

Geotechnical
Engineering

Environmental
Engineering

Hydrogeology

Geological
Engineering

Materials Testing

Building Science

Noise and Vibration
Studies

Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Residential Development
817 Roseview Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared For

Ottawa General Contractors

Paterson Group Inc.

Consulting Engineers
154 Colonnade Road South
Ottawa (Nepean), Ontario
Canada K2E 7J5

Tel: (613) 226-7381
Fax: (613) 226-6344
www.patersongroup.ca

October 15, 2021

Report: PG5852-1

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 Testing	3
3.4 Analytical Testing	3
4.0 Observations	4
4.1 Surface Conditions	4
4.2 Subsurface Profile	4
4.3 Groundwater	4
5.0 Discussion	6
5.1 Geotechnical Assessment	6
5.2 Site Grading and Preparation.....	6
5.3 Foundation Design	7
5.4 Design for Earthquakes	8
5.5 Basement Slab / Slab-on-Grade Construction	8
5.6 Basement Wall	8
5.7 Pavement Design.....	10
6.0 Design and Construction Precautions.....	11
6.1 Foundation Drainage and Backfill	11
6.2 Protection of Footings Against Frost Action	11
6.3 Excavation Side Slopes	12
6.4 Pipe Bedding and Backfill	13
6.5 Groundwater Control	14
6.6 Winter Construction.....	14
6.7 Corrosion Potential and Sulphate	15
7.0 Recommendations	16
8.0 Statement of Limitations.....	17

Appendices

- Appendix 1** Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets
 Symbols and Terms
 Analytical Testing Results
- Appendix 2** Figure 1 - Key Plan
 Drawing PG5852-1 - Test Hole Location Plan

1.0 Introduction

Paterson Group (Paterson) was commissioned by Ottawa General Contractors to conduct a geotechnical investigation for the proposed residential development site to be located at 817 Roseview Avenue in the City of Ottawa (refer to Figure 1 - Key Plan in Appendix 2 of this report).

The objective of the geotechnical investigation was to:

- Determine the subsoil and groundwater conditions at this site by means of boreholes.
- Provide geotechnical recommendations pertaining to 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

It is understood that the proposed development will consist of a four storey, low-rise apartment building with one basement level. Access lanes, parking areas, walkways, and landscaped areas are also anticipated as part of the development. It is further anticipated that the proposed building(s) will be municipally serviced.

3.0 Method of Investigation

3.1 Field Investigation

Field Program

The field program for the current geotechnical investigation was carried out on June 9, 2021, and consisted of advancing a total of 5 test holes to a maximum depth of 5.9 m below existing ground surface. The test hole locations were distributed in a manner to provide general coverage of the subject site and taking into consideration underground utilities and site features. The test hole locations are shown on Drawing PG5852-1 - Test Hole Location Plan included in Appendix 2.

The boreholes were completed using a low-clearance, rubber track-mounted drill rig operated by a two-person crew. The hand auger holes were completed using a steel, handheld hand auger. All fieldwork was conducted under the full-time supervision of Paterson personnel under the direction of a senior engineer. The drilling procedure consisted of advancing each test hole to the required depths at the selected locations and sampling the overburden.

Sampling and In Situ Testing

The soil samples were collected from the boreholes using a 50 mm diameter split-spoon (SS) sampler or from the drill auger and hand auger flights. The samples were initially classified on site, placed in sealed plastic bags, and transported to our laboratory. The depths at which the drill auger, and split-spoon and hand auger samples were recovered from the boreholes are shown as AU, SS and HA, respectively, on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets in Appendix 1.

The 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.

The thickness of the overburden was evaluated by a dynamic cone penetration test (DCPT) at borehole BH 2-21. The DCPT consists of driving a steel drill rod, equipped with a 50 mm diameter cone at its tip, using a 63.5 kg hammer falling from a height of 760 mm. The number of blows required to drive the cone into the soil is recorded for each 300 mm increment.

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

Flexible polyethylene standpipes were installed in all boreholes to permit monitoring of the groundwater levels following the completion of the sampling program.

Sample Storage

All samples will be stored in the laboratory for a period of one (1) month after issuance of this report. They will then be discarded unless we are otherwise directed.

3.2 Field Survey

The test hole locations were selected by Paterson to provide general coverage of the proposed development, taking into consideration the existing site features and underground utilities. The test hole locations and ground surface elevation at each test hole location were surveyed by Paterson using a handheld GPS and referenced to a geodetic datum. The location of the boreholes and ground surface elevation at each test hole location are presented on Drawing PG5852-1 - Test Hole Location Plan in Appendix 2.

3.3 Laboratory Testing

Soil samples were recovered from the subject site and visually examined in our laboratory to review the results of the field logging.

3.4 Analytical Testing

One (1) soil sample was submitted for analytical testing to assess the corrosion potential for exposed ferrous metals and the potential of sulphate attacks against subsurface concrete structures. The sample was submitted to determine the concentration of sulphate and chloride, the resistivity, and the pH of the samples. The results are presented in Appendix 1 and are discussed further in Subsection 6.7.

4.0 Observations

4.1 Surface Conditions

The ground surface across the subject site is relatively flat and at grade with the surrounding roadways. The subject site is currently occupied by a single-family residential dwelling with landscaped areas, fences and an asphalt paved driveway. It should be noted that multiple mature trees were noted across the subject site.

The site is bordered by a commercial property and Carling Avenue to the north, a recreational park to the east, residential dwellings and a community centre to the south, and residential dwellings and a family shelter to the west. The existing ground surface across the site is relatively level and at grade with the surrounding roadways, with an approximate geodetic elevation of 66 m, gradually sloping downward to the east to an approximate elevation of 65 m.

4.2 Subsurface Profile

Generally, the subsurface profile at the test hole locations consists of topsoil and/or fill consisting of brown silty sand with some gravel, organics and trace brick. Loose to compact, native brown silty sand was encountered underlying the above noted layers followed by a loose to very loose brown clayey silt to sandy silt. A very loose to compact, brown, silty sand with some clay and gravel was also encountered below the silty sand layer. Practical refusal to DCPT was encountered in borehole BH 2-21 at a depth of 6.55 m below the existing ground surface.

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

Bedrock

Based on available geological mapping, the bedrock in the subject area consists of Paleozoic, shale of the Billings formation, with an estimated overburden drift thickness of 5 to 15 m depth. It should be noted that the site lies within a bedrock transition zone where the depth of bedrock can vary in a limited space.

4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater levels were measured within the polytube piezometers installed in the boreholes June 14, 2021. The measured groundwater levels are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Summary of Groundwater Levels				
Test Hole Number	Ground Surface Elevation (m)	Measured Groundwater Level		Dated Recorded
		Depth (m)	Elevation (m)	
BH 1-21	65.94	4.69	61.25	June 14, 2021
BH 2-21	65.69	4.07	61.62	
BH 3-21	65.57	3.47	62.10	
Note: The ground surface elevation at each borehole location was surveyed using a handheld GPS using a geodetic datum.				

It should be noted that long-term groundwater levels can also be estimated based on the observed colour and consistency of the recovered soil samples. Based on these observations, the long-term groundwater table can be expected at approximately 3.5 to 4.5 m below ground surface. The recorded groundwater levels are noted on the applicable Soil Profile and Test Data sheet presented in Appendix 1.

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 suitable for the proposed development. It is expected that the proposed development will be founded on conventional footings placed on an undisturbed, compact silty sand to sandy silt and clayey silt.

The above and other considerations are discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.2 Site Grading and Preparation

Stripping Depth

Topsoil and deleterious fill, such as those containing organic materials, should be stripped from under any proposed buildings, paved areas, pipe bedding and other settlement sensitive structures.

It is anticipated that existing fill within the proposed building footprint, free of deleterious material and significant amounts of organics, and approved by the geotechnical consultant at the time of construction can be left in place below the proposed building footprints outside of lateral support zones for the footings. However, it is recommended that the existing fill layer be proof-rolled by a vibratory roller making several passes under dry conditions and above freezing temperatures and approved by the geotechnical consultant at the time of construction. Any poor performing areas noted during the proof-rolling operation should be removed and replaced with an approved engineered fill.

Existing foundation walls and other construction debris should be entirely removed from within the building perimeters. Under paved areas, existing construction remnants such as foundation walls should be excavated to a minimum of 1 m below final grade.

Fill Placement

Fill placed for grading beneath the building areas should consist, unless otherwise specified, of clean imported granular fill, such as Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS) Granular A or Granular B Type II. The imported fill material should be tested and approved prior to delivery. The fill should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose lifts and compacted by suitable compaction equipment. Fill placed beneath the building should be compacted to a minimum of 99% of the standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).

Non-specified existing fill along with site-excavated soil could be placed as general landscaping fill where settlement of the ground surface is of minor concern. These materials should be spread in lifts with a maximum thickness of 300 mm and compacted by the tracks of the spreading equipment to minimize voids. Non-specified existing fill and site-excavated soils are not suitable for placement as backfill against foundation walls, unless used in conjunction with a geocomposite drainage membrane, such as Miradrain G100N or Delta Drain 6000, connected to a perimeter drainage system is provided.

5.3 Foundation Design

Bearing Resistance Values

Footings placed on an undisturbed, compact silty sand to sandy silt and/or clayey silt can be designed using a bearing resistance value at serviceability limit states (SLS) of **100 kPa** and a factored bearing resistance value at ultimate limit states (ULS) of **150 kPa** incorporating a geotechnical factor of 0.5. Where the subgrade is found to be in a loose state of compactness below the proposed footings, the subgrade should be proof rolled using heavy vibratory compaction equipment making several passes and approved by Paterson prior to placing the footings. Any soft or poor performing areas should be removed and backfilled with OPSS Granular A crushed stone.

An undisturbed soil bearing surface consists of one from which all topsoil and deleterious materials, such as loose, frozen, or disturbed soil, have been removed, in the dry, prior to the placement of concrete footings.

Footings bearing on an undisturbed soil bearing surface and designed using the bearing resistance values provided herein will be subjected to potential post-construction total and differential settlements of 25 and 20 mm, respectively.

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 silty sand when a plane extending down and out from the bottom edges of the footing, at a minimum of 1.5H:1V, passes only through in situ soil or engineered fill of the same or higher capacity as that of the bearing medium.

5.4 Design for Earthquakes

The site class for seismic site response can be taken as **Class D** for foundations constructed at the subject site. As per the geological mapping of the bedrock, the site was found to be located within a bedrock transitions area where the bedrock tapers down rapidly. Therefore, it is recommended that a shear wave velocity test be completed within the subject site to assess whether a higher seismic site class such as Class C be provided for the subject site.

The soils underlying the subject site are not susceptible to liquefaction. Reference should be made to the latest revision of the 2012 Ontario Building Code for a full discussion of the earthquake design requirements.

5.5 Basement Slab / Slab-on-Grade Construction

With the removal of all topsoil and deleterious fill within the footprint of the proposed building, the native, undisturbed silty sand or sandy to clayey silt will be considered an acceptable subgrade upon which to commence backfilling for basement slab construction.

Provisions should be made to proof-rolling the soil subgrade using heavy vibratory compaction equipment prior to placing any engineered fill. Any soft areas should be removed and backfilled with appropriate backfill material. OPSS Granular B Types II, with a maximum particle size of 50 mm, are recommended for backfilling below the floor slab (outside the zones of influence of the footings).

For structures with basement slabs, it is recommended that the upper 200 mm of sub-slab fill consists of OPSS Granular A crushed stone. All backfill material within the footprint of the proposed building should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum 99% of its SPMDD.

5.6 Basement Wall

There are several combinations of backfill materials and retained soils that could be applicable for the basement walls of the subject structure. 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 bulk (drained) unit weight of 20 kN/m³.

Where undrained conditions are anticipated (i.e. below the groundwater level), the applicable effective (undrained) unit weight of the retained soil can be taken as 13 kN/m³, where applicable. A hydrostatic pressure should be added to the total static earth pressure when using the effective unit weight.

Two distinct conditions, static and seismic, should be reviewed for design calculations. The parameters for design calculations for the two conditions are presented below.

Static Conditions

The static horizontal earth pressure (p_o) could be calculated with 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/m³)
- H = height of the wall (m)

An additional pressure with 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 Conditions

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}) could be calculated using $0.375 \cdot a_c \cdot \gamma \cdot H^2/g$ where:

- $a_c = (1.45 - a_{max}/g)a_{max}$
- γ = unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m³)
- H = height of the wall (m)
- g = gravity, 9.81 m/s²

The peak ground acceleration, (a_{max}), for the Ottawa area is 0.32g according to OBC 2012. The vertical seismic coefficient is assumed to be zero. The earth force component (P_o) under seismic conditions could be calculated using:

$P_o = 0.5 K_o \gamma H^2$, where $K_o = 0.5$ for the soil conditions presented 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 Pavement Design

Car only parking areas and heavy traffic access areas are expected at this site. The proposed pavement structures are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 – 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 fill, in-situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in-situ soil.	

Table 3 – Recommended Pavement Structure – Access Lanes and Heavy Truck Parking/Loading Areas	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	Wear Course – HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	Wear Course – HL-8 or Superpave 19 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE – OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
450	SUBBASE – OPSS Granular B Type II
Subgrade – Either fill, in-situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in-situ soil.	

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 I or II material compacted to a minimum of 100% of the material's SPMDD using suitable compaction equipment.

Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 58-34 asphalt cement should be used for this project. 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 recommended that a perimeter foundation drainage system be provided for the proposed structures. The system should consist of a 100 to 150 mm diameter perforated, corrugated plastic pipe which is surrounded on all sides by 150 mm of 19 mm clear crushed stone and is placed at the footing level around the exterior perimeter of the structure. The pipe should have a positive outlet, such as a gravity connection to the storm sewer.

Foundation Backfill

Backfill against the exterior sides of the foundation walls should consist of free-draining, non-frost susceptible granular materials. The greater part of the site excavated materials will be frost susceptible and, as such, are not recommended for re-use as backfill against the foundation walls, unless used in conjunction with a drainage geocomposite, such as Delta Drain 6000, connected to the perimeter foundation drainage system. Imported granular materials, such as clean sand or OPSS Granular B Type I granular material, should otherwise be used for this purpose.

Underfloor Drainage

Underfloor drainage may be required to control water infiltration for the lower basement area. For preliminary design purposes, we recommend that 150 mm diameter perforated PVC pipes be placed at a 6 m spacing center to center. The requirement of the underfloor drainage pipes along with the spacing should be confirmed at the time of completing the excavation when water infiltration can be better assessed.

6.2 Protection of Footings Against Frost Action

Perimeter footings of heated structures are required to be insulated against the deleterious effects of frost action. A minimum 1.5 m thick soil cover (or insulation equivalent) should be provided in this regard.

Other exterior unheated footings, such as those for isolated exterior piers and retaining walls, are more prone to deleterious movement associated with frost action. A minimum of 2.1 m thick soil cover (or equivalent) should be provided for all exterior unheated footings.

6.3 Excavation Side Slopes

The side slopes of excavations in the overburden materials should be either cut back at acceptable slopes or should be retained by shoring systems from the start of the excavation until the structure is backfilled. It is assumed that sufficient room will be available for the greater part of the excavation to be undertaken by open-cut methods (i.e. unsupported excavations). Where space restrictions exist, or to reduce the trench width, the excavation can be carried out within the confines of a fully braced steel trench box.

Unsupported Side Slopes

The excavation side slopes above the groundwater level extending to a maximum depth of 3 m should be cut back at 1H:1V or flatter. The flatter slope is required for excavation below groundwater level. 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.

It is recommended that a trench box be used at all times 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.

Temporary Shoring

Temporary shoring may be required for the overburden soil to complete the required excavations where insufficient room is available for open cut methods. The shoring requirements designed by a structural engineer specializing in those works will depend on the depth of the excavation, the proximity of the adjacent structures and the elevation of the adjacent building foundations and underground services. The design and implementation of these temporary systems will be the responsibility of the excavation contractor and their design team. Inspections and approval of the temporary system will also be the responsibility of the designer.

Geotechnical information provided below is to assist the designer in completing a suitable and safe shoring system. The designer should take into account the impact of a significant precipitation event and designate design measures to ensure that a precipitation 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 design prior to implementation.

The temporary shoring system could consist of a soldier pile and lagging system or steel sheet piles. Any additional loading due to street traffic, construction equipment, adjacent structures and facilities, etc., should be included to the earth pressures described below. This system could be cantilevered, anchored or braced. The shoring system is recommended to be adequately supported to resist toe failure, if required, by means of extending the piles into the bedrock through pre-augered holes, if a soldier pile and lagging system is the preferred method.

The earth pressures acting on the temporary shoring system may be calculated with the following parameters.

Table 4 – Soils Parameter for Shoring System Design	
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 (γ), kN/m ³	20
Submerged Unit Weight (γ), 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 level.

The hydrostatic groundwater pressure should be included to the earth pressure distribution wherever the effective unit weight are calculated for earth pressures. If the groundwater level is lowered, the dry unit weight for the soil/bedrock 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.

At least 150 mm of OPSS Granular A should be used for pipe bedding for sewer and water pipes. The bedding should extend to the spring line of the pipe. Cover material, from the spring line to at least 300 mm above the obvert of the pipe, should consist of OPSS Granular A or Granular B Type II with a maximum size of 25 mm. The bedding and cover materials should be placed in maximum 225 mm thick lifts compacted to 98% of the material's standard Proctor maximum dry density.

It should generally be possible to re-use the upper portion of the dry to moist (not wet) silty sand above the cover material if the excavation and filling operations are carried out in dry weather conditions.

The backfill material within the frost zone (about 1.8 m below finished grade) should match the soils exposed at the trench walls to reduce potential differential frost heaving. The backfill should be placed in maximum 225 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum of 95% of the material's SPMDD.

6.5 Groundwater Control

Groundwater Control for Building Construction

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

Permit to Take Water

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

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 by the use of 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 in 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.

6.7 Corrosion Potential and Sulphate

The results of analytical testing show that the sulphate content is less than 0.1%. This result is indicative that Type 10 Portland cement (normal cement) would be appropriate for this site. The chloride content and the pH of the sample indicate that they are not significant factors in creating a corrosive environment for exposed ferrous metals at this site, whereas the resistivity is indicative of a non-aggressive to slightly aggressive corrosive environment.

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.

- Observation of all bearing surfaces prior to the placement of concrete.
- Review of the proposed drainage system design and components along with the waterproofing system for the building's mechanical pits (elevator and sump pit)
- Sampling and testing of the concrete and fill materials used.
- Periodic observation of the condition of unsupported excavation side slopes in excess of 3 m in height, if applicable.
- Observation of all subgrades prior to placing backfill material.
- 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 request, following the completion of a satisfactory material testing and observation program by the geotechnical consultant.

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 General Contractors 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.



Owen Canton, E.I.T.



Faisal I. Abou-Seido, P. Eng.

Report Distribution:

- Ottawa General Contractors (e-mail copy)
- Paterson Group

APPENDIX 1

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA SHEETS

SYMBOLS AND TERMS

ANALYTICAL TESTING RESULTS

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Multi-Storey Residential Building
817 Roseview Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario

DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill

DATE June 9, 2021

FILE NO. **PG5852**

HOLE NO. **BH 1-21**

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE				DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)	Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m ● 50 mm Dia. Cone				Piezometer Construction	
		TYPE	NUMBER	RECOVERY %	N VALUE or RQD			○ Water Content %					
GROUND SURFACE								20	40	60	80		
TOPSOIL	0.10	AU	1			0	65.94						
Loose to compact, brown SILTY SAND , trace to some clay		SS	1	17	9	1	64.94						
		SS	2	75	11	2	63.94						
Brown CLAYEY SILT , trace sand	2.29	SS	3	100	3	3	62.94						
		SS	4	100	2	4	61.94						
Very loose, brown SILTY SAND , some clay - clay content increasing with depth - grey by 4.9m depth	3.35	SS	5	83	1	4	61.94						
		SS	6	83	1	5	60.94						
End of Borehole	5.43	SS	7	100	50+								
Practical refusal to augering at 5.43m depth (GWL @ 4.69m - June 14, 2021)													
								20	40	60	80	100	
								Shear Strength (kPa)					
								▲ Undisturbed △ Remoulded					

DATUM Geodetic


REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill

DATE June 9, 2021

FILE NO. **PG5852**

HOLE NO. **BH 2-21**



DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill

DATE June 9, 2021

FILE NO. **PG5852**

HOLE NO. **BH 3-21**

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE				DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)	Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m ● 50 mm Dia. Cone				Piezometer Construction	
		TYPE	NUMBER	RECOVERY %	N VALUE or RQD			20	40	60	80		
GROUND SURFACE													
TOPSOIL	0.10	AU	1			0	65.57						
Loose, brown SILTY SAND , trace clay		SS	8	100	18								
		SS	2	67	7	1	64.57						
Loose to very loose, stratified brown CLAYEY SILT and SANDY SILT	1.37	SS	3	83	10	2	63.57						
		SS	4	75	3								
		SS	5	83	1	3	62.57						
		SS	6	100	2	4	61.57						
Very loose to compact, brown SILTY SAND , trace gravel	4.57	SS	7	100	2	5	60.57						
End of Borehole (GWL @ 3.47m - June 14, 2021)	5.94												

○ Water Content %

▲ Undisturbed △ Remoulded

Shear Strength (kPa)

20 40 60 80 100

DATUM Geodetic








REMARKS

BORINGS BY Hand Auger

DATE June 9, 2021

FILE NO. **PG5852**

HOLE NO. **HA 1-21**

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE				DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)	Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m ● 50 mm Dia. Cone				Piezometer Construction
		TYPE	NUMBER	RECOVERY %	N VALUE or RQD			20	40	60	80	
GROUND SURFACE												
FILL: Topsoil with sand and organics						0	64.81					
FILL: Brown silty sand with gravel												
TOPSOIL		G	1									
												
Reddish brown SILTY SAND		G	2			1	63.81					
Brown CLAYEY SILT to SANDY SILT												
		G	3									
End of Hand Auger Hole												

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

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
 Proposed Multi-Storey Residential Building
 817 Roseview Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario

DATUM Geodetic

REMARKS

BORINGS BY Hand Auger

DATE June 9, 2021

FILE NO. **PG5852**

HOLE NO. **HA 2-21**

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE				DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)	Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m ● 50 mm Dia. Cone				Piezometer Construction
		TYPE	NUMBER	RECOVERY %	N VALUE or RQD			20	40	60	80	
GROUND SURFACE												
TOPSOIL	0.05					0	64.91					
FILL: Brown silty sand, trace brick	0.30											
Brown SILTY SAND, trace to some clay		G	1									
	1.22	G	2			1	63.91					
End of Hand Auger Hole												
								20	40	60	80	100
								Shear Strength (kPa)				
								▲ Undisturbed △ Remoulded				

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)
D _{xx}	-	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
D ₁₀	-	Grain size at which 10% of the soil is finer (effective grain size)
D ₆₀	-	Grain size at which 60% of the soil is finer
C _c	-	Concavity coefficient = $(D_{30})^2 / (D_{10} \times D_{60})$
C _u	-	Uniformity coefficient = D_{60} / D_{10}

C_c and C_u are used to assess the grading of sands and gravels:

Well-graded gravels have: $1 < C_c < 3$ and $C_u > 4$

Well-graded sands have: $1 < C_c < 3$ and $C_u > 6$

Sands and gravels not meeting the above requirements are poorly-graded or uniformly-graded.

C_c and C_u 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
C _{cr}	-	Recompression index (in effect at pressures below p' _c)
C _c	-	Compression index (in effect at pressures above p' _c)
OC Ratio		Overconsolidation ratio = p'_c / p'_o
Void Ratio		Initial sample void ratio = volume of voids / volume of solids
W _o	-	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



Topsoil



Asphalt



Fill



Peat



Sand



Silty Sand



Silt



Sandy Silt



Clay



Silty Clay



Clayey Silty Sand



Glacial Till




Shale




Bedrock

MONITORING WELL AND PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION

MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION



PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION



Certificate of Analysis

Report Date: 17-Jun-2021

Client: Paterson Group Consulting Engineers

Order Date: 11-Jun-2021

Client PO: 32183

Project Description: PG5852

Client ID:	BH3-21 SS3	-	-	-
Sample Date:	09-Jun-21 09:00	-	-	-
Sample ID:	2124701-01	-	-	-
MDL/Units	Soil	-	-	-

Physical Characteristics

% Solids	0.1 % by Wt.	83.3	-	-	-
----------	--------------	------	---	---	---

General Inorganics

pH	0.05 pH Units	7.41	-	-	-
Resistivity	0.10 Ohm.m	56.5	-	-	-

Anions

Chloride	5 ug/g dry	24	-	-	-
Sulphate	5 ug/g dry	43	-	-	-

APPENDIX 2

FIGURE 1 – KEY PLAN

DRAWING PG5852-1 – TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN








FIGURE 1

KEY PLAN


ROSEVIEW AVENUE



LEGEND:

-  BOREHOLE LOCATION
-  HAND AUGER HOLE LOCATION
- 65.94 GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION (m)
- (60.51) PRACTICAL REFUSAL TO AUGERING/DCPT REFUSAL ELEVATION (m)

GROUND SURFACE ELEVATIONS ARE REFERENCED TO A GEODETIC DATUM.



patersongroup
consulting engineers

154 Colonnade Road South
Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7J5
Tel: (613) 226-7381 Fax: (613) 226-6344

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL
0			

OTTAWA GENERAL CONTRACTORS LTD.
GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROP. MULTI-STORY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING - 817 ROSEVIEW AVE.
OTTAWA, ONTARIO

TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN

Scale: 1:200
Drawn by: MPG
Checked by: OC
Approved by: DJG

Date: 06/2021
Report No.: PG5852-1
Dwg. No.: **PG5852-1**
Revision No.: