

January 27, 2022
PG6115-LET.01

Haslett Construction

414 Churchill Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K1Z 5C6

Attention: **Mr. Robert Haslett**

Subject: **Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed Residential Building
1058 to 1066 Silver Street - Ottawa, Ontario**

Dear Sir,

Paterson Group (Paterson) was commissioned by Haslett Construction to conduct a supplemental geotechnical investigation for the proposed residential building to be located at 1058 to 1066 Silver Street in the City of Ottawa, Ontario.

It is understood that the proposed development will consist of a three-storey residential structure with one level of underground parking. Access lanes and landscaped areas are also anticipated as part of the development. It is anticipated that the proposed development will be municipally serviced.

It is further understood that the existing residential buildings will be demolished as part of the proposed development.

1.0 Field Investigation

The fieldwork for the current supplemental investigation was conducted on January 13, 2022 and consisted of three test pits excavated to a maximum depth of 4.3 m below the existing ground surface using a rubber-tired backhoe. A previous geotechnical investigation program was completed on February 13, 2021 and consisted of excavating a total of three test pits to a maximum depth of 3.9 m below ground surface. All fieldwork was conducted under the full-time supervision of our personnel under the direction of a senior engineer from our geotechnical department. The test hole procedures consisted of excavating to the required depths at the selected locations and sampling the overburden.

The location and ground surface elevation at each test pit was surveyed by Paterson field personnel and are referred to a geodetic datum. The test pit locations along with the ground surface elevation at each test pit location are presented on Drawing PG6115-1 - Test Hole Location Plan attached to the current report.

2.0 Field Observations

One to two storey residential dwellings with associated driveways currently occupy each of the subject properties. The ground surface across the subject site is relatively flat and slopes gradually downwards from south to north between approximate geodetic elevations 83.6 to 81.9 m. Silver Street was observed to be at grade and approximately 1 m lower than the ground surface between 1066 and 1058 Silver Street, respectively. The subject site is bordered to the north by a 2.5 storey apartment building, to the west by a three storey apartment building, to the east by Silver Street and to the south by Summerville Avenue.

Generally, the subsurface profile encountered at the test hole locations during the supplemental investigation consisted of a layer of topsoil underlain by a layer of fill which was further underlain by a deposit of silty clay. The silty clay deposit was observed to consist of a hard to very stiff, weathered, brown silty clay crust.

During the previous investigation performed by Paterson Group a deposit of glacial till encountered below the silty clay deposit at TP 2-21 approximately 3.3 m below the ground surface. The glacial till was generally observed to consist of a brown silty clay with sand, gravel, cobbles, and boulders.

Reference should be made to the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets attached for specific details of the soil profile encountered at the test pit locations for the current and previous investigations.

Based on available geological mapping, the subject site consists of interbedded dolostone and limestone of the Gull River formation with an anticipated drift thickness between 2 to 5 m.

All test holes were generally observed to be dry upon completion of the sampling program. Based on the moisture levels and colouring of the recovered soil samples, and our experience with the local area, the long-term groundwater table is expected to be at or below the bedrock surface. It should be noted that groundwater levels are subject to seasonal fluctuations. Therefore, the groundwater level could vary at the time of construction.

3.0 Geotechnical Assessment

From a geotechnical perspective, the subject site is considered satisfactory for the proposed residential building. It is anticipated that the proposed building will be founded upon conventional shallow foundations bearing upon an undisturbed, very stiff silty clay or glacial till bearing surface.

Due to the presence of a silty clay deposit underlying the subject site, a permissible grade raise restriction will be required for settlement sensitive structures founded within the silty clay deposit.

Although bedrock was not encountered at any of the test hole locations, some bedrock removal may be required to complete deeper structures located within the basement level, such as elevator and sumps pits, as well as site servicing activities. All contractors should be prepared for bedrock removal within the subject site.

Stripping Depth

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

Existing foundation walls and other construction debris should be entirely removed from within the 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.

Bedrock Removal

Where a small quantity of bedrock removal is required, it can be accomplished by a combination of hoe ramming and conventional excavation techniques.

Vibration Considerations

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

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

Two parameters are used to determine the permissible vibrations, namely, the maximum peak particle velocity and the frequency.

For low frequency vibrations, the maximum allowable peak particle velocity is less than that for high frequency vibrations. As a guideline, the peak particle velocity should be less than 15 mm/s between frequencies of 4 to 12 Hz, and 50 mm/s above a frequency of 40 Hz (interpolate between 12 and 40 Hz). The guidelines are for current construction standards. Considering that these guidelines are above perceptible human level and, in some cases, could be very disturbing to some people, a pre-construction survey is recommended be completed to minimize the risks of claims during or following the construction of the proposed building.

Fill Placement

Fill placed for grading beneath the structure or other settlement sensitive 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. This material should be tested and approved prior to delivery to the site. The engineered fill should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick lifts and compacted to 98% of the material's standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).

Non-specified existing fill along with site-excavated soil can be placed as general landscaping fill where surface settlement is a minor concern. The backfill materials should be spread in thin lifts and at a minimum compacted by the tracks of the spreading equipment to minimize voids. If the non-specified backfill is to be placed to increase the subgrade level for areas to be paved, the fill should be compacted in maximum 300 mm lifts and compacted to 95% of the material's SPMDD. Non-specified existing fill and site-excavated soils are not suitable for placement as backfill against foundation walls unless a composite drainage blanket connected to a perimeter drainage system is provided.

Foundation Design

Pad footings, up to 5 m wide, and strip footings, up to 3 m wide, placed on an undisturbed, very stiff silty clay bearing surface can be designed using a bearing resistance value at serviceability limit states (SLS) of **150 kPa** and a factored bearing resistance value at ultimate limit states (ULS) of **225 kPa**. A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the reported bearing resistance value at ULS.

Footings placed on an undisturbed, compact glacial till bearing surface can be designed using a bearing resistance value at serviceability limit states (SLS) of **150 kPa** and a factored bearing resistance value at ultimate limit states (ULS) of **225 kPa**. A geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5 was applied to the bearing resistance value at ULS.

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 for footings.

Footings placed directly on clean, surface sounded bedrock, can be designed using a factored bearing resistance value at Ultimate Limit States (ULS) of **1,000 kPa**, incorporating a geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5. 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.

Bedrock/Soil Transition

Where a building is founded partly on bedrock and partly on soil, it is recommended to decrease the soil bearing resistance value by 25% for the footings placed on a soil bearing medium to reduce the potential long-term total and differential settlements. At the soil/bedrock transitions, it is recommended that a minimum depth of 500 mm of bedrock be removed from below the founding elevation for a minimum length of 2 m on the bedrock side. This area should be subsequently reinstated with an engineered fill, such as OPSS Granular A or Granular B Type II and compacted to a minimum of 98% of the material SPMDD.

Settlement

Footings placed on a soil bearing surface and designed using the bearing resistance values at SLS given for the soil bearing surface will be subjected to potential post construction total and differential settlements of 25 and 20 mm, respectively.

Footings bearing on a sound bedrock bearing surface and designed using the bearing resistance values noted above will be subjected to negligible potential post-construction total and differential settlements.

Lateral Support

The bearing medium under footing-supported structures is required to be provided with adequate lateral support with respect to excavations and different foundation levels. Adequate lateral support is provided to a very stiff silty clay or compact 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. Adequate lateral support is provided to a sound bedrock bearing medium when a plane extending down and out from the bottom edge of the footing at a minimum of 1H:6V (or flatter) passes only through sound bedrock or a material of the same or higher capacity as the bedrock, such as concrete. A weathered bedrock bearing medium will require a lateral support zone of 1H:1V (or flatter).

Permissible Grade Raise Restriction

Based on the current test hole information, a permissible grade raise restriction of **2 m** is recommended for the proposed residential building and settlement sensitive structures where founded over a silty clay deposit.

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 risk of unacceptable long-term post construction total and differential settlements.

Design for Earthquakes

The site class for seismic site response can be taken as **Class C** for foundations constructed at the subject site. A higher site class, such as Class A or B may be provided for foundations placed on or within 3 m of the bedrock surface. However, the higher site class will need to be confirmed by a site-specific seismic shear wave velocity test. The soils underlying the subject site are not susceptible to liquefaction. Reference should be made to the latest revision of the 2012 Ontario Building Code for a full discussion of the earthquake design requirements.

Basement Slab

With the removal of all topsoil and deleterious fill from within the footprint of the proposed residential building, the native soil surface or approved fill surface will be an acceptable subgrade on which to commence backfilling for floor slab construction.

Any soft areas should be removed and backfilled with appropriate backfill material prior to placing any fill. OPSS Granular B Type II, with a maximum particle size of 50 mm, are recommended for backfilling below the floor slab. For structures with basement slabs, it is recommended that the upper 200 mm of subfloor fill consists of 19 mm clear crushed stone.

It is recommended that a subfloor drainage system, consisting of lines of perforated drainage pipe subdrains connected to a positive outlet, should be provided in the clear stone under the lower basement floor. The spacing of the underfloor drainage system should be confirmed at the time of completing the excavation when water infiltration can be better assessed.

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, in our opinion, 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 dry unit weight of 20 kN/m³. The applicable effective unit weight of the retained soil can be estimated as 13 kN/m³, where applicable.

The total earth pressure (P_{AE}) includes both the static earth pressure component (P_o) and the seismic component (ΔP_{AE}).

Static Conditions

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

$$\begin{aligned} K_o &= \text{at-rest earth pressure coefficient of the applicable retained soil, } 0.5 \\ \gamma &= \text{unit weight of fill of the applicable retained soil (kN/m}^3\text{)} \\ H &= \text{height of the wall (m)} \end{aligned}$$

Seismic Conditions

The seismic earth pressure (ΔP_{AE}) can be calculated using the earth pressure distribution equal to $0.375 \cdot a_c \cdot \gamma \cdot H^2/g$ where:

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

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

The earth force component (P_o) under seismic conditions could be calculated using

$$P_o = 0.5 K_o \gamma H^2, \text{ where } K_o = 0.5 \text{ for the soil conditions presented above.}$$

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

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

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

Pavement Structure

For design purposes, the pavement structure presented in the following tables could be used for the design of the pavement structure for the car only parking areas and access lanes.

Table 1 - Recommended Flexible Pavement Structure – Driveways/Car Only Parking Areas	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
50	Wear Course - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
300	SUBBASE - OPSS Granular B Type II
SUBGRADE - Either fill, in situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil.	

Table 2 - Recommended Flexible Pavement Structure - Access Lanes and Heavy Truck Parking Areas	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	Wear Course - HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	Binder Course - HL-8 or Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
450	SUBBASE - OPSS Granular B Type II
SUBGRADE - Either fill, in situ soil, or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil.	

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 sub-excavated and replaced with OPSS Granular B Type II material.

The pavement granular base and subbase should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick lifts and compacted to a minimum of 100% of the SPMDD.

Pavement Structure Drainage

Satisfactory performance of the pavement structure is largely dependent on 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 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.

4.0 Design and Construction Precautions

Foundation Drainage and Backfill

A perimeter foundation drainage system is recommended to be provided for the proposed structure. The system should consist of a 100 to 150 mm diameter perforated corrugated plastic pipe, surrounded on all sides by 150 mm of 19 mm clear crushed stone, placed at the footing level around the exterior perimeter of the structure. The clear stone should be wrapped in a non-woven geotextile. The pipe should have a positive outlet, such as a gravity connection to a sump pit located in the lowest basement level or storm sewer.

Backfill against the exterior sides of the foundation walls should consist of free draining, non-frost susceptible granular materials. Imported granular materials, such as clean sand or OPSS Granular B Type I granular material, should be used for this purpose. The greater part of the site excavated materials will be frost susceptible and, as such, are not recommended for re-use as backfill against the foundation walls, unless used in conjunction with a composite drainage blanket, such as Miradrain G100N or Delta Drain 6000.

Underfloor Drainage

It is anticipated that underfloor drainage will be required to control water infiltration. For design purposes, we recommend that 150 mm in perforated pipes be placed in each bay. The spacing of the underfloor drainage system should be confirmed by the geotechnical consultant once the buildings foundation and architectural drawings have been finalized. The layout should be further confirmed as suitable by the geotechnical consultant at the time of completing the excavation when water infiltration can be better assessed.

Protection of Footings Against Frost Action

Perimeter footings of heated structures are recommended to be protected against the deleterious effects of frost action. A minimum of 1.5 m of soil cover alone, or a combination of soil cover and foundation insulation should be provided.

The parking garage should not require protection against frost action due to the founding depth. Unheated structures, such as the access ramp wall footings, may be required to be insulated against the deleterious effect of frost action. A minimum of 2.1 m of soil cover alone, or a minimum of 0.6 m of soil cover, in conjunction with foundation insulation, should be provided.

Excavation Side Slopes

The temporary excavation side slopes should either be excavated to acceptable slopes or retained by shoring systems from the beginning of the excavation until the structure is backfilled.

The excavation side slopes above the groundwater level extending to a maximum depth of 3 m should be excavated at 1H:1V or shallower. The shallower slope is required for excavation below groundwater level. The subsurface soil is considered to be mainly 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 maintain safe working distance 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. Excavation side slopes carried out for the building footprint are recommended to be provided surface protection from erosion due to rain and surface water runoff if shoring is not anticipated to be implemented. This can be accomplished by covering the surface of the excavation side-slopes with tarps secured between the top and bottom of the excavation and approved by Paterson personnel at the time of construction. It is further recommended to maintain a relatively dry surface along the bottom of the excavation footprint to mitigate the potential for sloughing of the side-slopes.

A trench box is recommended to be installed at all times to protect personnel working in trenches with steep or vertical sides. Services are expected to be installed by “cut and cover” methods and excavations should not remain exposed for extended periods of time.

Temporary Shoring

Depending on the proximity of the building's excavation 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. Furthermore, the design of the temporary shoring system should take into consideration a full hydrostatic condition which can occur during significant precipitation events.

The temporary shoring system may consist of a soldier pile and lagging system which could be cantilevered, anchored, or braced. The shoring system is recommended to be adequately supported to resist toe failure, if required, by means of rock bolts or extending the piles into the bedrock through pre-augered holes, if a soldier pile and lagging system is the preferred method.

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 pressures acting on the shoring system may be calculated using the following parameters:

Table 3 - Soil Parameters	
Parameters	Values
Active Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_a)	0.33
Passive Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_p)	3
At-Rest Earth Pressure Coefficient (K_o)	0.5
Dry Unit Weight (γ), kN/m ³	21
Effective Unit Weight (γ'), kN/m ³	13

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

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

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

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 a 150 mm layer of OPSS Granular A crushed stone should be placed for pipe bedding for sewer and water pipes for a soil subgrade. The bedding thickness should be increased to 300 mm for areas where the subgrade consists of bedrock. 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. The bedding and cover materials should be placed in maximum 300 mm thick lifts compacted to a minimum of 99% of the SPMDD.

The site excavated material may be placed above cover material if the excavation operations are completed in dry weather conditions and the site excavated material is approved by the geotechnical consultant. All cobbles greater than 200 mm in the longest dimension should be removed prior to the site materials being reused.

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) should match the soils exposed at the trench walls to reduce 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 SPMD. Within the frost zone (1.8 m below finished grade), non-frost susceptible materials should be used when backfilling trenches below the original bedrock level.

Groundwater Control for Building Construction

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

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

For typical ground or surface water volumes, being pumped during the construction phase, 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.

Winter Construction

The subsoil conditions at this site consist of frost susceptible materials. In the presence of water and freezing conditions, ice could form within the soil mass. Heaving and settlement upon thawing could occur.

In the event of construction during below zero temperatures, the founding stratum should be protected from freezing temperatures by the installation of straw, propane heaters and tarpaulins or other suitable means. The excavation base 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 difficult activities to complete during freezing conditions without introducing frost in the subgrade or in the excavation walls and bottoms. Precautions should be considered if such activities are to be completed during freezing conditions. Additional information could be provided, if required.

Corrosion Potential and Sulphate

One (1) sample was submitted for testing. The analytical test results of the soil sample indicate that the sulphate content is less than 0.01%. These results along with the chloride and pH value are indicative that Type 10 Portland cement (Type GU) would be appropriate for this site. The chloride content and the pH of the sample indicate they are not significant factors in creating a corrosive environment for exposed ferrous metals at this site, whereas the resistivity is indicative of a low to slightly aggressive corrosive environment.

5.0 Recommendations

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

- Review detailed grading plan(s) from a geotechnical perspective.
- Review of architectural and structural drawings to ensure adequate frost protection is provided to the subsoil.
- Review of the buildings sub-slab and foundation drainage system designs and implementation.
- 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 the construction work has been conducted in general accordance with the above recommendations could be issued, upon request, following the completion of a satisfactory materials testing and observation program by the geotechnical consultant.

6.0 Statement of Limitations

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

A geotechnical investigation is a limited sampling of a site. Should any conditions encountered during construction differ from the test pit locations, Paterson requests immediate notification to permit reassessment of the recommendations provided herein.

The recommendations provided should only be used by the design professionals associated with this project. The recommendations are not intended for contractors bidding on or constructing the project. The latter should evaluate the factual information provided in the report. The contractor should also determine the suitability and completeness for the intended construction schedule and methods. Additional testing may be required for the contractor's purpose.

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 Haslett Construction or their agent(s) is not authorized without review by Paterson for the applicability of our recommendations to the altered use of the report.

We trust this report meets your present requirements.

Best Regards,

Paterson Group Inc.



Drew Petahtegoose, B.Eng.



David J. Gilbert, P.Eng.

Attachments

- Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets
- Symbols and Terms
- Atterberg Limits Testing Results
- Figure 1 - Key Plan
- Drawing PG6115-1 - Test Hole Location Plan

Report Distribution

- Mr. Robert Haslett (e-mail copy)
- Paterson Group (Digital copy)

patersongroup

Ottawa Head Office
154 Colonnade Road South
Ottawa – Ontario – K2E 7S8
Tel: (613) 226-7381

Ottawa Laboratory
28 Concourse Gate
Ottawa – Ontario – K2E 7T7
Tel: (613) 226-7381

Northern Office and Laboratory
63 Gibson Street
North Bay – Ontario – P1B 8Z4
Tel: (705) 472-5331

DATUM Geodetic


FILE NO. PG6115

REMARKS

HOLE NO. TP 1-22

BORINGS BY Excavator

DATE January 13, 2022



DATUM Geodetic


FILE NO. **PG6115**

REMARKS

HOLE NO. **TP 3-22**

BORINGS BY Excavator

DATE January 13, 2022



DATUM Geodetic


REMARKS

BORINGS BY Backhoe

DATE 2021 February 23

FILE NO. **PG5573**

HOLE NO. **TP 1-21**



DATUM Geodetic


FILE NO. **PG5573**

REMARKS

HOLE NO. **TP 2-21**

BORINGS BY Backhoe

DATE 2021 February 23



DATUM Geodetic

FILE NO. **PG5573**

REMARKS

HOLE NO. **TP 3-21**

BORINGS BY Backhoe

DATE 2021 February 23

SOIL DESCRIPTION	STRATA PLOT	SAMPLE				DEPTH (m)	ELEV. (m)	Pen. Resist. Blows/0.3m ● 50 mm Dia. Cone				Piezometer Construction
		TYPE	NUMBER	RECOVERY	N VALUE or RQD			20	40	60	80	
GROUND SURFACE												
Well graded gravel	0.05					0	83.31					
FILL: Brown silty sand trace topsoil, clay, brick fragments, gravel and crushed stone	0.15	G	1									
FILL: Brown silty clay with sand, trace topsoil, brick fragments, gravel and crushed stone	0.76	G	2									
FILL: Brown silty sand trace organics clay, gravel and crushed stone	0.91	G	3									
Hard to very stiff brown SILTY CLAY						1	82.31					
		G	4									▲ 260
End of Test Pit	2.13					2	81.31					
Test Pit terminated due to mechanical failure (TP dry upon completion)												

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

SYMBOLS AND TERMS

SOIL DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

SOIL DESCRIPTION (continued)

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

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

ROCK DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

SAMPLE TYPES

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

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)

PLASTICITY LIMITS AND GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

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

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

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

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

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

C_c and C_u are not applicable for the description of soils with more than 10% silt and clay (more than 10% finer than 0.075 mm or the #200 sieve)

CONSOLIDATION TEST

p' _o	-	Present effective overburden pressure at sample depth
p' _c	-	Preconsolidation pressure of (maximum past pressure on) sample
C _{cr}	-	Recompression index (in effect at pressures below p' _c)
C _c	-	Compression index (in effect at pressures above p' _c)
OC Ratio		Overconsolidation ratio = p'_c / p'_o
Void Ratio		Initial sample void ratio = volume of voids / volume of solids
W _o	-	Initial water content (at start of consolidation test)

PERMEABILITY TEST


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

SYMBOLS AND TERMS (continued)


STRATA PLOT



Topsoil




Asphalt




Fill




Peat



Sand



Silty Sand




Silt



Sandy Silt



Clay



Silty Clay




Clayey Silty Sand



Glacial Till




Shale




Bedrock

MONITORING WELL AND PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION

MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION



PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION



CLIENT:	Haslett Construction	FILE NO.:	PG6115
PROJECT:	Silver Street	DATE SAMPLED:	13-Jan-22
LOCATION:	TP1-22 G4 @ 7' - 7' 6"	DATE REPORTED:	18-Jan-22

LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATION


CAN NO.	16	17	18				
WT. OF CAN	8.61	4.32	8.63				
WT. OF SOIL & CAN	15.42	11.29	14.85				
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	12.50	8.28	12.15				
WT. OF MOISTURE	2.92	3.01	2.70				
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	3.89	3.96	3.52				
WATER CONTENT, w, %	75.06	76.01	76.7				
NO. OF BLOWS, N	32	23	18				

PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION

CAN NO.	1	2
WT. OF CAN	19.84	19.90
WT. OF SOIL & CAN	27.73	28.42
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	25.59	26.08
WT. OF MOISTURE	2.14	2.34
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	5.75	6.18
WATER CONTENT, w, %	37.22	37.86

RESULTS

LIQUID LIMIT	76
PLASTIC LIMIT	38
PLASTICITY INDEX	38



TECHNICIAN:CS	REVIEWED BY:	C. Beadow	J. Forsyth, P. Eng.
		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>

CLIENT:	Haslett Construction	FILE NO.:	PG6115
PROJECT:	Silver Street	DATE SAMPLED:	13-Jan-22
LOCATION:	TP3-22 G5 @ 9' 6" - 10'	DATE REPORTED:	18-Jan-22

LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATION

CAN NO.	30	31	32				
WT. OF CAN	4.33	4.33	4.37				
WT. OF SOIL & CAN	12.66	10.88	10.26				
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	9.09	8.05	7.65				
WT. OF MOISTURE	3.57	2.86	2.61				
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	4.76	3.72	3.28				
WATER CONTENT, w, %	75	76.88	79.57				
NO. OF BLOWS, N	35	25	15				


PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION

CAN NO.	3	4
WT. OF CAN	19.36	19.93
WT. OF SOIL & CAN	27.07	27.82
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	24.95	25.67
WT. OF MOISTURE	2.12	2.15
WT. OF DRY SOIL & CAN	5.59	5.74
WATER CONTENT, w, %	37.92	37.46

RESULTS

LIQUID LIMIT	77
PLASTIC LIMIT	38
PLASTICITY INDEX	39

Liquid Limit Chart




TECHNICIAN:CS	REVIEWED BY:	C. Beadow	J. Forsyth, P. Eng.
		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>



FIGURE 1


KEY PLAN



SIDEWALK

SILVER STREET

SIDEWALK



SIDEWALK

SUMMERVILLE AVENUE

SIDEWALK

LEGEND:

TEST PIT LOCATION

82.86 GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION (m)

GROUND SURFACE ELEVATION AT TEST PIT LOCATION ARE REFERENCED TO A GEODETIC DATUM

SCALE: 1:250

patersongroup
consulting engineers

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

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL

HASLETT CONSTRUCTION
GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL BUILDING
1058 TO 1066 SILVER STREET

GATINEAU,
Title: **TEST HOLE LOCATION PLAN**

ONTARIO

Scale:	1:250	Date:	01/2022
Drawn by:	YA	Report No.:	PG6115-1
Checked by:	DP	Dwg. No.:	PG6115-1
Approved by:	DJG	Revision No.:	

p:\autocad drawings\geotechnical\pg6115\pg6115-1-test hole location plan.dwg