

# Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residential Development

6208 Renaud Road Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for TM (262615) HOLDING INC., and Marissa & Mathieu Brisebois.

Report PG6640 - 1 dated June 1, 2023



# **Table of Contents**

| 1.0 | Introduction                                | 1  |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.0 | Proposed Development                        | 1  |
| 3.0 | Method of Investigation                     | 2  |
| 3.1 | Field Investigation                         |    |
| 3.2 |   |    |
| 3.3 | Laboratory Testing                          | 3  |
| 3.4 | Analytical Testing                          | 4  |
| 4.0 | Observations                                | 5  |
| 4.1 | Surface Conditions                          | 5  |
| 4.2 | Subsurface Profile                          | 5  |
| 4.3 | Groundwater                                 | 5  |
| 5.0 | Discussion                                  | 7  |
| 5.1 | Geotechnical Assessment                     | 7  |
| 5.2 | Site Grading and Preparation                | 7  |
| 5.3 | Foundation Design                           | 8  |
| 5.4 | Design for Earthquakes                      | 9  |
| 5.5 | Basement Slab / Slab-on-Grade Construction  | 9  |
| 5.6 | Pavement Structure                          | 10 |
| 6.0 | Design and Construction Precautions         | 12 |
| 6.1 | Foundation Drainage and Backfill            | 12 |
| 6.2 | Protection of Footings Against Frost Action | 12 |
| 6.3 | Excavation Side Slopes                      | 13 |
| 6.4 | Pipe Bedding and Backfill                   | 13 |
| 6.5 | Groundwater Control                         | 14 |
| 6.6 |   |    |
| 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 PG6640-1 - Test Hole Location Plan



## 1.0 Introduction

Paterson Group (Paterson) was commissioned by TM (262615) HOLDING INC., and Marissa & Mathieu Brisebois to conduct a geotechnical investigation for the proposed residential development to be located at 6208 Renaud Road in Ottawa, Ontario (refer to Figure 1 - Key Plan in Appendix 2 of this report for the general site location).

The objectives of the geotechnical investigation were to:

| Determing test hole |     | and groundwater co | nditions at th | nis site | by me | ans of |
|---------------------|-----|--------------------|----------------|----------|-------|--------|
|                     | · · | recommendations    |                |          | •     |        |

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 this present investigation. Therefore, the present report does not address environmental issues.

# 2.0 Proposed Development

affect the design.

Based on our review of available information, it is anticipated the proposed project will consist of severing the existing parcel to build 2 dwellings. It is anticipated that the residential dwellings will consist of low-rise residential buildings, as well as attached garages and landscaped areas.

It is anticipated that the site will be municipally serviced by future water, storm and sanitary services.



# 3.0 Method of Investigation

# 3.1 Field Investigation

#### Field Program

The field program for the current investigation was carried out on May 8, 2023 and consisted of a total of two (2) boreholes sampled to a maximum depth of 6.7 m below ground surface throughout the subject site.

The test hole locations were distributed in a manner to provide general coverage of the subject site, taking into consideration underground utilities and site features. The test hole locations are shown on Drawing PG6640-1 - Test Hole Location Plan included in Appendix 2.

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

#### Sampling and In Situ Testing

Soil samples were recovered from the boreholes using two different techniques, namely, sampled directly from the auger flights (AU) or collected using a 50 mm diameter split spoon (SS) sample. All samples were visually inspected and initially classified on site. The auger and split-spoon samples were placed in sealed plastic bags.

All samples were transported to our laboratory for further examination and classification. The depths at which the auger and split spoon samples were recovered from the boreholes are shown as AU and SS respectively, on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets presented in Appendix 1.

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



Undrained shear strength testing was carried out at regular depth intervals in cohesive soils.

The subsurface conditions observed in the test holes 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 standpipe piezometers were installed in all boreholes to permit monitoring of the groundwater levels subsequent to the completion of the sampling program. All groundwater observations are noted on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets presented in Appendix 1.

## 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 referenced to a geodetic datum. The locations of the test holes, and the ground surface elevation at each test hole location, are presented on Drawing PG6640-1 – Test Hole Location Plan in Appendix 2.

# 3.3 Laboratory Testing

Soil samples were collected from the subject site during the investigation and were visually examined in our laboratory to review the results of the field logging. All samples were submitted for moisture content testing. The test results are included on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets presented in Appendix 1.

All samples will be stored in the laboratory for a period of one month after issuance of this report. The samples will then be discarded unless otherwise directed.



# 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 sample. The results are presented in Appendix 1 and are discussed further in Section 6.7.



#### 4.0 Observations

#### 4.1 Surface Conditions

The subject site is currently occupied by a residential dwelling with a detached garage, asphaltic driveway, and landscaped areas. Large trees are located within the north of the site and along the west property limits.

The subject site is bordered to the north by Renaud Road, to the east by a single story residential dwelling and to the west and south by three-storey residential buildings. The ground surface across the site is relatively flat at an approximate geodetic elevation of 86.6 m.

#### 4.2 Subsurface Profile

#### Overburden

Generally, the subsurface profile at the test hole locations consists of 0.3 m of topsoil underlain by a loose silty sand fill with traces of gravel and crushed stone to a depth of 0.6 m, underlain by compact sandy silt deposit extending to depths of 1.7 m to 2.0 m, below the existing grade. The sandy silt deposit encountered within the boreholes was observed to change from brown to grey in color, with traces of grey silty clay, below a depth 1.4 m from the existing ground surface.

The grey silty sand was underlain by a firm grey silty clay, extending to the end of the test holes. Shear strength ranging from 39 kPa to 24 kPa were measured within the silty clay deposit.

Specific details of the soil profile at each test hole location are presented Appendix 1.

#### **Bedrock**

Based on geological mapping, the overburden drift thickness ranges between 30 and 50 m and is underlain by interbedded limestone and shale bedrock of the Carlsbad formation and shale of the Billings Formation.

#### 4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater level readings were measured on May 19, 2023, and are presented in Table 1 below, and on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets in Appendix 1.



| Table 1 - Summary of Groundwater Level Readings |                                    |                          |                              |                |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Test Hole<br>Number                             | Ground<br>Surface<br>Elevation (m) | Groundwater<br>Depth (m) | Groundwater<br>Elevation (m) | Recording Date |
| BH 1-23   | 86.64                              | 1.85                     | 84.79                        | May 19, 2023   |
| BH 2-23   | 86.61                              | 2.02                     | 84.59                        | May 19, 2023   |

#### Note:

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

Based on these observations, the long-term groundwater level is anticipated to be at a depth ranging between 1.5 to 2.0 m throughout the subject site. However, groundwater levels are subject to seasonal fluctuations and could vary during the time of construction.

<sup>-</sup> The ground surface elevations are referenced to a geodetic datum.



## 5.0 Discussion

#### 5.1 Geotechnical Assessment

#### **Foundation Design Considerations**

From a geotechnical perspective, the subject site is suitable for the proposed development. It is recommended that the proposed buildings be founded on conventional spread footings bearing on the undisturbed loose to compact silty sand, stiff silty clay and/or approved engineered fill.

Due to the presence of a silty clay deposit at the site, permissible grade raise restrictions have been provided.

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

#### 5.2 Site Grading and Preparation

#### **Stripping Depth**

Topsoil and deleterious fill, such as those containing significant organic materials, should be stripped from under any buildings and other settlement sensitive structures. The existing fill material, where free of organic materials, should be reviewed by Paterson personnel at the time of construction to determine if the existing fill can be left in place below paved areas and below the slab granular fill layers.

#### 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 areas should be compacted to a minimum of 98% of the standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).



Non-specified existing fill along with site-excavated soil can 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. If these materials are to be used to build up the subgrade level for areas to be paved, they should be compacted in thin lifts to a minimum density of 98% of their respective SPMDD.

Non-specified existing fill and site-excavated soils are not suitable for placement as backfill against foundation walls, unless used in conjunction with a geo-composite drainage membrane connected to a perimeter drainage system.

## 5.3 Foundation Design

#### **Conventional Spread Footings**

It is expected that the proposed building will be founded on conventional spread footings placed on undisturbed, loose to compact silty sand or firm to stiff silty clay. Using continuously applied loads, footings for the proposed buildings can be designed using the bearing resistance values presented in Table 2.

| Table 2 – Bearing Resistance Values |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Bearing Surface                     | Bearing Resistance<br>Value at SLS (kPa) | Factored Bearing<br>Resistance Value at<br>ULS (kPa) |  |
| Loose to Compact Silty Sand         | 60                                       | 90   |  |
| Firm to Stiff Silty Clay            | 50                                       | 75   |  |

**Note:** Strip footings, up to 2 m wide, and pad footings, up to 4 m wide, placed on an undisturbed, firm to stiff silty clay or on engineered fill, which is placed and compacted directly over the strata, can be designed using the above bearing resistance values.

\*Site review should ensure a minimum of 300 mm of silty sand is present under the footings for the bearing resistance proved to be applicable.

A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the above noted bearing resistance values at ULS. Bearing resistance values are provided on the assumption that the footings will be placed on undisturbed soil bearing surfaces. An undisturbed soil bearing surface consists of a surface from which all topsoil and deleterious materials, such as loose, frozen or undisturbed soil, whether in situ or not, have been removed, in the dry, prior to the placement of concrete for footings.

The bearing resistance value at SLS will be subjected to potential post-construction total and differential settlements of 25 and 20 mm, respectively.



It should be noted that if the silty sand layer is noted to be in a loose state of compactness at the subgrade level. It is recommended to proof roll the silty sand layer under dry conditions. Additionally, the subgrade should be inspected by a geotechnical consultant at the time of construction.

#### **Lateral Support**

The bearing medium under footing-supported structures is required to be provided with adequate lateral support. Adequate lateral support is provided to a soil bearing medium above the groundwater table when a plane extending down and out from the bottom edge of the footing at a minimum of 1.5H:1V passes only through in situ soil of the same or higher capacity as the bearing medium soil.

#### **Permissible Grade Raise**

Due to the presence of the silty clay deposit throughout the subject site, a permissible grade raise restriction is recommended for grading at the subject site. A permissible grade raise restriction of **0.3 m** is recommended for the subject site.

If higher than permissible grade raises are required, preloading with or without a surcharge, lightweight fill, and/or other measures should be investigated to reduce the risks of unacceptable long-term post construction total and differential settlements.

# 5.4 Design for Earthquakes

The site class for seismic site response can be taken as **Class E** for the foundations considered as defined in Table 4.1.8.4.A of the Ontario Building Code (OBC) 2020. Soils underlying the subject site are not susceptible to liquefaction. Reference should be made to the latest version of the OBC 2020 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 from within the footprints of the proposed buildings, the existing fill, and/or native soil will be considered an acceptable subgrade surface on which to commence backfilling for floor slab construction.



For structures with basement slabs, it is recommended that the upper 200 mm of sub-floor fill consists of 19 mm clear crushed stone.

For structures with slab-on-grade construction, the upper 300 mm of sub-slab fill is recommended to consist of OPSS Granular A crushed stone. All backfill material within the footprints of the proposed buildings should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum of 98% of its SPMDD.

#### 5.6 Pavement Structure

For design purposes, the following pavement structures, presented below, are recommended for the design of the car parking areas and local roadways.

| Table 3 - Recommended Pavement Structure – Driveways                                       |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 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 or fill   |   |  |  |

| Table 4 - Recommended Pavement Structure – Local Residential Roadways                      |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Thickness (mm)   | Material Description                                    |  |  |
| 40   | Wear Course - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete |  |  |
| 50 Binder Course - HL-8 or Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete                               |   |  |  |
| 150 BASE - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone   |   |  |  |
| 450 SUBBASE - OPSS Granular B Type II  |   |  |  |
| SUBGRADE - Either fill, in situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over |   |  |  |
| in situ soil, bedrock or fill.   |   |  |  |

Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 58-34 asphalt cement should be used for this project.

If soft spots develop in the subgrade during compaction or due to construction traffic, the affected areas should be excavated and replaced with OPSS Granular B Type II material. The pavement granular base and subbase should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick lifts and compacted to a minimum of 99% of the material's SPMDD using suitable vibratory equipment.



#### **Pavement Structure Drainage**

Satisfactory performance of the pavement structure is largely dependent on keeping the contact zone between the subgrade material and the base stone in a dry condition. Failure to provide adequate drainage under conditions of heavy wheel loading can result in the fine subgrade soil being pumped into the voids in the stone subbase, thereby reducing its load carrying capacity.

Due to the low permeability of the subgrade materials consideration should be given to installing subdrains during the pavement construction as per City of Ottawa standards. The subdrain inverts should be approximately 300 mm below subgrade level. The subgrade surface should be crowned to promote water flow to the drainage lines.



# 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 any proposed buildings with below-grade space. The system, where considered, should consist of a 150 mm diameter perforated and corrugated plastic pipe, surrounded on all-sides by 150 mm of 19 mm clear crushed stone, which 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**

For proposed buildings with below-grade space, backfill against the exterior sides of the foundation walls should consist of free-draining, non-frost susceptible granular materials. The site materials will be frost susceptible and, as such, are not recommended for re-use as backfill unless a composite drainage system (such as Miradrain G100N, Delta Drain 6000 or equivalent) connected to a drainage system is provided.

# 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. Generally, a minimum of 1.5 m thick soil cover (or an equivalent combination of soil cover and foundation insulation) should be provided in this regard.

Exterior unheated footings, such as those for isolated exterior piers, are more prone to deleterious movement associated with frost action than the exterior walls of the structure proper and require additional protection, such as soil cover of 2.1 m or a combination of soil cover and foundation insulation.



## 6.3 Excavation Side Slopes

The side slopes of the shallow excavations anticipated at this site should either be cut back at acceptable slopes or be retained by temporary shoring systems from the start of the excavation until the structure is backfilled. It is anticipated that sufficient space will be available for the great part of the excavations to be undertaken by open-cut methods (i.e., unsupported excavations).

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 ground water level. The subsoil at this site appeared to be mainly a Type 2 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.

# 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 crushed stone should be used for pipe bedding for sewer and water pipes. However, the bedding thickness should be increased to 300 mm and placed over a woven geotextile for areas where the services are bearing on firm grey silty clay. 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 300 mm thick lifts compacted to 99% of the material's standard Proctor maximum dry density.

It should generally be possible to re-use the moist (not wet) site-generated silty sand above the cover material if the excavation and filling operations are carried out in dry weather conditions. Wet site-generated silty clay fill or silty sand will be difficult to re-use, as the high-water contents make compacting impractical without an extensive drying period.

Where hard surface areas are considered above the trench backfill, the trench backfill material within the frost zone (about 1.8 m below finished grade) and above the cover material should match the soils exposed at the trench walls to minimize potential differential frost heaving. The trench backfill should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum of 98% of the material's SPMDD. All cobbles larger than 200 mm in the longest direction should be segregated from re-use as trench backfill.

To reduce long-term lowering of the groundwater level at this site, clay seals should be provided in the service trenches. The seals should be at least 1.5 m long (in the trench direction) and should extend from trench wall to trench wall. The seals should extend from the frost line and fully penetrate the bedding, subbedding and cover material. The barriers should consist of relatively dry and compactable brown silty clay placed in maximum 300 mm thick loose layers and compacted to a minimum of 95% of the SPMDD. The clay seals should be placed at the site boundaries and at strategic locations at no more than 60 m intervals in the service trenches.

#### 6.5 Groundwater Control

Due to the relatively impervious nature of the silty clay materials, it is anticipated that groundwater infiltration into the excavations should be low and controllable using open sumps. A perched groundwater condition may be encountered within the silty sand deposit which may produce significant temporary groundwater infiltration levels. Pumping from open sumps should be sufficient to control the groundwater influx through the sides of shallow excavations.

#### Groundwater Control for Building Construction

A temporary Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) permit to take water (PTTW) will be required if more than 400,000 L/day of ground and/or surface water are to be pumped during the construction phase.



At least 4 to 5 months should be allowed for completion of the application 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 using straw, propane heaters and tarpaulins or other suitable means. In this regard, the base of the excavations should be insulated from sub-zero temperatures immediately upon exposure and until such time as heat is adequately supplied to the building and the footings are protected with sufficient soil cover to prevent freezing at founding level.

Trench excavations and pavement construction are also difficult activities to complete during freezing conditions without introducing frost 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 the subject site, whereas the resistivity is indicative of a non-aggressive to slightly aggressive corrosive environment.



# 7.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that the following be carried out by Paterson once preliminary and future details of the proposed development have been prepared:

Review preliminary and detailed grading, servicing and structural plan(s) from a geotechnical perspective.

For the foundation design data provided herein to be applicable, a material testing and observation services program is required to be completed. The following aspects be performed by Paterson:

|   | Observation of all bearing surfaces prior to the placement of concrete.\   |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | Sampling and testing of the concrete and fill materials.   |  |  |
|   | Observation of the placement of the foundation insulation, if applicable.  |  |  |
|   | 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 backfilling and follow-up field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved. |  |  |
|   | Field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved.   |  |  |
|   | Sampling and testing of the bituminous concrete including mix design reviews.  |  |  |
| A report confirming the construction has been conducted in general accordance with the recommendations could be issued, upon request, following the completion of a satisfactory materials testing and observation program by Paterson. |  |  |  |

All excess soil must be handled as per *Ontario Regulation 406/19: On-Site and Excess Soil Management.* 



## 8.0 Statement of Limitations

The recommendations provided herein 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 TM (262615) HOLDING INC., and Marissa & Mathieu Brisebois, 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.

Pratheep Thirumoolan, M.Eng.

Joey R Villeneuve, M.A.Sc., P.Eng., ing.

195/1

#### **Report Distribution:**

- TM (262615) HOLDING INC., and Marissa & Mathieu Brisebois. (e-mail copy)
- □ Paterson Group Inc (1 copy)



# **APPENDIX 1**

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA SHEETS
SYMBOLS AND TERMS

ANALYTICAL TESTING RESULTS

Report: PG6640-1 June 1, 2023

# patersongroup Consulting Engineers

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA

Geotechnical Investigation
Prop. Residential Development

Prop. Residential Development - 6208 Renaud Road 9 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7T9 Ottawa, Ontario **DATUM** Geodetic FILE NO. **PG6640 REMARKS** HOLE NO. **BH 1-23** BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill **DATE** May 8, 2023 **SAMPLE** Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m PLOT Piezometer Construction DEPTH ELEV. **SOIL DESCRIPTION**  50 mm Dia. Cone (m) (m) RECOVERY N VALUE or RQD NUMBER Water Content % 80 **Ground Surface** 20 0+86.64**TOPSOIL** SS 1 25 3 FILL: Brown silty sand, trace gravel and crushed stone 0.60 Compact, brown SANDY SILT, trace 1 + 85.642 SS 46 16 Compact, grey **SANDY SILT**, trace 1.68 SS 3 46 11 2 + 84.64SS 4 100 1 0 3+83.64 SS 5 Ρ 100 Δ O 4 + 82.64Firm, grey SILTY CLAY, trace sand SS 6 100 Ρ Ö SS 7 Ρ 100  $5 \pm 81.64$ 

SS

SS

8

9

100

100

Ρ

Ρ

 $6 \pm 80.64$ 

Ö

Ó

40

▲ Undisturbed

Shear Strength (kPa)

60

80

△ Remoulded

100

End of Borehole

(GWL @ 1.85m depth on April 20, 2023)

# patersongroup Consulting Engineers

Geotechnical Investigation

Prop. Residential Development - 6208 Renaud Road Ottawa, Ontario

**SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA** 

9 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 7T9

**DATUM** Geodetic FILE NO. **PG6640 REMARKS** HOLE NO. **BH 2-23** BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill **DATE** May 8, 2023 **SAMPLE** Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m PLOT Piezometer Construction DEPTH ELEV. **SOIL DESCRIPTION** • 50 mm Dia. Cone (m) (m) N VALUE or RQD RECOVERY STRATA NUMBER Water Content % 80 **Ground Surface** 20 0 + 86.61**TOPSOIL** 0 0.25 SS 1 83 2 **FILL:** Brown silty sand Ö 0.60 Compact, brown SANDY SILT, trace 1 + 85.612 SS 75 13 1.37 Compact, grey SANDY SILT, trace 3 SS 67 11 Ö 2 + 84.61Ρ SS 4 92 3+83.61 SS 5 Ρ 92 0 4 + 82.61Firm, grey SILTY CLAY, trace sand SS 6 100 Ρ Ó SS 7 Ρ 100 5+81.61 SS 8 100 Ρ Ö  $6 \pm 80.61$ 6.55 End of Borehole (GWL @ 2.02m depth on April 20, 2023) 40 60 100 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 strength of cohesionless soils is the relative density, 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.

| Relative Density | '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 vane tests, penetrometer tests, unconfined compression tests, or occasionally by Standard Penetration Tests.

| 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 is the ratio between the undisturbed undrained shear strength and the remoulded undrained shear strength of the soil.

Terminology used for describing soil strata based upon texture, or the proportion of individual particle sizes present is provided on the Textural Soil Classification Chart at the end of this information package.

#### **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 NXL size core. However, it can be used on smaller core sizes, such as BX, 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   |
| PS | - | Piston sample   |
| AU | - | Auger sample or bulk sample   |
| WS | - | Wash sample   |
| RC | - | Rock core sample (Core bit size AXT, BXL, etc.). Rock core samples are obtained with the use of standard diamond drilling bits. |

#### SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

#### **GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION**

MC% - Natural moisture content or water content of sample, %

Liquid Limit, % (water content above which soil behaves as a liquid)
 PL - Plastic limit, % (water content above which soil behaves plastically)

PI - Plasticity index, % (difference between LL and PL)

Dxx - Grain size which xx% of the soil, by weight, is of finer grain sizes

These grain size descriptions are not used below 0.075 mm grain size

D10 - Grain size at which 10% of the soil is finer (effective grain size)

D60 - Grain size at which 60% of the soil is finer

Cc - Concavity coefficient =  $(D30)^2 / (D10 \times D60)$ 

Cu - Uniformity coefficient = D60 / D10

Cc and Cu are used to assess the grading of sands and gravels:

Well-graded gravels have: 1 < Cc < 3 and Cu > 4 Well-graded sands have: 1 < Cc < 3 and Cu > 6

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

Cc and Cu are not applicable for the description of soils with more than 10% silt and clay

(more than 10% finer than 0.075 mm or the #200 sieve)

#### **CONSOLIDATION TEST**

p'<sub>o</sub> - Present effective overburden pressure at sample depth

p'c - Preconsolidation pressure of (maximum past pressure on) sample

Ccr - Recompression index (in effect at pressures below p'c)
Cc - Compression index (in effect at pressures above p'c)

OC Ratio Overconsolidaton ratio =  $p'_c/p'_o$ 

Void Ratio Initial sample void ratio = volume of voids / volume of solids

Wo - Initial water content (at start of consolidation test)

#### PERMEABILITY TEST

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

## SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

#### STRATA PLOT



#### MONITORING WELL AND PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION





Order #: 2320501

Certificate of Analysis

Client: Paterson Group Consulting Engineers

Report Date: 26-May-2023

Order Date: 19-May-2023

Client PO: 57546 Project Description: PG6640

|                          | -             |                 |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---|---|---|
|                          | Client ID:    | BH2-23-SS6      | - | - | - |
|                          | Sample Date:  | 08-May-23 09:00 | - | - | - |
|                          | Sample ID:    | 2320501-01      | - | - | - |
|                          | MDL/Units     | Soil            | - | ı | - |
| Physical Characteristics |               |                 |   |   | • |
| % Solids                 | 0.1 % by Wt.  | 53.7            | - | - | - |
| General Inorganics       |               |                 | • |   |   |
| рН                       | 0.05 pH Units | 8.21            | - | - | - |
| Resistivity              | 0.1 Ohm.m     | 31.4            | - | - | - |
| Anions                   |               |                 |   |   |   |
| Chloride                 | 10 ug/g dry   | 44              | - | - | - |
| Sulphate                 | 10 ug/g dry   | 42              | - | - | - |



# **APPENDIX 2**

FIGURE 1 - KEY PLAN

DRAWING PG6640-1 - TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN

Report: PG6640-1 June 1, 2023



# FIGURE 1

**KEY PLAN** 



