

Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Concrete Plant 2596 Carp Road Ottawa, Ontario



Submitted to:

Cavanagh Developments 9094 Cavanagh Road Ashton, Ontario K0A 1B0

Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Concrete Plant 2596 Carp Road Ottawa, Ontario

> September 14, 2018 Project: 61318.20

GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists Limited 32 Steacie Drive Ottawa, ON, Canada K2K 2A9

September 14, 2018

File: 61318.20

Cavanagh Developments 9094 Cavanagh Road Ashton, Ontario K0A 1B0

Attention: Ben Houle, P.Eng. - Project Engineer, Land Development

Re: Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Concrete Plant 2596 Carp Road Ottawa, Ontario

Enclosed is our geotechnical investigation report for the above noted project, in accordance with our proposal dated July 5, 2018. This report was prepared by Gregory Davidson, B.Eng., E.I.T. and Brent Wiebe, P.Eng.

Daridsa

Greg Davidson, B.Eng., E.I.T.

GD/BW

521

Brent Wiebe P.Eng. VP Operations - Ontario

Enclosures P:\0. Files\61300\61318.20\Report\61318.20_RPT01_V02_2018-09-14.docx



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRO	DUCTION	.1
2.0	PROJE	CT DESCRIPTION AND SITE GEOLOGY	.1
2.1	1 Pro	ject Description	.1
3.0	METH	DDOLOGY	.1
3.1	1 Ge	otechnical Investigation	.1
4.0	SUBSI	JRFACE CONDITIONS	.2
4.1	1 Ge	neral	.2
4.2	•	soil, Topsoil Fill	
4.3		Material	
4.4		ıd	
4.		/ Sand/Sandy Silt	
4.6		cial Till	
4.7		er Refusal	
4.8		undwater	
4.9	9 501	Chemistry Relating to Corrosion	.7
5.0	GEOT	ECHNICAL GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	.7
5.1	1 Ge	neral	.7
5. ⁻ 5.2			
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1	neral posed Buildings Excavation	.7 .7
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design	.7 .7 .8
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures	.7 .7 .8 .9
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab	.7 .7 .8 .9
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures	.7 .7 .8 .9 .9
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 .9
5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 10
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .7 .9 .9 .9 10
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .7 .8 .9 .9 .9 10 11
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 .9 10 11 11
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1 5.2.2	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 .9 10 11 11 11
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 .9 10 11 11 12 12
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.3 5.2.4	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support frosion of Buried Concrete and Steel Subgrade Preparation Pavement Structure Pavement Transitions	.7 .8 .9 .9 .9 10 11 11 12 12
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6	neral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage Slab on Grade Support	.7 .8 .9 .9 10 11 11 12 12 13
5.2 5.2 5.2	2 Pro 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 1 Cor 2 Roa 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.2.5 5.2.6 3 Exi	heral posed Buildings Excavation Footing Design. Seismic Design of Proposed Structures Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage. Slab on Grade Support 1 rosion of Buried Concrete and Steel	.7 .8 .9 .9 .10 11 11 12 12 13 13

6.2	Winter Construction1	3
6.3	Excess Soil Management Plan1	4
6.4	Design Review1	4

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Fill Material)	3
Table 4.2 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Sand)	4
Table 4.3 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Silty Sand/Sandy Silt)	4
Table 4.4 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Glacial Till)	5
Table 4.5 – Auger Refusal Summary	6
Table 4.6 – Groundwater Level Observations (August 17, 2018)	6
Table 5.1 – Allowable Stress Levels	10

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – Key Plan	15
Figure 2 – Borehole Location	16

LIST OF APPENDICES

List of Abbreviations and Terminology

Appendix A	Record of Borehole Sheets
Appendix B	Laboratory Testing Results
Appendix C	Chemical Analysis of Soil and Groundwater Samples



1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation carried out for the proposed development of a new concrete plant to be located at 2596 Carp Road in Carp (Ottawa), Ontario (see Key Plan, Figure 1). The purpose of the investigation was to identify the general subsurface conditions at the site by means of a limited number of boreholes and, based on the factual information obtained, to provide engineering guidelines on the geotechnical design aspects of the project, including construction considerations that could influence design decisions.

This investigation was carried out in general accordance with our proposal dated July 5, 2018.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SITE GEOLOGY

2.1 **Project Description**

It is understood that plans are being prepared to construct a new concrete batch plant on a relatively undeveloped parcel of land at 2596 Carp Road. The proposed structure(s) include a batching plant, office, aggregate storage bins and a wash plant. The area is surrounded by commercial properties to the south and west, residential properties at the far east property limits and wooded forest to the north. The area where the concrete plant is proposed appears to be relatively flat. A small slope is observed alongside a creek that crosses through the property.

Based on historical geological mapping, the overburden deposit within the vicinity of the new development generally consist of sand, silt and glacial till. Bedrock geology mapping indicates limestone and shale of the Verulam formation at depths ranging from about 5 to 10 metres.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Geotechnical Investigation

The field work for this investigation was carried out on August 8, 2018. At that time, eleven (11) boreholes, numbered 18-1 to 18-11, inclusive, were advanced at the site by George Downing Estate Drilling Ltd. to depths ranging from about 1.5 to 2.9 metre below surface grade (elevations 107.4 to 113.2 metres, geodetic datum).

Standard penetration tests (SPT) were carried out in the boreholes and samples of the soils encountered were recovered using a 50 millimetre diameter split barrel sampler.

The field work was observed throughout by a member of our engineering staff who directed the drilling operations and logged the samples and boreholes.

Four (4) standpipe piezometers were installed and sealed in the overburden at borehole locations 18-1, 18-6, 18-7 and 18-11 to facilitate groundwater level measurements and hydraulic conductivity testing by others.

Following completion of the drilling, the soil samples were returned to our laboratory for examination by a geotechnical engineer. One (1) sample of the soil from borehole 18-8 and one (1) groundwater sample recovered from the monitoring well installed in borehole 18-7 was sent to Paracel Laboratories Ltd. for basic chemical testing relating to corrosion of buried concrete and steel.

The results of the boreholes are provided on the Record of Borehole sheets in Appendix A. The approximate locations of the boreholes are shown on the Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2. The laboratory testing results are provided on the Soils Grading charts in Appendix B. The results of the chemical analysis of a sample of soil relating to corrosion of buried concrete and steel are provided in Appendix C.

The borehole locations were selected by GEMTEC and positioned on site relative to existing features. The ground surface elevations at the location of the boreholes were determined using a Trimble R10 global positioning system. The coordinates of the boreholes are referenced to NAD83 (CSRS) Epoch 2010, vertical network CGVD2013 and are considered to be accurate within the tolerance of the instrument.

4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

4.1 General

As previously indicated, the soil and groundwater conditions identified in the boreholes are given on the Record of Borehole sheets in Appendix A. The logs indicate the subsurface conditions at the specific test locations only. Boundaries between zones on the logs are often not distinct, but rather are transitional and have been interpreted. The precision with which subsurface conditions are indicated depends on the method of drilling, the frequency and recovery of samples, the method of sampling, and the uniformity of the subsurface conditions. Subsurface conditions at other than the test locations may vary from the conditions encountered in the boreholes. In addition to soil variability, fill of variable physical and chemical composition can be present over portions of the site or on adjacent properties.

The soil descriptions in this report are based on commonly accepted methods of classification and identification employed in geotechnical practice. Classification and identification of soil and bedrock involves judgement and GEMTEC does not guarantee descriptions as exact, but infers accuracy to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice.

The groundwater conditions described in this report refer only to those observed at the place and time of observation noted in the report. Groundwater conditions may vary seasonally or as a consequence of construction activities in the area. The following presents an overview of the subsurface conditions encountered in the boreholes advanced during this investigation. It should be noted borehole 18-11 was drilled to facilitate the installation of a standpipe piezometer. The soil conditions at this location were not logged.

4.2 Topsoil, Topsoil Fill

A surficial layer of topsoil or topsoil fill was encountered at all borehole locations. The thickness of the topsoil/ topsoil fill layer ranges from about 30 to 80 millimetres.

4.3 Fill Material

Fill material was encountered at borehole locations 18-2 to 18-5, inclusive, below the surficial topsoil fill layer. The fill material is variable across the site but can generally be described as grey to dark brown silty sand with varying amounts of gravel, clay, cobbles and boulders. It was noted that construction debris (reinforcing steel) was encountered in the fill material at borehole 18-3. Boreholes 18-2 to 18-5, inclusive, were terminated within the fill material at depths of about 1.5 metres below surface grade (elevations 112.4 to 113.2 metres, geodetic datum).

The results of grain size distribution testing on samples of the fill material is provided on the Soils Grading Charts in Appendix B and summarized in Table 4.1.

Location	Sample Number	Sample Depth (metres)	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt & Clay (%)
18-2	1	0.3 – 0.6	22	49	29
18-4	1	0.3 – 1.2	7	63	30

Table 4.1 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Fill Material)

Moisture content testing carried out on samples of the fill material indicate moisture contents ranging from about 12 to 14 percent.

4.4 Sand

A deposit of brown sand with varying amounts of silt and gravel was encountered in boreholes 18-1 and 18-6 below the surficial topsoil layer and/or silty sand.

The results of grain size distribution testing on a sample of the native sand is provided on the Soils Grading Charts in Appendix B and summarized in Table 4.2.

Location	Sample Number	Sample Depth (metres)	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt & Clay (%)
18-1	1	0.1 – 0.4	0	92	8

Table 4.2 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Sand)

Moisture content testing carried out on a sample of the native sand indicates a moisture content of about 18 percent.

4.5 Silty Sand/Sandy Silt

Native deposits of silty sandy/sandy silt were encountered at borehole locations 18-1 and 18-6 to 18-10, inclusive, below the surficial topsoil layer and/or sand. The native deposits consist of grey to brown silty sand with varying amounts of gravel and clay to dark brown sandy silt. The thickness of the silty sand/sandy silt layer ranges from about 0.3 to 1.4 metres and extends to depths ranging from about 0.3 to 2.1 metres below surface grade. Boreholes 18-1 and 18-6 were terminated within the silty sand at a depth of about 2.1 metres below surface grade (elevation 110.7 and 108.7 metres, geodetic datum, respectively).

Penetration tests carried out within the silty sand/ sandy silt gave N values ranging from 3 to 9 blows per 0.3 metres of penetration, which reflects a very loose to loose relative density.

The results of grain size distribution testing on samples of the native silty sand/sandy silt are provided on the Soils Grading Charts in Appendix B and summarized in Table 4.3.

Location	Sample Number	Sample Depth (metres)	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt & Clay (%)
18-6	3	0.9 – 1.2	7	47	46
18-7	1B	0.1 – 0.6	4	70	26
18-10	2	0.8 – 1.4	0	35	65

Table 4.3 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Silty Sand/Sandy Silt)

Moisture content testing carried out on samples of the native silty sand/sandy silt indicate moisture contents ranging from about 14 to 36 percent.



4.6 Glacial Till

Native deposits of glacial till were encountered at borehole locations 18-7 to 18-10, inclusive, at depths ranging from about 0.8 to 1.5 metres below surface grade. Glacial till is a heterogeneous mixture of all grain sizes but at this site can generally be described as grey brown silty sand with trace to some gravel and probable cobbles and boulders. The thickness of the glacial till ranges from about 1.4 to 1.9 metres based on auger refusal at boreholes 18-7 to 18-10 inclusive.

Penetration tests carried out within the glacial till gave N values ranging from 18 blows per 0.3 metres of penetration to greater than 50 blows for 80 millimetres, which reflects a compact to very dense relative density. The relative density variability is likely due to the presence of cobbles and boulders within the glacial till.

The results of grain size distribution testing on a sample of the native glacial till is provided on the Soils Grading Charts in Appendix B and summarized in Table 4.4.

Location	Sample Number	Sample Depth (metres)	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt (%)	Clay (%)
18-8	3	1.5 – 2.1	5	53	25	17

Table 4.4 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Testing (Glacial Till)

Moisture content testing carried out on samples of the native glacial till indicate moisture contents ranging from about 6 to 10 percent.

4.7 Auger Refusal

Practical auger refusal on inferred bedrock occurred at boreholes 18-7 to 18-11, inclusive, at depths ranging from about 2.7 to 2.9 metres below surface grade (elevations 107.4 to 109.8 metres, geodetic datum). Table 4.5 summarizes the depth of refusal and corresponding elevations at the borehole locations. It is noted that boreholes 18-1 to 18-6, inclusive, were advanced to pre-determined depths (1.5 to 2.1 metres below surface grade) to determine the conditions below the proposed access roadway and parking areas. As such, these boreholes were not taken to auger refusal.



Table 4.5 – Auger Refusal Summary

Borehole	Refusal Depth Below Existing Ground Surface (metres)	Elevation – Geodetic Datum (metres)
18-7	2.9	109.8
18-8	2.7	108.9
18-9	2.9	108.9
18-10	2.9	107.4
18-11	2.8	108.1

Auger refusal typically occurs on or within boulders or on the surface of the bedrock.

4.8 Groundwater

The groundwater conditions in the open boreholes were observed prior to backfilling. Groundwater seepage was observed in borehole 18-2 at about 1.4 metres below surface grade (elevation 112.8). It is noted that groundwater seepage may not be representative of the groundwater table. Standpipe piezometers were installed in boreholes 18-1, 18-6, 18-7 and 18-11, to measure stabilized groundwater conditions and facilitate hydraulic conductivity testing. The groundwater levels measured on August 17, 2018, are summarized in Table 4.6.

Borehole	Date	Depth Below Existing Ground Surface (metres)	Elevation – Geodetic Datum (metres)
18-1	August 17, 2018	0.7	112.2
18-6	August 17, 2018	1.3	109.6
18-7	August 17, 2018	1.5	111.2
18-11	August 17, 2018	1.5	109.4

It should be noted that the groundwater levels may be higher during wet periods of the year such as the early spring or following periods of precipitation.

4.9 Soil Chemistry Relating to Corrosion

The results of chemical testing of a soil sample from borehole 18-8 sample 2B are provided in Appendix D and summarized below:

- pH 7.89
- Sulphate Content <5 micrograms per gram
- Chloride Content <5 micrograms per gram
- Resistivity 121 Ohm metres

The results of chemical testing of a groundwater sample from borehole 18-7 sample 2B are also provided in Appendix D and summarized below:

- pH 7.7
- Sulphate Content 25 micrograms per gram
- Chloride Content 12 micrograms per gram
- Resistivity 18.1 Ohm metres

5.0 GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 General

This section of the report provides engineering guidelines on the geotechnical design aspects of the project based on our interpretation of the boreholes advanced as part of this investigation and the project requirements. It is stressed that the information in the following sections is provided for the guidance of the designers and is intended for this project only. Contractors bidding on or undertaking the works should examine the factual results of the investigation, satisfy themselves as to the adequacy of the information for construction, and make their own interpretation of the factual data as it affects their construction techniques, schedule, safety and equipment capabilities.

The professional services retained for this project include only the geotechnical aspects of the subsurface conditions at this site. The presence or implications of possible surface and/or subsurface contamination resulting from previous uses or activities of this site or adjacent properties, and/or resulting from the introduction onto the site from materials from offsite sources are outside the terms of reference for this report and have not been investigated or addressed.

5.2 Proposed Buildings

5.2.1 Excavation

Based on the test pits advanced in the vicinity of the proposed buildings (18-7 to 18-10, inclusive) the excavations for the proposed batching plant, office, aggregate storage bins and

wash plant will be carried out mostly through topsoil, sand, silt sand/sandy silt and glacial till. The sides of the excavation in overburden should be sloped in accordance with the requirements in Ontario Regulation 213/91 under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. According to the Act, the fill material at this site can be classified as Type 3 soil and, accordingly, allowance should be made for excavation side slopes of 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter.

In the event that a granular pad is necessary below the foundations, the excavations should be sized to accommodate a pad of imported granular material which extends at least 0.3 metres horizontally beyond the edge of the footings and down and out from this point at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter.

Groundwater inflow, if any, from the overburden deposits should be relatively small and controlled by pumping from filtered sumps within the excavation. It is not expected that short term pumping during excavation will have a significant effect on nearby structures and services.

5.2.2 Footing Design

Based on the results of the current investigation, the proposed structures could be founded on conventional footings bearing on or within native, undisturbed sand, silty sand and/or glacial till however, based on the results pits 18-7 to 18-10, inclusive, it considered likely that the foundations will bear on the native glacial till.

In areas where subexcavation of disturbed material is required below proposed founding level, the grade could be raised with compacted granular material (engineered fill). The engineered fill should consist of granular material meeting Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS) requirements for Granular B Type II and should be compacted in maximum 200 millimetre thick lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density. To provide adequate spread of load beneath the footings, the engineered fill should extend horizontally at least 0.3 metres beyond the footings and then down and out from this point at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter.

For design purposes, footings bearing on the native, undisturbed glacial till material, or on a pad of engineered fill above native, undisturbed glacial till should be sized using a geotechnical reaction at Serviceability Limit State (SLS) of 150 kilopascals and a factored geotechnical resistance at Ultimate Limit State (ULS) of 300 kilopascals. For footings bearing directly on the native, undisturbed sand, silty sand and/or sandy silt a geotechnical reaction at SLS of 90 kilopascals and a factored geotechnical resistance at ULS of 250 kilopascals could be used. The post construction total and differential settlement of the footings at SLS should be less than 25 millimetres, provided that all loose and/or disturbed soil is removed from the bearing surfaces.

To reduce the potential for cracking in the footings, foundation walls, and concrete slabs on grade where the footings transition between different subgrade materials, the foundation walls

should be reinforced for a distance of 3 metres on both sides of the transition areas or as recommended by the structural engineer.

5.2.3 Seismic Design of Proposed Structures

Based on the results of the investigation, the proposed structures should be designed for seismic Site Class D.

There is no potential for liquefaction of the overburden deposits below typical level (i.e. soils deeper than about 1.5 metres below ground surface) at this site.

5.2.4 Frost Protection of the Foundations and Slab

All exterior footings in unheated portions of the proposed structures or slabs should be provided with at least 1.5 metres of earth cover for frost protection purposes. Isolated, unheated exterior footings adjacent to surfaces which are cleaned of snow cover during the winter months should be provided with a minimum of 1.8 metres of earth cover. The required depth of frost protection can be reduced by the thickness of any engineered fill beneath the foundations. Alternatively, the required frost protection could be provided by means of a combination of earth cover and extruded polystyrene insulation. An insulation detail could be provided upon request.

5.2.5 Foundation Wall Backfill and Drainage

To avoid frost adhesion and possible heaving, the foundations should be backfilled with imported, free-draining, non-frost susceptible granular material such as that meeting OPSS Granular B Type I or II requirements.

Where the backfill will ultimately support areas of hard surfacing (pavement, sidewalks or other similar surfaces), the backfill should be placed in maximum 200 millimetre thick lifts and should be compacted to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density value using suitable vibratory compaction equipment. Light, walk behind compaction equipment should be used next to foundation walls to avoid excessive compaction induced stress on the foundation walls. Where future landscaped areas will exist next to the proposed structures and if some settlement of the backfill is acceptable, the backfill could be compacted to at least 90 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density value.

Where areas of hard surfacing (pavement etc.) abut the proposed structures, a gradual transition should be provided between those areas of hard surfacing underlain by non-frost susceptible granular wall backfill and those areas underlain by existing frost susceptible material to reduce the effects of differential frost heaving. It is suggested that granular frost tapers be constructed from 1.5 metres below finished grade to the underside of the granular subbase material for the hard surfaced areas. The frost tapers should be sloped at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter.

Perimeter foundation drainage is not considered necessary for slab on grade structures at this site, provided that the floor slab level is above the finished exterior ground surface level.

5.2.6 Slab on Grade Support

Based on the results of the investigation, the area in the vicinity of the buildings is generally underlain by topsoil and native overburden deposits. The existing topsoil should be removed from the slab on grade areas.

The grade below the concrete slabs on grade could be raised, where necessary, with granular material meeting OPSS requirements for Granular B Type I or II. The use of Granular B Type II material is preferred under wet conditions. The granular base for the proposed slab on grade should consist of at least 150 millimetres of OPSS Granular A.

All imported granular materials placed below the proposed floor slab should be compacted in maximum 200 millimetre thick lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density value.

Underfloor drainage is not considered necessary provided that the floor slab level is above the finished exterior ground surface level.

Thermal protection of the concrete slab on grade is required in areas that will remain unheated during the winter period. An insulation detail could be provided upon request. The type of insulation used below the slabs will depend on the stresses imposed on the insulation. The stress on the insulation should not exceed about 35 percent of the insulation's quoted compressive strength due to the time dependant creep characteristics of this material. The allowable stress levels for several strengths of insulation are provided in Table 5.1.

Insulation Type	Maximum Allowable Stress (kilopascals)
Dow SM (or equivalent)	70
Dow Highload 40 (or equivalent)	95
Dow Highload 60 (or equivalent)	145
Dow Highload 100 (or equivalent)	240

Table 5.1 – Allowable Stress Levels

If required, a modulus of subgrade reaction for the design of the concrete slabs on grade could be provided as the design progresses.

5.1 Corrosion of Buried Concrete and Steel

The measured sulphate concentrations in the soil sample and groundwater sample recovered from borehole 18-8 and the well screen in borehole 18-7 are <5 micrograms per gram and 25 milligrams per litre, respectively. According to Canadian Standards Association (CSA) "Concrete Materials and Methods of Concrete Construction", the concentration of sulphate can be classified as low. Therefore any concrete in contact with the groundwater could be batched with General Use (GU) cement.

Based on the resistivity and pH of the soil sample, the soil in this area can be classified as nonaggressive towards unprotected steel.

5.2 Roadway

5.2.1 Subgrade Preparation

In preparation for roadway construction at this site, all surficial topsoil and any soft, wet or deleterious materials should be removed from the proposed roadway areas.

Prior to placing granular material for the internal roads, the exposed subgrade should be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel. Any soft areas should be subexcavated and replaced with suitable (dry) earth borrow or well shattered and graded rock fill material that is frost compatible with the materials exposed on the sides of the area of subexcavation.

Similarly, should it be necessary to raise the roadway grades at this site, material which meets OPSS specifications for Select Subgrade Material, Earth Borrow or well shattered and graded rock fill material may be used.

The Select Subgrade material or Earth Borrow should be placed in maximum 300 millimetre thick lifts and compacted to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density value using vibratory compaction equipment. Rock fill should be placed in maximum 500 millimetres lifts and suitably compacted either with a large drum roller, the haulage and spreading equipment, or a combination of both.

5.2.2 Pavement Structure

For the access roadways and/or parking lot areas, the following minimum pavement structure should be used:

- 100 millimetres of hot mix asphaltic concrete (40 millimetres of Superpave 12.5 (Traffic Level B) over 60 millimetres of Superpave 19.0 (Traffic Level B)), over
- 150 millimetres of OPSS Granular A base over

• 450 millimetres of OPSS Granular B, Type II subbase

The above pavement structure assumes that the access roadway and parking lot subgrade surfaces are prepared as described in this report. If the subgrade surfaces become disturbed or wetted due to construction operations or precipitation, the granular subbase thickness given above may not be adequate and it may be necessary to increase the thickness of the subbase and/or to incorporate a woven geotextile separator between the subgrade surfaces and the granular subbase material. The adequacy of the design pavement thickness should be assessed by geotechnical personnel at the time of construction.

If the granular pavement materials are to be used by construction traffic, it may be necessary to increase the thickness of the granular subbase layer, install a woven geotextile separator between the roadway subgrade surface and the granular subbase material, or a combination of both, to prevent pumping and disturbance to the subbase material. The contractor should be made responsible for their construction access.

5.2.3 Asphalt Cement Type

Performance grade PG 58-34 asphalt cement should be specified for Superpave asphaltic concrete mixes.

5.2.4 Pavement Transitions

As part of the roadway construction, the new pavement will abut the existing pavement at Carp Road. The following is suggested to improve the performance of the joint between the new and the existing pavements:

- Neatly saw cut the existing asphaltic concrete;
- Remove the asphaltic concrete and slope the bottom of the excavation within the existing granular base and subbase at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter, to avoid undermining the existing asphaltic concrete.
- To avoid cracking of the asphaltic concrete due to an abrupt change in the thickness of the roadway granular materials where new pavement areas join with the existing pavements, the granular depths should taper up or down at 5 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter, to match the existing pavement structure.
- Remove (mill off) 40 to 50 millimetres of the existing asphaltic concrete to a distance of 300 millimetres at the joint and tack coat the asphaltic concrete at the joint in accordance with the requirements in OPSS 310.

5.2.5 Pavement Drainage

Adequate drainage of the pavement granular materials and subgrade is important for the long term performance of the pavement at this site. The subgrade surfaces should be crowned and

shaped to drain to the ditches and/or catch basins to promote drainage of the pavement granular materials.

Catch basins should be equipped with minimum 3 metre long stub drains extending in two directions at the subgrade level.

5.2.6 Granular Material Compaction

The granular base and subbase materials should be compacted in maximum 300 millimetre thick lifts to at least 98 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density value.

5.3 Existing Slope

As indicated above, a slope exists adjacent to a creek that crosses through the property. Plans provided to us indicate a "Meander Belt" setback for this creek. The proposed development is outside of this setback.

In order to assess the slope, available topographic information in the vicinity of the slope was reviewed and a site visit was carried out by a member of our engineering staff who assessed several sections of the slope in the vicinity of the development. Based on our review and observations, the slope height is generally less than about 2 metres. We have no concerns with impacts from the proposed development on the global stability of this slope. Furthermore, it is noted that the meander belt setback will result in a considerable separation distance between the development and the creek.

6.0 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Effects of Construction Induced Vibration

Some of the construction operations (such as excavation and granular material compaction, etc.) will cause ground vibration on and off of the site. The vibrations will attenuate with distance from the source, but may be felt at nearby structures. Assuming that any excavating is carried out in accordance with the guidelines in this report, the magnitude of the vibrations will be much less than that required to cause damage to the nearby structures or services in good condition, but may any felt at the nearby structures. We recommend that preconstruction surveys be carried out on the adjacent structures and that vibration monitoring be carried out during the construction to ensure that vibrations are below typical threshold values and so that any damage claims can be addressed in a fair manner.

6.2 Winter Construction

In the event that construction is required during freezing temperatures, the subgrade should be protected immediately from freezing using straw, propane heaters and insulated tarpaulins, or other suitable means.

6.3 Excess Soil Management Plan

This report does not constitute an excess soil management plan. The disposal requirements for excess soil from the site have not been assessed.

6.4 Design Review

It is recommended that the final design drawings be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer to ensure that the guidelines provided in this report have been interpreted as intended.


The engagement of the services of the geotechnical consultant during construction is recommended to confirm that the subsurface conditions throughout the proposed excavations do not materially differ from those given in the report and that the construction activities do not adversely affect the intent of the design. The subgrade surfaces for the proposed development should be inspected by experienced geotechnical personnel to ensure that suitable materials have been reached and properly prepared. The placing and compaction of earth fill and imported granular materials should be inspected to ensure that the materials used conform to the grading and compaction specifications.

We trust this report provides sufficient information for your present purposes. If you have any questions concerning this report, please do not hesitate to contact our office.


Greg Davidson, B.Eng., E.I.T.

Brent Wiebe, P.Eng. VP Operations - Ontario





P:\0. Files\61300\61318.20\Drafting\Drawings\61318.20_FG1_V01_2018-08-21.dwg, KEY PLAN, 18/08/21 9:47:07 AM



APPENDIX A

List of Abbreviations and Terminology Record of Borehole Sheets

ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMINOLOGY USED ON RECORDS OF BOREHOLES AND TEST PITS

	SAMPLE TYPES
AS	Auger sample
СА	Casing sample
CS	Chunk sample
BS	Borros piston sample
GS	Grab sample
MS	Manual sample
RC	Rock core
SS	Split spoon sampler
ST	Slotted tube
ТО	Thin-walled open shelby tube
TP	Thin-walled piston shelby tube
WS	Wash sample

PENETRATION RESISTANCE

Standard Penetration Resistance, N


The number of blows by a 63.5 kg (140 lb) hammer dropped 760 millimetres (30 in.) required to drive a 50 mm split spoon sampler for a distance of 300 mm (12 in.). For split spoon samples where less than 300 mm of penetration was achieved, the number of blows is reported over the sampler penetration in mm.

Dynamic Penetration Resistance

The number of blows by a 63.5 kg (140 lb) hammer dropped 760 mm (30 in.) to drive a 50 mm (2 in.) diameter 60° cone attached to 'A' size drill rods for a distance of 300 mm (12 in.).

WH	Sampler advanced by static weight of hammer and drill rods
WR	Sampler advanced by static weight of drill rods
РН	Sampler advanced by hydraulic pressure from drill rig
РМ	Sampler advanced by manual pressure

	SOIL TESTS
w	Water content
PL, w _p	Plastic limit
LL, w_L	Liquid limit
С	Consolidation (oedometer) test
D _R	Relative density
DS	Direct shear test
Gs	Specific gravity
М	Sieve analysis for particle size
MH	Combined sieve and hydrometer (H) analysis
MPC	Modified Proctor compaction test
SPC	Standard Proctor compaction test
OC	Organic content test
UC	Unconfined compression test
Y	Unit weight





BOULDER

PIPE WITH BENTONITE

SCREEN WITH SAND







BEDROCK






PIPE WITH SAND

 ∇ GROUNDWATER





LEVEL



GEMTEC

CLIENT: Cavanagh Developments PROJECT: 2596 Carp Road JOB#: 61318.20

LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

 SHEET:
 1 OF 1

 DATUM:
 CGVD2013

 BORING DATE:
 Aug 8 2018

	J L L	Ē.	SOIL PROFILE				SAN	IPLES		●RE	ESIST	FAN(CE (N), BLC	WS/0	.3m ·	+ N.	ATUR/	AL €	RE	MOU	ı), kPA LDED	4g F	_	
DEPTH SCALE METRES	DONG METHOD	ראואס ואבו	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. DEPTH (m)	NUMBER	TYPE	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ DY RE							WP		e	N Ə		⊣w	ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETI OR STANDPIP INSTALLATI	PE PE ION
\dashv	â		Oracid Octor	ST				<u> </u>	Ē		10	20	3	0	40	50	60	7 ע ::::	70 :::	80	9 	90 : : : :			
0			Ground Surface TOPSOIL	11, 11,	112.90 0.05																				
			Brown SAND, trace silt			1	GS					0											м	Bentonite seal	
			Grey SILTY SAND, trace clay		112.49 0.41																			Filter sand	
		0D)										· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					· · ·							∑	
1	Power Auger	Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)				2	GS										· · ·								
I	Po	llow Stem																						51 mm diametre, 1.52	٠F
		H																						m long well screen	
2			End of borehole		<u>110.77</u> 2.13																				
					2.10																				
																							_		
3																									
																							_		
4																									
																	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
																								GROUNDWAT OBSERVATIO	_
																							-	DATE DEPTH (m) 18/08/17 0.69 ⊻	-
5											· · · · ·														t
		G	EMTEC																				LOGO	BED: K.H.	

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

SHEET:1 OF 1DATUM:CGVD2013BORING DATE:Aug 8 2018

LOCATION:	See Borehole Location F	Plan, Figure 2
-----------	-------------------------	----------------

	ğ	SOIL PROFILE		-		SAM	IPLES		● ^{PE} RE	NETR/ SISTA	NCE (N	N), BLC	WS/0.3	-رج ۱+ m	IEAR S ⁻ NATUR/	AL \oplus F	REMOL	JLDED	μŞ	
METRES	BORING METHOD		STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	ER	ш	RECOVERY, mm	0.3m							WATE	R CON	ITENT,		ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE
ШЧ	RING	DESCRIPTION	ATA	DEPTH	NUMBER	TYPE	20V mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ RE	SISTA	NCE (N	N), BLC	ON)WS/0.3	m W	.⊢	W		⊣w	ADDI ⁻ AB. T	INSTALLATION
נ	BO		STF	(m)	2		R	BLO	1	0 2	20 3	30	40 5	io e	60 7	'0 8	30	90		
0		Ground Surface TOPSOIL FILL	it it	114.17 0.03																Bod
		Dark brown sandy silt, some clay, trace gravel (FILL MATERIAL)		0.03																
		trace gravel (FILL MATERIAL)																		
	er 210mr				1	GS				0									М	
	Power Auger																			Backfilled with soil cuttings
1	Power Auger Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)																			
1	wollo																			
	Ĩ				2	GS														
																				∠ ¢¢
		End of borehole	<u>XXX</u>	112.65 1.52																Groundwater seepage oberved in
																				open borehole
2																				
3																				
4																				
																				GROUNDWATER OBSERVATIONS
																				18/08/08 1.35 모 11
5																				
		GEMTEC																	LOGG	GED: K.H.

CLIENT: Cavanagh Developments PROJECT: 2596 Carp Road JOB#: 61318.20 LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

SHEET: 1 OF 1 DATUM: CGVD2013 BORING DATE: Aug 8 2018

u J			SOIL PROFILE		i		SAN	/IPLES		●PE RE	NETRA SISTA	ATION NCE (N	I), BLO	WS/0.3	-R N +N	IEAR S	TRENC	GTH (C	u), kPA JLDED	وبر	
METRES	DODING METHOD		DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. DEPTH	NUMBER	TYPE	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ ^{DY} RE	NAMIC) PENE NCE (N	TRATI I), BLO	ON WS/0.3	m W	WATE	R CON W	ITENT	_% — w _L	ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION
		P22		STRA	(m)	R		REC	BLO	1	0 2	20 3	30 ·	40 5	50 E	60 7	'0 8	30	90	LA	
0			Ground Surface TOPSOIL FILL	1.1.1.1.	114.76	1	GS														NUL
			Brown sandy silt, trace gravel and clay, with debris (rebar) (FILL MATERIAL)		11 <u>4.71</u> 0.05																
	Jer	(210mm OD)																			
	Power Auger	Hollow Stem Auger (2	GS													-	Backfilled with soil cuttings
1		Hollow																			
			End of borehole		113.24 1.52																No groundwater seepage observed upon completion of
																					completion of borehole
2																					
3																					
																				-	
4																					
5																					
				1	1	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>I</u>	<u></u>		<u> • • • • •</u>		<u> • • • • •</u>	<u></u>		<u></u>		<u> </u>		GED: K.H. KED: B.W.

CLIENT: Cavanagh Developments PROJECT: 2596 Carp Road JOB#: 61318.20 SHEET:1 OF 1DATUM:CGVD2013BORING DATE:Aug 8 2018

LOCATION: Se	e Borehole Location	Plan, Figure 2
--------------	---------------------	----------------

ш	ПОР	SOIL PROFILE	1.			SAN	IPLES		• PE RE	SISTA	ATION NCE (M	N), BLO	NS/0.3	 NATUR	AL \oplus F	REMO	u), kPA JLDED	μŞ	
DEPTH SCALE METRES	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	BER	ТҮРЕ	RECOVERY, mm	\$/0.3m	DY	NAMIO	PENE	TRATION), BLO	ON			ITENT		ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION
DEPI	BORIN	DESCRIPTION	TRAT	DEPTH (m)	NUMBER	Γ	RECO	BLOWS/0.3m									⊣w _L 90	ADD LAB.	INSTALLATION
- 0		Ground Surface		113.88															
0		TOPSOIL FILL		0.05															
		Brown sandy silt, trace gravel and clay, with possible cobbles and boulders (FILL MATERIAL)							-										
	n OD)																		
	ger (210mr																		
	wer Au				1	GS				0								м	Backfilled with soil cuttings
· 1	Power Auger Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)																		
	Hollov																		
				<u>112.36</u> 1.52															No groundwater seepage
		End of borehole		1.52															groundwater seepage observed upon completion of borehole
- 2																			
3																			
• 4																			
_																			
- 5																			
		SEMTEC																LOGG	BED: K.H.

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

SHEET:1 OF 1DATUM:CGVD2013BORING DATE:Aug 8 2018

LOCATION: See Boreh	le Location Plan, Figu	re 2
---------------------	------------------------	------

Ц	ДОН	SOIL PROFILE	1	-		SAN	IPLES		● ^{PE} RE	NETRA SISTA	TION NCE (N), BLO	NS/0.3	s⊦ m +∣		STRENC RAL⊕F	REMOL	u), KPA JLDED	μģ	
DEPTH SCALE METRES	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	NUMBER	ТҮРЕ	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m			PENE NCE (N				WATE	ER CON	ITENT,		ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE
	BORIN		STRAT	DEPTH (m)	NUN	F	RECO	BLOW										90	ADI	INSTALLATION
. 0		Ground Surface	<u></u>	113.91																ny.
		Grey to brown sandy silt, some clay, trace gravel (FILL MATERIAL)		0.03																
		trace gravel (FILL MATERIAL)																		
	nm OD)				1	GS														
	uger er (210n																			
	Power Auger Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)																			Backfilled with soil cuttings
1	ow Ste																			
	Holl				2	GS														
					_															N₀ 2
		End of borehole		112.39 1.52																groundwater seepage observed upon completion of
																				borehole
																			-	
2																				
																			-	
3																				
4																			-	
5																				
	6	GEMTEC	•				•								1			•	LOGO	ED: K.H.

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

 SHEET:
 1 OF 1

 DATUM:
 CGVD2013

 BORING DATE:
 Aug 8 2018

щ	1	UD	SOIL PROFILE				SAN	IPLES		● PE RE		ATION	I N), BLC	WS/0.3	SH m + N	EAR S		GTH (C	u), kPA	, U		
DEPTH SCALE METRES		BURING MELHUD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. DEPTH (m)	NUMBER	TYPE	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ DY RE	NAMI SIST	C PEN	ETRATI N), BLC	ON WS/0.3	m W _F	WATE	R CON W	ITENT,		ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOM OF STAND INSTALL	ETER } PIPE ATION
- 0			Ground Surface TOPSOIL	. + 1, - , t	110.86																	_
-			Dark brown SILTY SAND		0.05	1	GS														Bentonite seal	
-		Im OD)	Brown SAND, trace silt and gravel		<u>110.56</u> 0.30 <u>110.35</u> 0.51	2	GS														Filter sand	
-	Power Auger	uger (210m	Grey brown SILTY SAND		. 0.51																	
- - - 1	Powe	Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)				3	GS						0							м		
-		Hol																			51 mm diametre, 1.52 m long well screen	
-																					m long well screen	
-																						
- 2 - 2			End of borehole		108.73 2.13																	
-					2.10																	
-																						
-																						
- 3 - 81/2																						-
8.GDT 30/8/18																						
MIEC 201																						
																						-
GEO - BOREHOLE LOG 61318.20_GINT_V01_2018-08-08.GPJ GEMTEC 2018.GDT G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G																						
<u>5 61318.20</u>																					GROUND OBSERVA DATE DEP (m 18/08/17 1 25	TH ELEV
																					18/08/17 1.25	- <u>+</u> 109.61
		G	SEMTEC			-			•	-	·									LOGO	BED: K.H.	
		Co	nsulting Engineers D Scientists																	CHEC	KED: B.W.	

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

 SHEET:
 1 OF 1

 DATUM:
 CGVD2013

 BORING DATE:
 Aug 8 2018

u J	ПОН	SOIL PROFILE				SAN	IPLES		● ^{PE} RE	NETR/ SISTA	ATION NCE (N	I), BLO	WS/0.3	SH n + M	IEAR S NATUR	AL ⊕	GTH (C REMO	Cu), kPA ULDED	μŞ	
METRES	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	NUMBER	ТҮРЕ	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ ^{DY} RE	NAMIC) PENE NCE (N	TRATIO	DN WS/0.3r	n W _r			NTENT	, % —∣ w _L	ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION
2	BORI		STRA ⁻	DEPTH (m)	ÎN	-	REC	BLOW	1				40 5					90	LAE	INGTALLATION
0		Ground Surface TOPSOIL		112.68																
		Loose, brown SILTY SAND, trace		0.05																Bentonite seal
		gravel			1 1B	SS SS	430	7		0									м	
					ю	33				U										
																				Filter sand
1																				
		very dense, grey brown silty sand, trace to some gravel with possible		111.61	2	SS	480	10												
	ger (210mr	trace to some gravel with possible cobbles and boulders (GLACIAL TILL)																		
	Power Auger																			
	Hollow Stem Auger																			l ŀ.E
					3	SS	610	54						•						
2																				
																				51 mm diametre, 1.52 m long well
																				screen
					4	SS	410	>50 f	or 150 i	nm										51 mm diametre, 1.52 m long well screen
				109.78																
3		End of borehole Auger refusal on inferred bedrock		2.90																
4																				
																			-	GROUNDWATER OBSERVATIONS DATE DEPTH
																				DATE (m) 18/08/17 1.52 ⊻ 1
5																				
		J Gemtec		1	I	I	I	1			1	1	1			1	1	<u> </u>	LOGO	GED: K.H.
6		ONSULTING ENGINEERS ND SCIENTISTS																		KED: B.W.

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20 L

SHEET: 1 OF 1 DATUM: CGVD2013 BORING DATE: Aug 8 2018

2
2

	ДОН	SOIL PROFILE	1.			SAN	1PLES		● ^{PE} RE	NETE	RATIO ANCE	N (N),	BLOV	VS/0.3	-N S⊦ m +1	IEAR S	AL ⊕	REMO	(Cu), k OULDE	а :D ,	Q
METRES	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. DEPTH (m)	NUMBER	ТҮРЕ	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ DY RE				RATIC BLOV	0N VS/0.3	m W	wate P	ER CO W	NTEN		TION	PIEZOMETI SC OR STANDPIP MA INSTALLATI
0		Ground Surface		111.57				ш													
Ů		TOPSOIL Very loose, brown SILTY SAND, trace		0.05																· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		gravel			1A	SS SS	480	4					0							· · ·	E Contra
					1B	SS														· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
																				· · ·	Soil moist at
		Compact to very dense, grey brown		<u>110.81</u> 0.76																	Soil moist at about 0.8 metres below ground surface
1	(QO	Compact to very dense, grey brown silty sand, trace to some gravel with possible cobbles and boulders (GLACIAL TILL)																			
	10mm				2	SS	460	21	C) 										· · ·	
	Power Auger Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)																			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Backfilled with soil cuttings
	Stem #																				
	Hollow																				
					3	SS	510	54	0						•					M	н
2																					
					4	SS	510	>50 f	or 100 i	nm											
ŀ		End of borehole Auger refusal on inferred bedrock	(· Xà Ai X	108.88 2.69																	K.
3																					
Ĵ																					
																				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4																					
									· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·												
																		· · ·			
5											: : :	: :									
		SEMTEC DINSULTING ENGINEERS ID SCIENTISTS																		LO	GGED: K.H.

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

SHEET:1 OF 1DATUM:CGVD2013BORING DATE:Aug 8 2018

	BORING METHOD	SOIL PROFILE		1		SAN	IPLES			SIST	ANCE	(N)	, BLO	WS/0.	3m –	- NAT	URA		REMOL	u), kPA JLDED	NG	
METRES	MET		STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	ER	ш	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m		NAM		NET	DATI			W	ATEF		TENT,	%	ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETE
WE	RING	DESCRIPTION	ATA	DEPTH	NUMBER	ТҮРЕ	COV Tov	MS/(▲ ^{DY} RE	SIST	ANCE	(N),	, BLO	WS/0.	3m	w _P ⊢				⊣w	AB. T	STANDPIPE
ā	BOI		STR	(m)	z		R	BLC	1	0	20	30) 4	40	50	60	70	8	0	90	1-1	
0		Ground Surface		111.79							: ::	::	: : : :		: : :	: :	:::					
-		TOPSOIL		0.05																		E E
		Loose to compact, brown SILTY SAND, trace gravel																				
					1	SS	305	7														
																						Soil maint at
				•									· · · · ·					· · · · ·				Soil moist at about 0.8 metres below ground surface
																						ground surface
1	(QO			<u>110.72</u> 1.07	2	SS	560	15														
	0 mu	Compact to very dense, grey brown silty sand trace to some gravel with		1.07																		
	- (210	Compact to very dense, grey brown silty sand, trace to some gravel with possible cobbles and boulders (GLACIAL TILL)	9/1																			
	Power Auger em Auger (210mm																					Backfilled with soil cuttings
	Stem																					
	Hollow		× Z						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·													
	Ĩ				3	SS	560	58								•						
2			1																			
			A/Z																			
					4	SS	530	>50 f	or 130 i	nm												
			× ×									· · ·										
			ø /	108.92 2.87																		
3		End of borehole Auger refusal on inferred bedrock		2.07																		
									· · · · ·		· · ·	· · ·	<u></u>				::	· · · · ·			-	
4																						
-																						
																	::	· · · · ·			-	
5												::										
) (Semtec																			LOGO	GED: K.H.
	C	DNSULTING ENGINEERS ID SCIENTISTS																			CHEC	KED: B.W.

CLIENT:Cavanagh DevelopmentsPROJECT:2596 Carp RoadJOB#:61318.20

LOCATION: See Borehole Location Plan, Figure 2

 SHEET:
 1 OF 1

 DATUM:
 CGVD2013


 BORING DATE:
 Aug 8 2018


م	тнор	SOIL PROFILE				SAN	IPLES		● ^{PE} RE	NETR/ SISTA	NCE (N), BLO	WS/0.3	SH 3m +N	IATUR	GTH (C REMOL	JLDED	IAL	DIEZOMETE
METRES	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV.	NUMBER	TYPE	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m	▲ DY RE		: PENE NCE (N		DN WS/0 ?	3m W		NTENT,	% ⊣w _L	ADDITIONAL LAB. TESTING	PIEZOMETE OR STANDPIPE
ے _ا	BORIN		STRAT	DEPTH (m)	NN	F	RECO	BLOW									90	ADI	INSTALLATIC
0		Ground Surface		110.28															nua.
-				<u>110.20</u> 0.08															
		Very loose to loose dark brown to brown SANDY SILT, trace clay			1	SS	510	3	•										
																			Soil moist at about 0.8 metres below ground surface
1																			
'	(QO				2	SS	585	9			0							м	
	er 210mm																		
	Power Auger Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)			108.76															Backfilled with soil cuttings
	Pow Stem A	Compact to very dense, grey brown		108.76 1.52															
	-follow	Compact to very dense, grey brown silty sand, trace to some gravel with possible cobbles and boulders (GLACIAL TILL)			3	SS	560	18											
_					5	55	500												
2																			
																		-	
					4	SS	280	>50 f	or 80 m	m									
			0/2																
	+	End of Borehole	_×RX	<u>107.38</u> 2.90															
3		Auger refusal on inferred bedrock										· · · · ·							
									· · · · ·									-	
4																			
4																			
_																			
5									· · · · · ·										
/		SEMTEC DISULTING ENGINEERS D SCIENTISTS																LOGO	ED: K.H.

	IOD	SOIL PROFILE	•			SAN	IPLES		● PE RE	NETR/	ATION NCE (N), BLO'	NS/0.3m	SHE + N	EAR S ⁻ ATURA	RENG	GTH (Cu), kP REMOULDEI		
	BORING METHOD	DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. DEPTH	NUMBER	TYPE	RECOVERY, mm	BLOWS/0.3m					DN VS/0.3m	,	WATE		TENT, %	TION	PIEZOMETE OR STANDPIP INSTALLATI
	BO		STR	(m)	2		R	вго	1	10 2	20 3	0 4	0 50	60	0 7	8 0	80 90		
┝		Ground Surface		110.87															
		Soil conditions not logged																	Bentonite seal
1	(10mm OD)																		Filter sand
Power Auger	Hollow Stem Auger (210mm OD)																		Σ
2																			51 mm diametre, 1.52 m long well screen
3		End of Borehole Auger refusal on inferred bedrock		108.08 2.79															
1																			
5																			GROUNDWAT OBSERVATIO DATE DEPTH (m) 18/08/18 1.47 又

APPENDIX B

Laboratory Testing Results Soils Grading Charts







- Limits Shown: None

Grain Size, mm

Line Symbol	Sample		orehole/ `est Pit	Sam Num		Depth	% Co Grav		% San	d Si	
•	Glacial Till		18-8	3	;	1.5-2.1	4.9	9	52.8	8 25	.5 16.8
	Fill Material		18-2	1		0.3-0.6	22.	.3	48.4	4	29.3
o	Fill Material		18-4	1		0.3-1.2	7.	3	62.6	5	30.1
	Silty Sand		18-6	3		0.9-1.2	7.	2	46.7	7	46.1
Line Symbol	CanFEM Classification	USCS Symbo		0	D ₁₅	D ₃₀	D ₅₀	D ₆	0	D ₈₅	% 5-75µm
•	Silty sand , some clay , trace gravel				0.00	0.03	0.12	0.2	20	1.14	25.5
_	Gravelly silty sand					0.08	0.20	0.3	34	14.70	
		k									
o	Silty sand , trace gravel						0.18	0.2	27	85.00	





- Limits Shown: None

Grain Size, mm

Line Symbol	Sample		Boreh Test			nple nber	Depth	9	% Cob Grave		% Sa		% Sil	% t Clay
•	Sand		18-	1		1	0.05-0.4		0.0		92	.4		7.6
	Silty Sand		18-	7	1	В	 0.05-0.6		3.6		70	.4		26.0
o	Sandy Silt		18-1	10	,	2	 0.8-1.4		0.2		35	.4		64.4
Line Symbol	CanFEM Classification		SCS mbol	D ₁	0	D ₁₅	D ₃₀	D ₅	50	D ₆	0	D	35	% 5-75µm
	Sand, trace silt	1												
	Sand, trace sin	N	J/A	0.0)9	0.12	0.17	0.2	21	0.2	24	0.	37	
	Silty sand, trace gravel	N	∛/A	0.0		0.12	 0.17 0.09	0.2		0.2 0.2		0.: 0.:		
			J/A J/A				 		21				89	

APPENDIX C

Chemical Analysis of Soil and Groundwater Samples Relating to Corrosion (Paracel Laboratories Ltd. Order No. 1833415 and 1834104)



Report Date: 20-Aug-2018

Order Date: 15-Aug-2018

Project Description: 61318.20

Certificate of Analysis Client: GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists Limited Client PO: 61318.20

	Client ID:	BH-18-8 SA 2B	-	-	-
	Sample Date:	08/08/2018 09:00	-	-	-
	Sample ID:	1833415-01	-	-	-
	MDL/Units	Soil	-	-	-
Physical Characteristics					
% Solids	0.1 % by Wt.	91.2	-	-	-
General Inorganics					
рН	0.05 pH Units	7.89	-	-	-
Resistivity	0.10 Ohm.m	121	-	-	-
Anions					
Chloride	5 ug/g dry	<5	-	-	-
Sulphate	5 ug/g dry	<5	-	-	-



Client: GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists Limited

Certificate of Analysis

Client PO:

Report Date: 24-Aug-2018

Order Date: 20-Aug-2018

Project Description: 61318.20

	Client ID:	BH18-702	-	-	-
	Sample Date:	08/17/2018 12:00	-	-	-
	Sample ID:	1834104-01	-	-	-
	MDL/Units	Water	-	-	-
General Inorganics					
рН	0.1 pH Units	7.7	-	-	-
Resistivity	0.01 Ohm.m	18.1	-	-	-
Anions					
Chloride	1 mg/L	12	-	-	-
Sulphate	1 mg/L	25	-	-	-



civil geotechnical environmental field services materials testing civil géotechnique environnementale surveillance de chantier service de laboratoire des matériaux

