommended to be adequately supported to resist toe failure.

Any additional loading due to street traffic, construction equipment, adjacent structures and facilities, etc., should be added to the earth pressures described below. The earth pressure acting on the shoring system may be calculated using the following parameters.

Table 8 - Soil Parameters

Parameters	Values
Active Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_a)	0.33
Passive Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_p)	3
At-Rest Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_o)	0.5
Unit Weight , kN/m^3	21
Submerged Unit Weight , kN/m^3	13

The active earth pressure should be calculated where wall movements are permissible while the at-rest pressure should be calculated if no movement is permissible. The dry unit weight should be calculated above the groundwater level while the effective unit weight should be calculated below the groundwater table.

The hydrostatic groundwater pressure should be included to the earth pressure distribution wherever the effective unit weight is calculated for earth pressures. If the groundwater level is lowered, the dry unit weight for the soil should be calculated full weight, with no hydrostatic groundwater pressure component.

For design purposes, the minimum factor of safety of 1.5 should be calculated.

6.4 Pipe Bedding and Backfill

Bedding and backfill materials should be in accordance with the most recent Material Specifications and Standard Detail Drawings from the Department of Public Works and Services, Infrastructure Services Branch of the City of Ottawa.

A minimum of 150 mm of OPSS Granular A should be placed for bedding for sewer or water pipes when placed on a soil subgrade. The bedding should extend to the spring line of the pipe. Cover material, from the spring line to a minimum of 300 mm above the obvert of the pipe, should consist of OPSS Granular A (concrete or PSM PVC pipes) or sand (concrete pipe). The bedding and cover materials should be placed in maximum 225 mm thick lifts and compacted to 98% of the SPMDD.

It is generally possible to re-use the site materials above the cover material if the operations are carried out in dry weather conditions.

Where hard surface areas are considered above the trench backfill, the trench backfill material within the frost zone (about 1.8 m below finished grade) and above the cover material should match the soils exposed at the trench walls to minimize differential frost heaving. The trench backfill should be placed in maximum 225 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum of 98% of the material's SPMDD. All cobbles larger than 200 mm in their longest direction should be segregated from re-use as trench backfill.

6.5 Groundwater Control

Based on our observations, it is anticipated that groundwater infiltration into excavations should be low to moderate and controllable using open sumps. The contractor should be prepared to direct water away from all subgrades, regardless of the source to prevent disturbance to the founding medium.

Groundwater Control for Building Construction

A temporary Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) permit to take water (PTTW) may be required if more than 400,000 L/day of ground and/or surface water are to be pumped during the construction phase. At least 4 to 5 months should be allowed for completion of the application and issuance of the permit by the MECP.

For typical ground or surface water volumes being pumped during the construction phase, typically between 50,000 to 400,000 L/day, it is required to register on the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR). A minimum of two to four weeks should be allotted for completion of the EASR registration and the Water Taking and Discharge Plan to be prepared by a Qualified Persons as stipulated under O.Reg. 63/16. If a project qualifies for a PTTW based upon anticipated conditions, an EASR will not be allowed as a temporary dewatering measure while awaiting the MECP review of the PTTW application.

If a project qualifies for a PTTW based upon anticipated conditions, an EASR will not be allowed as a temporary dewatering measure while awaiting the MECP review of PTTW application.

Impacts on Neighbouring Properties

Given the shallow bedrock present at and in the vicinity of the subject site, the neighbouring structures are expected to be founded on bedrock. Therefore, no issues are expected with respect to groundwater lowering that would cause damage to adjacent structures surrounding the proposed development.

6.6 Winter Construction

Precautions must be taken if winter construction is considered for this project. The subsoil conditions at this site consist of frost susceptible materials. In the presence of water and freezing conditions, ice could form within the soil mass. Heaving and settlement upon thawing could occur.

In the event of construction during below zero temperatures, the founding stratum should be protected from freezing temperatures using straw, propane heaters and tarpaulins or other suitable means. In this regard, the base of the excavations should be insulated from sub-zero temperatures immediately upon exposure and until such time as heat is adequately supplied to the building and the footings are protected with sufficient soil cover to prevent freezing at founding level.

Trench excavations and pavement construction are also difficult activities to complete during freezing conditions without introducing frost into the subgrade or in the excavation walls and bottoms. Precautions should be taken if such activities are to be carried out during freezing conditions. Additional information could be provided, if required.

7.0 Recommendations

It is a requirement for the foundation design data provided herein to be applicable that the following material testing and observation program be performed by the geotechnical consultant.

- ❑ Review of the geotechnical aspects of the excavation contractor's temporary shoring design, if required, prior to construction.
- ❑ Review of the proposed groundwater infiltration control system and requirements.
- ❑ Review of the bedrock stabilization and excavation requirements.
- ❑ Observation of all bearing surfaces prior to the placement of concrete.
- ❑ Sampling and testing of the concrete and fill materials.
- ❑ Observation of all subgrades prior to backfilling.
- ❑ Field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved.
- ❑ Sampling and testing of the bituminous concrete including mix design reviews.

A report confirming that these works have been conducted in general accordance with our recommendations could be issued upon the completion of a satisfactory inspection program by the geotechnical consultant.

All excess soils, with the exception of engineered crushed stone fill, generated by construction activities that will be transported on-site or off-site should be handled as per *Ontario Regulation 406/19: On-Site and Excess Soil Management.*

8.0 Statement of Limitations

The recommendations provided are in accordance with the present understanding of the project. Paterson requests permission to review the recommendations when the drawings and specifications are completed.

A soils investigation is a limited sampling of a site. Should any conditions at the site be encountered which differ from those at the test locations, Paterson requests immediate notification to permit reassessment of our recommendations.

The recommendations provided herein should only be used by the design professionals associated with this project. They are not intended for contractors bidding on or undertaking the work. The latter should evaluate the factual information provided in this report and determine the suitability and completeness for their intended construction schedule and methods. Additional testing may be required for their purposes.

The present report applies only to the project described in this document. Use of this report for purposes other than those described herein or by person(s) other than Ottawa Korean Church LP. or their agents is not authorized without review by Paterson for the applicability of our recommendations to the alternative use of the report.

Paterson Group Inc.

Kevin A. Pickard, EIT

David J. Gilbert, P.Eng

Report Distribution:

- ❑ Ottawa Korean Church LP c/o Windmill Developments Ltd. (email copy)
- ❑ Paterson Group (1 copy)

APPENDIX 1

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA SHEETS

SYMBOLS AND TERMS

patersongroup Consulting Engineers

9 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7T9

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Multi-Storey Building - 384 Arlington Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario

DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill **DATE** July 7, 2022

FILE NO. PG6263

HOLE NO. BH 1-22

SOIL DESCRIPTION		STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE NUMBER	SAMPLE % RECOVERY	SAMPLE N VALUE or RQD	DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)
GROUND SURFACE							0	72.70
Asphaltic concrete	0.08							
FILL: Crushed stone	0.18		AU	1				
FILL: Dark brown silty sand with gravel and crushed stone	0.61		SS	2	50	4	1	71.70
FILL: Reddish brown silty sand, some gravel, occasional cobbles, trace concrete	1.68		SS	3	100	50+		
			RC	1	29		2	70.70
GLACIAL TILL: Dense, brown silty sand with gravel, cobbles and boulders	2.21		RC	2	100	78	3	69.70
			RC	3	100	93	4	68.70
			RC	4	100	98	5	67.70
BEDROCK: Good to excellent quality, grey limestone			RC	5	100	100	6	66.70
			RC	6	100	100	7	65.70
			RC	7	100	100	8	64.70
							9	63.70
							10	62.70
	10.62							
End of Borehole								
(GWL @ 2.14m - July 22, 2022)								

Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m
● 50 mm Dia. Cone
○ Water Content %
20 40 60 80

Monitoring Well Construction

20 40 60 80 100
Shear Strength (kPa)
▲ Undisturbed △ Remoulded

patersongroup Consulting Engineers

9 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7T9

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Multi-Storey Building - 384 Arlington Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario

DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill **DATE** July 7, 2022

FILE NO. PG6263

HOLE NO. BH 2-22

SOIL DESCRIPTION		STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE NUMBER	SAMPLE % RECOVERY	SAMPLE N VALUE or RQD	DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)
GROUND SURFACE							0	72.81
Asphaltic concrete	0.05		AU	1				
FILL: Crushed stone	0.13							
FILL: Crushed stone with sand	0.38							
FILL: Brown silty sand with gravel, occasional cobbles, trace brick and concrete			SS	2	8	5	1	71.81
	1.88		SS	3	25	50+		
			RC	1	100	80	2	70.81
							3	69.81
			RC	2	100	97	4	68.81
BEDROCK: Good to excellent quality, grey limestone							5	67.81
			RC	3	100	100	6	66.81
			RC	4	100	100	7	65.81
	7.57							
End of Borehole								
(GWL @ 2.12m - July 22, 2022)								



patersongroup Consulting Engineers

9 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7T9

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Multi-Storey Building - 384 Arlington Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario

DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill **DATE** July 8, 2022

FILE NO. PG6263

HOLE NO. BH 3-22

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE NUMBER	SAMPLE % RECOVERY	SAMPLE N VALUE or RQD	DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)
GROUND SURFACE						0	72.40
Asphaltic concrete 0.05							
FILL: Crushed stone 0.25		AU	1				
FILL: Dark brown silty sand with gravel, crushed stone, some clay 0.69		RC	1	100	62	1	71.40
		RC	2	100	97	2	70.40
						3	69.40
BEDROCK: Good to excellent quality, grey limestone		RC	3	100	100	4	68.40
		RC	4	100	100	5	67.40
						6	66.40
		RC	5	100	100	7	65.40
7.54 End of Borehole							
(GWL @ 1.60m - July 22, 2022)							

Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m
● 50 mm Dia. Cone
○ Water Content %



Piezometer Construction

SYMBOLS AND TERMS

SOIL DESCRIPTION

Behavioural properties, such as structure and strength, take precedence over particle gradation in describing soils. Terminology describing soil structure are as follows:

Desiccated	-	having visible signs of weathering by oxidation of clay minerals, shrinkage cracks, etc.
Fissured	-	having cracks, and hence a blocky structure.
Varved	-	composed of regular alternating layers of silt and clay.
Stratified	-	composed of alternating layers of different soil types, e.g. silt and sand or silt and clay.
Well-Graded	-	Having wide range in grain sizes and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes (see Grain Size Distribution).
Uniformly-Graded	-	Predominantly of one grain size (see Grain Size Distribution).

The standard terminology to describe the relative strength of cohesionless soils is the compactness condition, usually inferred from the results of the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) 'N' value. The SPT N value is the number of blows of a 63.5 kg hammer, falling 760 mm, required to drive a 51 mm O.D. split spoon sampler 300 mm into the soil after an initial penetration of 150 mm. An SPT N value of "P" denotes that the split-spoon sampler was pushed 300 mm into the soil without the use of a falling hammer.

Compactness Condition	'N' Value	Relative Density %
Very Loose	<4	<15
Loose	4-10	15-35
Compact	10-30	35-65
Dense	30-50	65-85
Very Dense	>50	>85

The standard terminology to describe the strength of cohesive soils is the consistency, which is based on the undisturbed undrained shear strength as measured by the in situ or laboratory shear vane tests, unconfined compression tests, or occasionally by the Standard Penetration Test (SPT). Note that the typical correlations of undrained shear strength to SPT N value (tabulated below) tend to underestimate the consistency for sensitive silty clays, so Paterson reviews the applicable split spoon samples in the laboratory to provide a more representative consistency value based on tactile examination.

Consistency	Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)	'N' Value
Very Soft	<12	<2
Soft	12-25	2-4
Firm	25-50	4-8
Stiff	50-100	8-15
Very Stiff	100-200	15-30
Hard	>200	>30

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

SOIL DESCRIPTION (continued)

Cohesive soils can also be classified according to their "sensitivity". The sensitivity, S_t, is the ratio between the undisturbed undrained shear strength and the remoulded undrained shear strength of the soil. The classes of sensitivity may be defined as follows:

Low Sensitivity:	$S_t < 2$
Medium Sensitivity:	$2 < S_t < 4$
Sensitive:	$4 < S_t < 8$
Extra Sensitive:	$8 < S_t < 16$
Quick Clay:	$S_t > 16$

ROCK DESCRIPTION

The structural description of the bedrock mass is based on the Rock Quality Designation (RQD).

The RQD classification is based on a modified core recovery percentage in which all pieces of sound core over 100 mm long are counted as recovery. The smaller pieces are considered to be a result of closely-spaced discontinuities (resulting from shearing, jointing, faulting, or weathering) in the rock mass and are not counted. RQD is ideally determined from NQ or larger size core. However, it can be used on smaller core sizes, such as BQ, if the bulk of the fractures caused by drilling stresses (called "mechanical breaks") are easily distinguishable from the normal in situ fractures.

RQD %	**ROCK QUALITY**
90-100	Excellent, intact, very sound
75-90	Good, massive, moderately jointed or sound
50-75	Fair, blocky and seamy, fractured
25-50	Poor, shattered and very seamy or blocky, severely fractured
0-25	Very poor, crushed, very severely fractured

SAMPLE TYPES

SS	-	Split spoon sample (obtained in conjunction with the performing of the Standard Penetration Test (SPT))
TW	-	Thin wall tube or Shelby tube, generally recovered using a piston sampler
G	-	"Grab" sample from test pit or surface materials
AU	-	Auger sample or bulk sample
WS	-	Wash sample
RC	-	Rock core sample (Core bit size BQ, NQ, HQ, etc.). Rock core samples are obtained with the use of standard diamond drilling bits.

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

PLASTICITY LIMITS AND GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

WC%	-	Natural water content or water content of sample, %
LL	-	Liquid Limit, % (water content above which soil behaves as a liquid)
PL	-	Plastic Limit, % (water content above which soil behaves plastically)
PI	-	Plasticity Index, % (difference between LL and PL)
Dxx	-	Grain size at which xx% of the soil, by weight, is of finer grain sizes These grain size descriptions are not used below 0.075 mm grain size
D10	-	Grain size at which 10% of the soil is finer (effective grain size)
D60	-	Grain size at which 60% of the soil is finer
Cc	-	Concavity coefficient = $(D30)^2$ / (D10 x D60)
Cu	-	Uniformity coefficient = D60 / D10

Cc and Cu are used to assess the grading of sands and gravels:
Well-graded gravels have: $1 < Cc < 3$ and $Cu > 4$
Well-graded sands have: $1 < Cc < 3$ and $Cu > 6$
Sands and gravels not meeting the above requirements are poorly-graded or uniformly-graded.
Cc and Cu are not applicable for the description of soils with more than 10% silt and clay
(more than 10% finer than 0.075 mm or the #200 sieve)

CONSOLIDATION TEST

p'_o	-	Present effective overburden pressure at sample depth
p'_c	-	Preconsolidation pressure of (maximum past pressure on) sample
Ccr	-	Recompression index (in effect at pressures below p'_c)
Cc	-	Compression index (in effect at pressures above p'_c)
OC Ratio		Overconsolidaton ratio = p'_c / p'_o
Void Ratio		Initial sample void ratio = volume of voids / volume of solids
Wo	-	Initial water content (at start of consolidation test)

PERMEABILITY TEST

k	-	Coefficient of permeability or hydraulic conductivity is a measure of the ability of water to flow through the sample. The value of k is measured at a specified unit weight for (remoulded) cohesionless soil samples, because its value will vary with the unit weight or density of the sample during the test.

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

STRATA PLOT



MONITORING WELL AND PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION

MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION



PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION



APPENDIX 2

FIGURE 1 - KEY PLAN

FIGURE 2 – PODIUM DECK TO FOUNDATION WALL DRAINAGE SYSTEM TIE-IN DETAIL

FIGURE 3 – WATERPROOFING SYSTEM FOR ELEVATOR

DRAWING PG6263-1 - TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN



FIGURE 1

KEY PLAN

OPTION A - DOUBLE-SIDE POURED TOP OF FOUNDATION WALL



OPTION B - BLIND-SIDE POURED TOP OF FOUNDATION WALL



NOTES:

THE ABOVE DETAIL FOR HOT RUBBER AND DRAINAGE BOARD OVERLAP IS APPLICABLE TO ALL EDGE-PORTIONS OF THE PODIUM DECK AND/OR SUSPENDED GROUND FLOOR SLAB STRUCTURE.

APPLICABILITY THICKNESS AND EXTENSIONS OF RIGID INSULATION ARE SPECIFIED BY OTHERS

WHERE THE GRADING SURFACE TERMINATES AGAINST THE BUILDING FACE AND PAVEMENT STRUCTURE IS NOT LOCATED ABOVE THE EDGE OF THE FOUNDATION WALL AND PODIUM DECK SLAB AS DEPICTED HEREIN, IT IS RECOMMENDED TO PROVIDE A SUITABLE TERMINATION BAR TO SEAL THE TOP ENDLAP OF THE HOT-APPLIED RUBBER MEMBRANE LAYER TO THE VERTICAL FACE OF THE STRUCTURE. THIS WOULD BE REQUIRED TO MITIGATE THE POTENTIAL FOR THE MIGRATION OF WATER BEHIND THE RUBBER MEMBRANE.

ALL PORTIONS OF THE ABOVE-NOTED DETAIL (INSULATION OF FOUNDATION DRAINAGE BOARD, TERMINATION BAR, HOT-RUBBER MEMBRANE OVER SLAB, FOUNDATION WALL CONSTRUCTION JOINT AND OVERLAPPING/SHINGLING OF DRAINAGE BOARD) SHOULD BE REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION BY PATERSON PERSONNEL.

PATERSON GROUP
SOLUTION ORIENTED ENGINEERING

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL

OTTAWA KOREAN CHURCH LP c/o WINDMILL DEVELOPMENTS
PROPOSED MULTI-STOREY BUILDING
384 ARLINGTON AVENUE
OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Title: PODIUM DECK TO FOUNDATION WALL DRAINAGE SYSTEM TIE-IN DETAIL

Scale: N.T.S	Date: 07/2022
Drawn by: RCG	Report No.: PG6263-1
Checked by: KP	Dwg. No.: FIGURE 2
Approved by: DJG	Revision No.:

p:\autocad drawings\geotechnical\pg62xx\pg6263\pg6263-fig 2-podium drainage detail.dwg



NOTES:

1. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT PERIODIC INSPECTIONS BE COMPLETED BY THE GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT AT THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION DURING THE INSTALLATION OF THE ELEVATOR WATERPROOFING MEMBRANE(S).

PATERSON GROUP
SOLUTION ORIENTED ENGINEERING

OTTAWA KOREAN CHURCH LP c/o WINDMILL DEVELOPMENTS

PROPOSED MULTI-STOREY BUILDING

384 ARLINGTON AVENUE

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Title:

WATERPROOFING SYSTEM FOR ELEVATOR

Scale: N.T.S.	**Date:** 07/2022
Drawn by: RCG	**Report No.:** PG6263-1
Checked by: KP	**Drawing No.:** FIGURE 3
Approved by: DJG	**Revision No.:**

p:\autocad drawings\geotechnical\pg62xx\pg6263\pg6263- figure 3 - waterproofing systems for elevator.dwg



LEGEND:

- BOREHOLE LOCATION
- BOREHOLE WITH MONITORING WELL LOCATION
- 72.70 GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION (m)
- [70.49] BEDROCK SURFACE ELEVATION (m)

PROPOSED CONCEPTUAL PLAN PROVIDED BY NEUF ARCHITECT(E)S.

GROUND SURFACE ELEVATIONS AT BOREHOLE LOCATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO A GEODETIC DATUM.

SCALE: 1:300

0 1 2 3 4 5 10 15 20m

PATERSON GROUP
SOLUTION ORIENTED ENGINEERING

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL

OTTAWA KOREAN CHURCH C/O WINDMILL DEVELOPMENT

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROPOSED MULTI-STOREY BUILDING
384 ARLINGTON AVENUE

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Title:

TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN

Scale: 1:300	Date: 07/2022
Drawn by: GK	Report No.: PG6263-1
Checked by: KP	Dwg. No.: PG6263-1
Approved by: SD	Revision No.:

11x17

p:\autocad drawings\geotechnical\pg62xx\pg6263\pg6263-1-test hole location plan.dwg