


# Geotechnical Investigation

## Proposed Multi-Storey Building

54, 56, & 60 Bayswater Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for Centennial Developments Corporation

Report PG5645-1 Revision 2 dated September 13, 2022



## Table of Contents

|   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>                         | <b>3</b>    |
| <b>2.0 Proposed Development .....</b>                 | <b>3</b>    |
| <b>3.0 Method of Investigation .....</b>              | <b>4</b>    |
| 3.1 Field Investigation .....                         | 4           |
| 3.2 Field Survey .....                                | 5           |
| 3.3 Laboratory Review .....                           | 5           |
| 3.4 Analytical Testing .....                          | 5           |
| <b>4.0 Observations .....</b>                         | <b>6</b>    |
| 4.1 Surface Conditions .....                          | 6           |
| 4.2 Subsurface Profile .....                          | 6           |
| 4.3 Groundwater .....                                 | 7           |
| <b>5.0 Discussion .....</b>                           | <b>8</b>    |
| 5.1 Geotechnical Assessment .....                     | 8           |
| 5.2 Site Grading and Preparation .....                | 8           |
| 5.3 Foundation Design .....                           | 10          |
| 5.4 Design for Earthquakes .....                      | 11          |
| 5.5 Basement Floor Slab .....                         | 11          |
| 5.6 Basement Wall .....                               | 12          |
| 5.7 Pavement Structure .....                          | 13          |
| <b>6.0 Design and Construction Precautions .....</b>  | <b>15</b>   |
| 6.1 Foundation Drainage and Backfill .....            | 15          |
| 6.2 Protection of Footings Against Frost Action ..... | 15          |
| 6.3 Excavation Side Slopes .....                      | 16          |
| 6.4 Pipe Bedding and Backfill .....                   | 18          |
| 6.5 Groundwater Control .....                         | 19          |
| 6.7 Landscaping Consideration .....                   | 20          |
| 6.8 Corrosion Potential and Sulphate .....            | 20          |
| <b>7.0 Recommendations .....</b>                      | <b>22</b>   |
| <b>8.0 Statement of Limitations .....</b>             | <b>23</b>   |

---

## Appendices

- Appendix 1**      Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets  
                         Symbols and Terms  
                         Atterberg Limits' Testing Results  
                         Grain Size Distribution Analysis Results  
                         Analytical Testing Results
- Appendix 2**      Figure 1 - Key Plan  
                         Drawing PG5645-1 – Test Hole Location Plan

## 1.0 Introduction

Paterson Group (Paterson) was commissioned by Centennial Properties to conduct a supplemental geotechnical investigation for the proposed residential development to be located at 54, 56, & 60 Bayswater Avenue in the City of Ottawa, Ontario (refer to Figure 1 - Key Plan in Appendix 2 of this report).

The objectives of the geotechnical investigation were to:

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

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

## 2.0 Proposed Development

It is understood that the proposed development will consist of a multi-storey residential building with one level of underground parking. Asphalt-paved parking areas, walkways and landscaped areas surrounding the proposed building are also anticipated. Municipal services are also anticipated as part of the proposed development.

It is further anticipated that the existing residential dwellings throughout the subject site will be demolished to allow for construction of the proposed multi-storey building.

## **3.0 Method of Investigation**

### **3.1 Field Investigation**

#### **Field Program**

A supplemental geotechnical investigation was carried out at the subject site by Paterson on August 12, 2022. At that time a total of 1 borehole was advanced to a maximum depth of 5.0 m below the existing ground surface.

A previous geotechnical investigation was completed by this firm in February 2021, within the subject site. At that time, a total of 2 boreholes were advanced to a maximum depth of 6.6 m. The borehole locations were distributed in a manner to provide general coverage of the subject block, taking into consideration existing site features and underground utilities. The locations of test holes are shown on Drawing PG5645-1 – Test Hole Location Plan included in Appendix 2.

The supplemental borehole was advanced using a low-clearance 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 at the selected locations, and sampling and testing the overburden.

#### **Sampling and In Situ Testing**

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

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

The subsurface conditions observed in the test holes were recorded in detail in the field. The soil profiles are presented on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets in Appendix 1.

---

## **Groundwater**

Flexible standpipes were installed in all boreholes during the field investigation to permit monitoring of the groundwater levels subsequent to the completion of the sampling program.

## **Sample Storage**

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

## **3.2 Field Survey**

The supplemental borehole location was selected by Paterson to provide general coverage of the proposed building, taking into consideration existing site features and underground utilities. The borehole locations, and ground surface elevation at each borehole location were surveyed by Paterson using a GPS unit with respect to a geodetic datum.

The test hole locations and ground surface elevation at the historical test holes were recovered in the field by Austin Cooney. The ground surface elevations are referenced to a geodetic datum. The ground surface elevation and location of the test holes are presented on Drawing PG5645-1 - Test Hole Location Plan in Appendix 2.

## **3.3 Laboratory Review**

The soil samples recovered from the previous investigations were visually examined in our laboratory to review the results of the field logging. A total of one (1) Atterberg Limits test, one (1) grains size distribution analysis, and one shrinkage test were carried out on samples collected during the supplemental and historic geotechnical investigations. The test results are included in Appendix 1 and further discussed in Section 4.2.

## **3.4 Analytical Testing**

One 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 samples was submitted to determine the concentration of sulphate and chlorine, 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 consists of 3 contiguous properties: 54, 56, and 60 Bayswater Avenue. Each of the aforementioned properties are currently occupied by low-rise residential dwellings with associated landscaped areas and fencing, which bisects the western half of the subject properties in an approximate north-south orientation. Garages are also near the western property boundaries at 54 and 60 Bayswater Avenue.

The site is bordered to the north by a high-rise residential building with underground parking, to the east by Bayswater Avenue, to the south by low-rise residential dwellings, and to the west by an unnamed access lane. The ground surface across the subject site slopes gently downwards towards the rear of the property, from geodetic elevation 67 m along Bayswater Avenue to geodetic elevation 64 m at the rear lane way.

### **4.2 Subsurface Profile**

#### **Overburden**

Generally, the subsurface profile at the test hole locations consists of a topsoil layer underlain by fill. The fill material was observed to extend to approximate depths ranging from 1.8 to 2.3 m below the existing ground surface and consists of a loose to compact, brown silty sand with clay, gravel and cobbles.

The fill was observed to be underlain by a deposit of stiff, brown silty clay which was further underlain by a glacial till deposit. The glacial till deposit was encountered at approximate depths of 1.8 to 4.6 m below the existing ground surface, and was observed to consist of a silty clay with sand, gravel, cobbles and boulders. Practical refusal to augering was encountered in the boreholes at approximate depths of 5.0 to 6.5 m below the existing ground surface.

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

#### **Bedrock**

Based on available geological mapping, the local bedrock consists of limestone with interbedded shale of the Verulam formation.

## Laboratory Testing

Atterberg limits testing was completed on the recovered silty clay samples at borehole BH 1-22 during the supplemental investigation. Based on the Atterberg Limits testing results, the silty clay test sample was classified as a Inorganic Clay of Low Plasticity (CH). The results of the Atterberg Limits testing are presented in Table 1 below and on the Atterberg Limits Results sheet in Appendix 1.

| Test Hole | Sample | Depth (m) | Liquid Limit (%) | Plastic Limit (%) | Plastic Index (%) | Classification |
|-----------|--------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| BH 1-22   | SS3    | 1.8       | 24               | 12                | 12                | CL             |

**Notes:** CL: Inorganic Clay of Low Plasticity

Grain size distribution analysis was completed on one (1) soil sample during the supplemental geotechnical investigation. The results of the grain size distribution analysis are summarized in Table 2 below and presented on the Grain Size Distribution Results sheets in appendix 1.

| Test Hole | Sample | Depth (m) | Gravel (%) | Sand (%) | Silt (%) | Clay (%) |
|-----------|--------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|
| BH 11-22  | SS4    | 2.2       | 4.8        | 46.4     | 40.8     | 8.0      |

## 4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater level readings were measured at the piezometer locations on February 23, 2021. The observed groundwater levels are summarized in Table 3 below.

| Borehole Number | Ground Surface Elevation (m) | Measured Groundwater Level |               | Recording Date    |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                 |                              | Depth (m)                  | Elevation (m) |                   |
| BH 1-22         | 64.04                        | -                          | n/a           | August 29, 2022   |
| BH 1-21         | 67.27                        | 3.21                       | 64.06         | February 23, 2021 |
| BH 2-21         | 66.58                        | 2.45                       | 64.13         | February 23, 2021 |



## **5.0 Discussion**

### **5.1 Geotechnical Assessment**

From a geotechnical perspective, the subject site is suitable for the proposed development. It is recommended that the proposed building be founded on conventional spread footings bearing on the undisturbed, stiff silty clay or undisturbed, compact glacial till.

Alternatively, should the bearing pressures from the proposed building exceed the bearing resistance values provided herein for the undisturbed, stiff silty clay and/or undisturbed, compact glacial till, the conventional spread footings are recommended to be supported on lean concrete trenches which extend to the bedrock. This is discussed further herein.

Where the footings of the proposed building about the neighbouring existing buildings, they should match the existing footing elevations.

Due to the presence of a silty clay layer, the proposed development will be subjected to grade raise restrictions. The permissible grade raise recommendations are discussed in subsection 5.3.

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

### **5.2 Site Grading and Preparation**

#### **Stripping Depth**

Topsoil and fill, such as those containing organic or deleterious materials, should be stripped from under any building and other settlement sensitive structures.

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

#### **Fill Placement**

Fill used for grading beneath the proposed building should consist of clean imported granular fill, such as Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS) Granular A or Granular B Type II. The fill should be tested and approved prior to delivery to the site.

The fill should be placed in lifts no greater than 300 mm thick and compacted using suitable compaction equipment for the lift thickness.

Fill placed beneath the building and paved areas should be compacted to at least 98% of its Standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).

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

Non-specified existing fill and site excavated soils are not suitable for use as backfill against foundation walls unless used in conjunction with a composite drainage membrane.

### **Lean Concrete Filled Trenches**

As discussed above, should the bearing pressures from the proposed building exceed the bearing resistance values provided herein for the undisturbed, stiff silty clay and/or undisturbed, compact glacial till, the conventional spread footings are recommended to be supported on lean concrete trenches which extend to the bedrock.

In this case, as the bedrock is anticipated to be encountered below the underside of footing elevation, zero-entry vertical trenches would be excavated to the clean, surface-sounded bedrock, and backfilled with lean concrete to the founding elevation (minimum **17 MPa** 28-day compressive strength). Typically, the excavation side walls will be used as the form to support the concrete. The trench excavation should be at least 150 mm wider than all sides of the footing (strip and pad footings) at the base of the excavation. The additional width of the concrete poured against an undisturbed trench sidewall will suffice in providing a direct transfer of the footing load to the underlying bedrock. Once the trench excavation is approved by the geotechnical engineer, lean concrete can be poured up to the proposed founding elevation.

## 5.3 Foundation Design

### Conventional Spread Footings

Footings placed on an undisturbed, stiff silty clay or undisturbed, compact glacial till bearing surface can be designed using a bearing resistance value at serviceability limit states (SLS) of **200 kPa** and a factored bearing resistance value at ultimate limit states (ULS) of **300 kPa**. A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the above noted bearing resistance value at ULS.

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

An undisturbed soil bearing surface consists of a surface from which all topsoil and deleterious materials, such as loose, frozen, or disturbed soil, whether in situ or not, have been removed, in the dry, prior to the placement of concrete footings.

Footings supported on lean concrete trenches which are placed directly over a clean, surface-sounded bedrock, can be designed using a factored bearing resistance value at ultimate limit states (ULS) of **1,500 kPa**. A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the bearing resistance value at ULS.

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

Footings supported on lean concrete trenches which are placed directly on an acceptable bedrock bearing surface and designed for the bearing resistance values provided herein will be subjected to negligible post-construction total and differential settlements.

As a general procedure, it is recommended that the footings for the proposed building that are located adjacent to the existing neighbouring structures be founded at the same level as the existing footings. This accomplishes three objectives. First, the behaviour of the two structures at their connection will be similar due to the similar bearing medium, Second, there will be minimal stress added to the existing structure from the new structure. Third, the bearing of the new structure will not be influenced by any backfill from the existing structure.

## Lateral Support

The bearing medium under footing-supported structures is required to be provided with adequate lateral support with respect to excavations and different foundation levels. Adequate lateral support is provided to glacial till 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 Restrictions

Due to the presence of the silty clay deposit, a permissible grade raise restriction of **2.0 m** is recommended for grading at 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 C**. If higher seismic site class is required (Class A or B), and the proposed footings or lean concrete trenches are to be located within 3 m of the bedrock surface, a site specific shear wave velocity test may be completed to accurately determine the applicable seismic site classification for foundation design of the proposed building, as presented in Table 4.1.8.4.A of the Ontario Building Code (OBC) 2021.

Soils underlying the subject site are not susceptible to liquefaction. Reference should be made to the latest revision of the OBC 2012 for a full discussion of the earthquake design requirements.

## 5.5 Basement Floor Slab

With the removal of all topsoil and deleterious fill from within the footprint of the proposed buildings, the native soil surface will be considered an acceptable subgrade on which to commence backfilling for floor slab construction. It is anticipated that the basement area for the proposed building will be mostly parking and the recommended pavement structures noted in Subsection 5.7 will be applicable. However, if storage or other uses of the lower level will involve construction of a concrete floor slab, the upper 200 mm of sub-slab is recommended to consist of 19 mm clear crushed stone.

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

In consideration of the groundwater conditions encountered at the time of the field investigation, a sub-slab drainage system, consisting of lines of perforated drainage pipe subdrains connected to a sump pit, should be provided in the subfloor fill under the lower basement floor (discussed further in Subsection 6.1).

## 5.6 Basement Wall

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

Where undrained conditions are anticipated (i.e. below the groundwater level), the applicable effective (undrained) unit weight of the retained soil can be taken as 13 kN/m<sup>3</sup>, where applicable. A hydrostatic pressure should be added to the total static earth pressure when using the effective unit weight.

### Lateral Earth Pressures

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

- $K_o$  = at-rest earth pressure coefficient of the applicable retained soil (0.5)
- $\gamma$  = unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m<sup>3</sup>)
- $H$  = height of the wall (m)

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

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

## Seismic Earth Pressures

The total seismic force ( $P_{AE}$ ) includes both the earth force component ( $P_o$ ) and the seismic component ( $\Delta P_{AE}$ ).

The seismic earth force ( $\Delta P_{AE}$ ) can be calculated using  $0.375 \cdot a_c \cdot \gamma \cdot H^2/g$  where:

$$a_c = (1.45 - a_{max}/g) a_{max}$$

$$\gamma = \text{unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m}^3\text{)}$$

$$H = \text{height of the wall (m)}$$

$$g = \text{gravity, 9.81 m/s}^2$$

The peak ground acceleration, ( $a_{max}$ ), for the Ottawa area is 0.32g according to OBC 2012. Note that the vertical seismic coefficient is assumed to be zero.

The earth force component ( $P_o$ ) under seismic conditions can be calculated using  $P_o = .5 K_o \gamma H^2$ , where  $K_o = 0.5$  for the soil conditions noted above.

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

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

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

## 5.7 Pavement Structure

For design purposes, it is recommended that the rigid pavement structure for the underground parking level consists of Category C2, 32 MPa concrete at 28 days with air entrainment of 5 to 8%. The recommended rigid pavement structure is further presented in Table 4. The flexible pavement structure presented in Table 3 should be used for at grade access lanes and heavy loading parking areas.

| <b>Table 4 - Recommended Rigid Pavement Structure - Lower Parking Level</b>                                      |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Thickness (mm)</b>  | <b>Material Description</b>  |
| 150  | <b>Exposure Class C2 - 32 MPa Concrete</b> (5 to 8% Air Entrainment) |
| 300  | <b>BASE</b> – OPSS Granular A  |
| <b>SUBGRADE</b> – Existing imported fill, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material material placed over bedrock. |  |

To control cracking due to shrinking of the concrete floor slab, it is recommended that strategically located saw cuts be used to create control joints within the concrete floor slab of the underground parking level. The control joints are generally recommended to be located at the center of the column lines and spaced at approximately 24 to 36 times the slab thickness (for example, a 0.15 m thick slab should have control joints spaced between 3.6 and 5.4 m). The joints should be cut between 25 and 30% of the thickness of the concrete floor slab and completed as early as 4 hours after the concrete has been poured during warm temperatures and up to 12 hours during cooler temperatures.

| <b>Table 3 - Recommended Pavement Structure – Car Only Parking Area</b>                             |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Thickness (mm)</b>   | <b>Material Description</b>                                    |
| 40  | <b>Wear Course</b> - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete |
| 150   | <b>BASE</b> - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone                    |
| 450   | <b>SUBBASE</b> - OPSS Granular B Type II                       |
| <b>SUBGRADE</b> – Fill, in-situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over bedrock. |  |

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

If soft spots develop in the subgrade during compaction or due to construction traffic, the affected areas should be excavated and replaced with OPSS Granular B Type II material. The pavement granular base and subbase should be placed in a maximum 300 mm thick lifts and compacted to a minimum of 98% of the materials SPMDD using suitable vibratory equipment,

## **6.0 Design and Construction Precautions**

### **6.1 Foundation Drainage and Backfill**

#### **Foundation Drainage**

It is recommended that a perimeter foundation drainage system be provided for the proposed building. The system should consist of a 100 to 150 mm diameter, geotextile-wrapped, perforated and corrugated plastic pipe surrounded on all sides by 150 mm of 10 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.

#### **Sub-slab Drainage**

Sub-slab drainage will be required to control water infiltration. For preliminary design purposes, we recommend that 150 mm diameter perforated pipes be placed at approximately 6 m centres underlying the lowest level floor slab. The spacing of the sub-slab drainage system should be confirmed at the time of completing the excavation when water infiltration can be better assessed.

#### **Foundation Backfill**

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 Delta Drain 6000) 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 effect of frost action. A minimum of 1.5 m thick soil cover (or equivalent) 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 heated structure and require additional protection, such as soil cover of 2.1 m or an equivalent combination of soil cover and foundation insulation.

However, the foundations are generally not expected to require protection against frost action due to the founding depth, Unheated structures such as access ramp may require insulation for protection against the deleterious effects of frost action.



## 6.3 Excavation Side Slopes

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

### Unsupported Excavations

The excavation side slopes above the groundwater level extending to a maximum depth of 3 m should be cut back at 1H:1V or flatter. The flatter slope is required for excavation below groundwater level. The subsoil at this site is considered to be mainly a Type 2 and 3 soil according to the Occupational Health and Safety Act and Regulations for Construction Projects.

Excavated soil should not be stockpiled directly at the top of excavations and heavy equipment should be kept away from the excavation sides.

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

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

### Temporary Shoring

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

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

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

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

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

| <b>Table 5 - Soil Parameters</b>             |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Parameters</b>                            | <b>Values</b> |
| Active Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_a$ )  | 0.33          |
| Passive Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_p$ ) | 3             |
| At-Rest Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_0$ ) | 0.5           |
| Unit Weight , kN/m <sup>3</sup>              | 21            |
| Submerged Unit Weight , kN/m <sup>3</sup>    | 13            |

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

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

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

## **Underpinning of Adjacent Structures**

If the excavation for the proposed building is to extend within the lateral support zone of adjacent building foundations, underpinning of these structures would be required. The depth of the underpinning, if required, would be dependent on the depth of the neighbouring foundations relative to the founding depth of the proposed building at the subject site.

## **6.4 Pipe Bedding and Backfill**

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

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

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

Where hard surface areas are considered above the trench backfill, the trench backfill material within the frost zone (about 1.8 m below finished grade) and above the cover material should match the soils exposed at the trench walls to minimize differential frost heaving. The trench backfill should be placed in maximum 225 mm thick loose lifts and compacted to a minimum of 95% of the material's SPMDD. All cobbles larger than 200 mm in their 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. Generally, 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 225 mm thick loose layers compacted to a minimum of 95% of the materials standard Proctor maximum dry density. The clay seals should be placed at the site boundaries.

## 6.5 Groundwater Control

It is anticipated that groundwater infiltration into the excavations should be controllable using open sumps. The contractor should be prepared to direct water away from all bearing surfaces and subgrades, regardless of the source, to prevent disturbance to the founding medium.

### Groundwater Control for Building Construction

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

For typical ground or surface water volumes being pumped during the construction phase, typically between 50,000 to 400,000 L/day, it is required to register on the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR). A minimum of two to four weeks should be allotted for completion of the EASR registration and the Water Taking and Discharge Plan to be prepared by a Qualified 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.

### Impacts on Neighbouring

Clay seals have been recommended, as a conservation measure, to reduce long-term lowering of the groundwater level at, and in the vicinity of, the subject site. Further, given the subsurface soils at the site consists of a stiff silty clay overlying a compact to dense glacial till deposit, any short-term dewatering during construction will not impact adjacent properties and/or structures.

## 6.6 Winter Construction

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

In the event of construction during below zero temperatures, the founding stratum should be protected from freezing temperatures by the use of straw, propane heaters and tarpaulins or other suitable means. In this regard, the base of the excavations should be insulated from sub-zero temperatures immediately upon exposure and until such time as heat is adequately supplied to be 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 Landscaping Considerations

Paterson completed a soils review of the subject site to determine applicable tree planting setbacks, in accordance with the City of Ottawa Tree Planting in Sensitive Marine Clay Soils (2017 Guidelines) for trees planted within a public right-of-way (ROW). Atterberg limits testing was completed on 1 recovered silty clay sample during the supplemental geotechnical investigation. Grain size distribution analysis was also completed on 1 soil sample. The above noted test results were completed on samples taken at depths between the anticipated design underside of footing elevation and 3.5 m depth below anticipated finished grade. The results of our testing are presented in Tables 1 and 2 in Subsection 4.2 and in Appendix 1.

A low to medium sensitivity clay soil was encountered between anticipated underside of footing elevations and 3.5 m below preliminary finished grade. as per City Guidelines at the subject site. Based on our Atterberg Limits' test results, the modified plasticity limits did not exceed 40%. Therefore, the following tree planting setbacks are recommended for the low to medium sensitivity area.

Large trees (mature height over 14 m) can be planted within this area provided a tree to foundation setback equal to the full mature height of the tree can be provided (e.g. in a park or other green space). Tree planting setback limits may be reduced to **4.5 m** for small (mature tree height up to 7.5m) and medium size trees (mature tree height 7.5 m to 14 m) provided that the following conditions are met:

- ❑ The underside of footing (USF) is 2.1 m or greater below the lowest finished grade must be satisfied for footings within 10 m from the tree, as measured from the centre of the tree trunk and verified by means of the Grading Plan as indicated procedural changes below. **It should be noted that where the footings are proposed at a shallower depth, a combination of engineered fill and/or root barrier system can be designed to**

**accommodate a reduced footing depths which can be discussed in a separate report.**

- ❑ A small tree must be provided with a minimum of 25 m<sup>3</sup> of available soil volume while a medium tree must be provided with a minimum of 30 m<sup>3</sup> of available soil volume, as determined by the Landscape Architect. The developer is to ensure that the soil is generally un-compacted when backfilling in street tree planting locations.
- ❑ The tree species must be small (mature tree height up to 7.5 m) to medium size (mature tree height 7.5 m to 14 m) as confirmed by the Landscape Architect.
- ❑ The foundation walls are to be reinforced at least nominally (minimum of two upper and two lower 15M bars in the foundation wall).
- ❑ Grading surrounding the tree must promote drainage to the tree root zone (in such a manner as not to be detrimental to the tree).

## **6.8 Corrosion Potential and Sulphate**

The results of the 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 chlorine content and the pH of the sample indicate that they are not significant factors in creating a corrosive environment for exposed ferrous metals at this site, whereas the resistivity is indicate of a non-aggressive to slightly aggressive corrosive environment.

## 7.0 Recommendations

A materials testing and observation services program is also a requirement for the foundation design data to be applicable. The following aspects of the program should be performed by the geotechnical consultant:

- Observation of all bearing surfaces prior to the placement of concrete.
- Sampling and testing of the concrete and fill materials used.
- Periodic observation of the condition of unsupported excavation side slopes in excess of 3 m in height, if applicable.
- Observation of all subgrades prior to backfilling.
- Field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved.
- Sampling and testing of the bituminous concrete including mix design reviews.

A report confirming that these works have been conducted in general accordance with our recommendations could be issued, upon request, following the completion of a satisfactory material testing and observation program by the geotechnical consultant.

## 8.0 Statement of Limitations

The recommendations provided in this report are in accordance with our present understanding of the project. We request permission to review our recommendations when the drawings and specifications are completed.

A geotechnical investigation of this nature is a limited sampling of a site. Should any conditions at the site be encountered which differ from those at the test locations, we request 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 its 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 Centennial Properties or their agents is not authorized without review by Paterson Group for the applicability of our recommendations to the altered use of the report.

**Paterson Group Inc.**



Kevin Pickard, EIT



Scott S. Dennis, P.Eng.

**Report Distribution:**

- Centennial Development Corporation (e-mail copy)
- Paterson Group (1 copy)



# APPENDIX 1

SOIL PROFILE AND TEST DATA SHEETS

SYMBOLS AND TERMS

ATTERBERG LIMITS' TESTING RESULTS

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS RESULTS

ANALYTICAL TESTING RESULTS

DATUM Geodetic


REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill

DATE August 12, 2022

FILE NO.  
**PG5645**

HOLE NO.  
**BH 1-22**





DATUM Geodetic


REMARKS

BORINGS BY CME-55 Low Clearance Drill

DATE 2021 February 5

FILE NO. **PG5645**

HOLE NO. **BH 2-21**



# SYMBOLS AND TERMS

## SOIL DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

### SOIL DESCRIPTION (continued)

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

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

### ROCK DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

### SAMPLE TYPES

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

## SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

### PLASTICITY LIMITS AND GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

|                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| WC%             | - | Natural water content or water content of sample, %   |
| LL              | - | Liquid Limit, % (water content above which soil behaves as a liquid)  |
| PL              | - | Plastic Limit, % (water content above which soil behaves plastically)   |
| PI              | - | Plasticity Index, % (difference between LL and PL)  |
| D <sub>xx</sub> | - | Grain size at which xx% of the soil, by weight, is of finer grain sizes<br>These grain size descriptions are not used below 0.075 mm grain size |
| D <sub>10</sub> | - | Grain size at which 10% of the soil is finer (effective grain size)   |
| D <sub>60</sub> | - | Grain size at which 60% of the soil is finer  |
| C <sub>c</sub>  | - | Concavity coefficient = $(D_{30})^2 / (D_{10} \times D_{60})$   |
| C <sub>u</sub>  | - | Uniformity coefficient = $D_{60} / D_{10}$  |

C<sub>c</sub> and C<sub>u</sub> are used to assess the grading of sands and gravels:

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

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

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

C<sub>c</sub> and C<sub>u</sub> 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' <sub>c</sub> | - | Preconsolidation pressure of (maximum past pressure on) sample      |
| C <sub>cr</sub> | - | Recompression index (in effect at pressures below p' <sub>c</sub> ) |
| C <sub>c</sub>  | - | Compression index (in effect at pressures above p' <sub>c</sub> )   |
| OC Ratio        |   | Overconsolidation ratio = $p'_c / p'_o$                             |
| Void Ratio      |   | Initial sample void ratio = volume of voids / volume of solids      |
| W <sub>o</sub>  | - | Initial water content (at start of consolidation test)              |

### PERMEABILITY TEST

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

## SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)


### STRATA PLOT



Topsoil




Asphalt




Fill




Peat




Sand




Silty Sand




Silt



Sandy Silt



Clay




Silty Clay




Clayey Silty Sand



Glacial Till




Shale




Bedrock

### MONITORING WELL AND PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION

#### MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION




#### PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION







|               |                       |               |   |                |           |
|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---|----------------|-----------|
| CLIENT:       | Centennial Properties | DEPTH:        | - | FILE NO:       | PG5645    |
| CONTRACT NO.: |                       | BH OR TP No.: | - | LAB NO:        | 37476     |
| PROJECT:      | Geo Investigation     |               |   | DATE RECEIVED: | 25-Aug-22 |
|               |                       |               |   | DATE TESTED:   | 31-Aug-22 |
| DATE SAMPLED: | 24-Aug-22             |               |   | DATE REPORTED: | 6-Sep-22  |
| SAMPLED BY:   | DR                    |               |   | TESTED BY:     | DK/CS     |



|      |      |  |  |  |      |        |        |        |        |        |
|------|------|--|--|--|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Clay | Silt |  |  |  | Sand |        |        | Gravel |        | Cobble |
|      |      |  |  |  | Fine | Medium | Coarse | Fine   | Coarse |        |

|                |                     |     |     |     |            |       |      |      |     |    |    |
|----------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|------------|-------|------|------|-----|----|----|
| Identification | Soil Classification |     |     |     |            | MC(%) | LL   | PL   | PI  | Cc | Cu |
|                | D100                | D60 | D30 | D10 | Gravel (%) | 9.8   | 46.4 | 40.8 | 8.0 |    |    |
|                |                     |     |     |     | 4.8        |       |      |      |     |    |    |

Comments:

|              |                    |  |                      |  |
|--------------|--------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| REVIEWED BY: | Curtis Beadow      |  | Joe Forsyth, P. Eng. |  |
|              | <i>[Signature]</i> |  | <i>[Signature]</i>   |  |

|             |                       |               |          |                |           |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------|----------------|-----------|
| CLIENT:     | Centennial Properties | DEPTH:        | -        | FILE NO.:      | PG5645    |
| PROJECT:    | Geo Investigation     | BH OR TP No.: | -        | DATE SAMPLED:  | 24-Aug-22 |
| LAB No. :   | 37476                 | TESTED BY:    | DK/CS    | DATE RECEIVED: | 25-Aug-22 |
| SAMPLED BY: | DR                    | DATE REPT'D:  | 6-Sep-22 | DATE TESTED:   | 31-Aug-22 |

| SAMPLE INFORMATION        |        |                      |                  |               |  |
|---------------------------|--------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|--|
| SAMPLE MASS               |        |                      | SPECIFIC GRAVITY |               |  |
| 341.3                     |        |                      | 2.700            |               |  |
| INITIAL WEIGHT            | 50.00  | HYGROSCOPIC MOISTURE |                  |               |  |
| WEIGHT CORRECTED          | 76.10  | TARE WEIGHT          | 50.00            | ACTUAL WEIGHT |  |
| WT. AFTER WASH BACK SIEVE | 23.64  | AIR DRY              | 241.40           | 191.40        |  |
| SOLUTION CONCENTRATION    | 40 g/L | OVEN DRY             | 341.30           | 291.30        |  |
|                           |        | CORRECTED            | 1.522            |               |  |

| GRAIN SIZE ANALYSIS |                     |                  |                 |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| SIEVE DIAMETER (mm) | WEIGHT RETAINED (g) | PERCENT RETAINED | PERCENT PASSING |
| 26.5                | 0                   | 0.0              | 100.0           |
| 19                  | 0.0                 | 0.0              | 100.0           |
| 13.2                | 5.0                 | 1.5              | 98.5            |
| 9.5                 | 3.8                 | 1.1              | 98.9            |
| 4.75                | 16.4                | 4.8              | 95.2            |
| 2.0                 | 28.2                | 8.3              | 91.7            |
| Pan                 | 285.0               |                  |                 |
|                     |                     |                  |                 |
| 0.850               | 3.98                | 15.6             | 84.4            |
| 0.425               | 8.49                | 23.8             | 76.2            |
| 0.250               | 13.17               | 32.4             | 67.6            |
| 0.106               | 21.05               | 46.9             | 53.1            |
| 0.075               | 23.40               | 51.2             | 48.8            |
| Pan                 | 23.64               |                  |                 |
| SIEVE CHECK         | 0.0                 | MAX = 0.3%       |                 |

| HYDROMETER DATA |                 |      |     |            |          |      |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------|------|-----|------------|----------|------|-----------------------|
| ELAPSED         | TIME (24 hours) | Hs   | Hc  | Temp. (°C) | DIAMETER | (P)  | TOTAL PERCENT PASSING |
| 1               | 7:55            | 26.5 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0446   | 26.6 | 24.4                  |
| 2               | 7:56            | 24.5 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0320   | 24.0 | 22.1                  |
| 5               | 7:59            | 22.5 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0205   | 21.4 | 19.7                  |
| 15              | 8:09            | 20.0 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0121   | 18.2 | 16.7                  |
| 30              | 8:24            | 19.0 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0086   | 16.9 | 15.5                  |
| 60              | 8:54            | 16.0 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0062   | 13.0 | 11.9                  |
| 250             | 12:04           | 14.0 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0031   | 10.4 | 9.5                   |
| 1440            | 7:54            | 11.0 | 6.0 | 23.0       | 0.0013   | 6.5  | 6.0                   |

7:55

Moisture = 9.79%

|              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
| REVIEWED BY: | C. Beadow   | Joe Forsyth, P. Eng.  |
|              |  |  |

Certificate of Analysis

Report Date: 16-Feb-2021

Client: Paterson Group Consulting Engineers

Order Date: 9-Feb-2021

Client PO: 31907

Project Description: PG5645

|                     |                 |   |   |   |
|---------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Client ID:</b>   | BH2-SS6         | - | - | - |
| <b>Sample Date:</b> | 05-Feb-21 13:00 | - | - | - |
| <b>Sample ID:</b>   | 2107194-01      | - | - | - |
| <b>MDL/Units</b>    | Soil            | - | - | - |

**Physical Characteristics**

|          |              |      |   |   |   |
|----------|--------------|------|---|---|---|
| % Solids | 0.1 % by Wt. | 78.2 | - | - | - |
|----------|--------------|------|---|---|---|

**General Inorganics**

|             |               |      |   |   |   |
|-------------|---------------|------|---|---|---|
| pH          | 0.05 pH Units | 7.39 | - | - | - |
| Resistivity | 0.10 Ohm.m    | 44.5 | - | - | - |

**Anions**

|          |            |    |   |   |   |
|----------|------------|----|---|---|---|
| Chloride | 5 ug/g dry | 47 | - | - | - |
| Sulphate | 5 ug/g dry | 55 | - | - | - |

# APPENDIX 2

FIGURE 1 - KEY PLAN

DRAWING PG5645-1R1 - TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN






FIGURE 1  
**KEY PLAN**



62.00

ASPHALTIC CONCRETE DRIVEWAY




SIDEWALK

**BAYSWATER AVENUE**

SIDEWALK

64.00

**LEGEND:**

-  BOREHOLE LOCATION
- 67.27 GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION (m)
- (60.64) PRACTICAL REFUSAL TO AUGERING ELEVATION (m)

CONCEPTUAL PLAN PROVIDED BY NOVATECH ENG.  
 ALL GROUND SURFACE ELEVATIONS REFERENCED TO A GEODETIC DATUM.

SCALE: 1:200




9 AURIGA DRIVE  
 OTTAWA, ON  
 K2E 7S9  
 TEL: (613) 226-7381

| NO. | REVISIONS  | DATE       | INITIAL |
|-----|--|------------|---------|
| 1   | BH 1-22 ADDED TO DRAWING<br>CONCEPTUAL PLAN ADDED TO DRAWING | 25/08/2022 | KP      |

**CENTENNIAL DEVELOPMENTS CORP.**  
**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION**  
**PROPOSED MULTI-STOUREY BUILDING**  
**54, 56 & 60 BAYSWATER AVENUE**

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

**TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN**

|              |       |
|--------------|-------|
| Scale:       | 1:200 |
| Drawn by:    | NFRV  |
| Checked by:  | OM    |
| Approved by: | SD    |

|               |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|
| Date:         | 02/2021         |
| Report No.:   | PG5645-1        |
| Dwg. No.:     | <b>PG5645-1</b> |
| Revision No.: | 1               |

p:\autocad\drawings\geotechnical\pg5645\pg5645-1.thp (rev.01).dwg