



- **Humanics Universal Inc.**

## **Geotechnical Investigation and Slope Stability Assessment**

### **Type of Document**

Final (3rd Revision)

### **Project Name**

Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park  
3400 Old Montreal Road  
Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Old Survey  
Ottawa (Formerly Township of Cumberland), Ontario

### **Project Number**

OTT-00229886-A0

**Prepared By:** Surinder K. Aggarwal, M.Sc., P.Eng.

**Reviewed By:** Ismail Taki, M.Eng., P.Eng.

**exp** Services Inc.  
100-2650 Queensview Drive  
Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6  
Canada

### **Date Submitted**

November 25, 2022

# Humanics Universal Inc.

601 Brook Ridge Crescent  
Ottawa, Ontario K4A 1Z7

Attention: Dr. Ranjit Perera

## Geotechnical Investigation and Slope Stability Assessment

### Type of Document:

Final (2<sup>nd</sup> Revision)

### Project Name:

Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park  
3400 Old Montreal Road  
Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Old Survey  
Ottawa (Formerly Township of Cumberland), Ontario

### Project Number:

OTT-00229886-A0

### Prepared By:

**exp**

100-2650 Queensview Drive  
Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6  
Canada  
T: 613 688-1899  
F: 613 225-7337  
www.exp.com



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S.K. Aggarwal".

---

Surinder K. Aggarwal, M.Sc., P.Eng.  
Senior Project Manager, Geotechnical Services  
Earth and Environmental

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ismail Taki".

---

Ismail Taki, M.Eng., P.Eng.  
Manager, Geotechnical Services  
Earth and Environmental

### Date Submitted:

November 25, 2022

## Legal Notification

This report was prepared by **exp** Services Inc. for the account of **Humanics Universal Inc.**

Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. **Exp** Services Inc. accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this project

## Executive Summary

A geotechnical investigation was undertaken at the site of the proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park to be located on the south side of 3400 Old Montreal Road in the City of Ottawa, Ontario. This work was authorized by Dr. Ranjit Perera on November 15, 2015. This report was updated/revised to address the comments received by the City of Ottawa and to reflect the new site plan proposed by the client and design team.

The purpose of this revision is to update Figure No. 2 to reflect the new limit of the environmental set back line established by Bernie Muncaster's in his letter on April 14, 2022 which adjust the line at the east portion of the south slope. All other items on this report remained unchanged. Bernie Muncaster's letter is attached as Appendix C of this report.

The proposed development would comprise of a hostel, residential building, sanctuary building, education centre, and designated areas across the parkland for display of various sculptures, which will be constructed over the years and in phases. The proposed buildings will be one- to three-storeys high with one basement level.

The geotechnical investigation comprised of drilling four boreholes to 18.9 m to 19.8 m depth and excavating 10 test pits to 3.4 m to 3.7 m depth. The boreholes and test pits revealed that beneath 150 mm to 355 mm of topsoil, silty sand extends to 0.9 m to 1.5 m depth. The sand is underlain by clay, which extends to the entire depth investigated in the test pits and boreholes, i.e. 3.4 m to 19.8 m depth. The clay is firm to very stiff with some localized soft clay layers (undrained shear strength of 19 kPa to 180 kPa). The clay at the site is over-consolidated by 130 kPa to 135 kPa based on the consolidation tests undertaken on the Humanics subdivision site located south of the subject property.

It is recommended that the maximum grade raise at the site should be limited to 2 m to prevent over-stressing of the clay.

The investigation has revealed that the geotechnical conditions at the site are suitable for construction of the one- to three-storey buildings on spread and strip footing foundations. It is recommended that the footings should be founded above the groundwater table (i.e. at a maximum depth of 2.2 m below the existing ground surface) and designed for Serviceability Limit State (SLS) bearing pressure of 95 kPa and factored geotechnical resistance at Ultimate Limit State (ULS) of 140 kPa.

The lowest level floor slabs of the structures may be constructed as slabs-on-grade. Perimeter as well as underfloor drains should be provided for the structures with basements.

Excavations at the site will be undertaken to a maximum depth of 2.2 m below the existing ground surface and will be above the groundwater table. The excavations may be undertaken as open cut provided they are cut back at 45 degrees. Minor seepage of surface and subsurface water into the excavations should be anticipated. However, it should be possible to collect this water in perimeter ditches and remove by pumping from sumps. The backfill against the subsurface walls should be free draining granular materials conforming to OPSS 1090 for Granular B, Type II. It should be compacted to 95 percent of standard Proctor Maximum Dry Density (SPMDD).

The pavement structure of the gravel parking lot(s) may consist of 200 mm of Granular A base underlain by 550 mm of Granular B, Type II sub-base. Unpaved access roads may consist of 250 mm of Granular A base underlain by 550 mm of Granular B, Type II sub-base.

General Use (GU) Portland cement may be used in the subsurface structures at the site.

The site has been classified as Class D for seismic site response.

Trees should not be planted in close proximity of the structures to prevent settlements due to shrinkage of the clay as a result of water extraction by tree roots.

Slope stability analysis was undertaken to compute the slope inclination, which will have a minimum factor of safety of 1.5. This information was used to compute geotechnical set back. To this was added the erosion allowance and erosion access allowance to arrive at limit of hazardous lands. These limits have been plotted on the Site Plan, Figure 2.

It is noted that a pathway was constructed approximately 10 years ago part way up the slope by cutting into the slope on the east and west side of the creek. This has resulted in steepening and caving of the upper slope and erosion of the downhill slope at random locations along the pathway. These areas should be remediated as discussed in Section 16 of this report.

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>EX-i</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Procedure</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Site and Soil Description</b> .....	<b>4</b>
3.1 Topsoil.....	6
3.2 Fill.....	6
3.3 Silt and Sand.....	6
3.4 Clay.....	6
3.4.1 Consolidation Characteristics of Clay.....	8
3.5 Bedrock.....	8
3.6 Groundwater.....	8
<b>4 Site Re-grading</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5 Foundation Considerations</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>6 Floor Slab and Drainage Requirements</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>7 Lateral Earth Pressure Against Subsurface Walls</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>8 Excavations</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>9 Backfilling Requirements and Suitability of On-Site Soils for Backfilling Purposes</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>10 Access Roads</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>11 Subsurface Concrete Requirements</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>12 Seismic Site Classification and Liquefaction Potential of On-Site Soils</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>13 Tree Planting</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>14 Slope Stability</b> .....	<b>21</b>
14.1 Slope Stability Analysis.....	21
14.2 Behaviour of Slopes During Earthquakes.....	24
14.3 Flow Slides.....	24
<b>15 Limit of Hazardous Lands</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>16 Pathway</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>17 General Comments</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## List of Tables

	<b>Page</b>
Table I: Test Pit Logs.....	4
Table II: Summary of Geotechnical Properties of Soils.....	7
Table III: Results of Consolidation Tests .....	8
Table IV: Groundwater Observations in Boreholes .....	8
Table V: Recommended Pavement Structure Thicknesses .....	16
Table VI: Chemical Test Results .....	18
Table VII: List of Trees Suitable for Planting On Site (City of Ottawa Guidelines) .....	20
Table VIII: Natural Slope Inclination of Cross-sections Analyzed .....	21
Table IX: Results of Slope Stability Analysis.....	23
Table X: Limit of Hazardous Lands at Cross-Section Locations.....	26

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Site Location Plan
Figure 2: Borehole Location Plan (updated)
Figures 3 to 6: Borehole Logs
Figures 7 to 12: Grain-size Analyses
Figure 13: Plasticity Chart
Figure 14: Bray et al. (2004) Criteria for Liquefaction Assessment of Fine-Grained Soils
Figure 15: Drainage and Backfill Recommendations
Figures 16 to 36: Slope Stability Analyses
Figure 37: Localized Areas Requiring Remedial Work Along Pathway

## List of Appendices

Appendix A: One-dimensional Oedometer Test Results
Appendix B: Pathway & Erosion Photos
Appendix C: Bernie Muncatsers letter dated April 14, 2022

# 1 Introduction

A geotechnical investigation was undertaken at the site of the proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park to be located on the south side of 3400 Old Montreal Road in the City of Ottawa, Ontario. The site forms part of Lot 7, Concession 1 in the former Township of Cumberland, now City of Ottawa, Plan 4R-2542 (Figure 1). This work was authorized by Dr. Ranjit Perera on November 15, 2015.

It is proposed to construct a hotel, residential building, sanctuary building, education centre and designated areas across the parkland for display of various sculptures to be constructed over the years and in phases. The proposed buildings will be one- to three-storeys high with one basement level. The proposed development will be supported by private well and septic tile bed and storm sewers.

The purpose of this revision is to update Figure No. 2 to reflect the new limit of the environmental set back line established by Bernie Muncaster's in his letter on April 14, 2022 which adjust the line at the east portion of the south slope. All other items on this report remained unchanged. Bernie Muncaster's letter is attached as Appendix C of this report.

The investigation was undertaken to:

- a) Establish geotechnical and groundwater profile at the site;
- b) Comment on maximum grade raise feasible at the site;
- c) Make recommendations regarding the most suitable type of foundations, founding depth and allowable bearing pressure of founding soil;
- d) Determine anticipated settlements;
- e) Classify the site for seismic site response in accordance with the requirements of Ontario Building Code, 2012.
- f) Comment on excavation conditions;
- g) Discuss backfilling requirements and suitability of on-site soils for backfilling purposes;
- h) Recommend pavement structure thickness for access roads and parking areas;
- i) Comment on subsurface concrete requirements; and
- j) Assess the stability of the slopes to the creek that crosses the site and establish the limit of hazardous lands.

The comments and recommendations given in this report are based on the assumption that the above-described design concept will proceed into construction. If changes are made either in the design phase or during construction, this office must be retained to review these modifications. The result of this review



may be a modification of our recommendations or it may require additional field or laboratory work to check whether the changes are acceptable from a geotechnical viewpoint.

## 2 Procedure

The geotechnical investigation was completed between November 30 and December 3, 2015. It comprised the drilling of four boreholes (Boreholes 1 to 4) to depths ranging between 18.9 m to 19.8 m. The locations of the boreholes are shown on Site Plan, Figure 2.

The fieldwork was undertaken with a track-mounted drill rig equipped with continuous flight hollow stem augers and with a backhoe. It was supervised on a full-time basis by a representative of **exp**. A dynamic cone penetration test was then performed in the bottom of each borehole to refusal at 30.2 m to 34.8 m depth.

Standard penetration tests were performed in all the boreholes at 0.75 m to 3.0 m depth intervals and soil samples retrieved by split barrel sampler. The undrained shear strength of the clay was established by in-situ field-vane shear tests.

Water levels were measured in the open boreholes on completion of drilling. In addition, long-term groundwater monitoring installations consisting of 13 mm diameter PVC (polyvinyl chloride) pipes were placed in Borehole Nos. 1 and 4. The installation configuration is documented on the respective borehole logs. All the boreholes were backfilled upon completion of the fieldwork. The locations of the boreholes were established by a representative of **exp** using GPS technology and therefore are approximate. The elevations of the boreholes were determined based on the contours shown on the Lidar Survey Plan.

All the soil samples were visually examined in the field for textural classification, logged, preserved in plastic bags and identified. On completion of the fieldwork, all the soil samples were transported to the **exp** laboratory in the City of Ottawa, Ontario.

All the soil samples were visually examined in the laboratory by a geotechnical engineer and borehole logs prepared. The engineer also assigned the laboratory testing which consisted of performing natural moisture content, unit weight, grain-size analysis, Atterberg Limit, pH and sulphate content tests on selected soil samples.

In addition to the above investigation, a total of 12 test pits were excavated as part of a hydrogeological study by **exp** in November 2015. The approximate locations of these test pits are also shown on Figure 2. The test pit logs have been presented on Table I.

### 3 Site and Soil Description

The site of the proposed development is located on the south side of Old Montreal Road at 3400 Old Montreal Road in the City of Ottawa, Ontario (Figure 1). The site forms Part of Lot 7, Concession 1 in the former Township of Cumberland, now the City of Ottawa.

A ravine is located in the central part of the property and runs in a northwest to southeast direction. It then swings to the north and drains into the Ottawa River. The slopes to the creek are 9.5 m to 13 m high at an inclination of 2.7H:1V to 3.2H:1V. The slopes are covered with vegetation.

A detailed description of the geotechnical conditions encountered in the four boreholes drilled and 12 test pits excavated at the site is given on the borehole logs, Figures 3 to 6 inclusive and on the test pit logs, Table I. The borehole and test pit logs and related information depict subsurface conditions only at the specific locations and times indicated. Subsurface conditions and water levels at other locations may differ from conditions at the locations where sampling was conducted. The passage of time also may result in changes in the conditions interpreted to exist at the locations where sampling was conducted. Boreholes were drilled and test pits excavated to provide representation of subsurface conditions as part of a geotechnical exploration program and are not intended to provide evidence of potential environmental conditions.

<b>Table I: Test Pit Logs</b>					
Test Pit No.	Depth (m)	Soil Description	Grain-size Analysis (%)		
			Clay	Silt	Sand
1	0 – 0.15	Topsoil			
	0.15 – 1.2	Sand	0	0	100
	1.2 – 3.7	Clay			
	Test pit terminated at 3.7 m depth. Water seepage into test pit at 2.6 m depth. Backfilled.				
2	0 – 0.2	Topsoil			
	0.2 – 0.9	Silt	0	98	2
	0.0 – 3.4	Clay			
	Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 3.0 m depth. Backfilled.				
3	0 – 0.22	Topsoil			
	0.22 – 1.2	Sand			
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
	Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Water seepage into test pit at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.				
4	0 – 0.3	Topsoil			
	0.3 – 1.4	Sand			
	1.4 – 3.4	Clay			
	Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.				

<b>Table I: Test Pit Logs</b>					
Test Pit No.	Depth (m)	Soil Description	Grain-size Analysis (%)		
			Clay	Silt	Sand
5	0 – 0.3	Topsoil			
	0.3 – 0.9	Sand			
	0.9 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Water seepage into test pit at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.			
6	0 – 0.3	Topsoil			
	0.3 – 0.9	Sand			
	0.9 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.			
7	0 – 0.3	Topsoil			
	0.3 – 0.9	Sand			
	0.9 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.			
8	0 – 0.25	Topsoil			
	0.25 – 1.2	Sand			
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.			
9	0 – 0.25	Topsoil			
	0.25 – 1.2	Sand	0	0	100
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.7 m depth. Backfilled.			
10	0 – 0.36	Topsoil			
	0.36 – 1.2	Sand			
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.4 m depth. Backfilled.			
11	0 – 0.2	Topsoil			
	0.2 – 1.2	Sand			
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.4 m depth. Backfilled.			
12	0 – 0.2	Topsoil			
	0.2 – 1.2	Sand			
	1.2 – 3.4	Clay			
		Test pit terminated at 3.4 m depth. Wet at 2.4 m depth. Backfilled.			

A review of Table I and Figures 3 to 6 reveals the following soil stratigraphy with depth in descending order:

### 3.1 Topsoil

A 150 mm to 355 mm of topsoil was encountered at the locations of Borehole No. 4 and at the locations of all the test pits.

### 3.2 Fill

Approximately 0.6 m of fill was encountered in Borehole 1. The fill comprised of crushed run limestone to sand and gravel. The fill is loose ('N' value = 7).

### 3.3 Silt and Sand

The surficial soil in Boreholes 2, 3, and 4 and beneath the topsoil in all the test pits, silt and fine to medium sand was encountered, which extends to a depth of 0.9 m to 1.5 m. The silt and sand are very loose to loose ('N' values of 2 to 9). Its moisture content varies from 10 to 48 percent. Three grain-size analyses performed on silt and sand samples retrieved from the test pits yielded a soil composition of 0 to 100 percent silt and 0 to 100 percent sand (Figures 7 to 9 inclusive).

### 3.4 Clay

The fill in Borehole 1 and the silt and/or the sand stratum in all the other boreholes and test pits are underlain by clay, which extends to the entire depths investigated in all the test pits and boreholes, i.e. 3.4 m to 19.8 m depth. The clay is very stiff to soft as indicated by its undrained shear strength, which varies from 180 kPa to 19 kPa. It is noted that shear strength of 19 kPa recorded in Borehole No. 3 at 4.5 m depth is localized and likely the result of disturbance from augering. The sensitivity of the clay varied from 1.7 to 10.2, which indicates clay of low sensitivity to extra sensitive clay. The natural moisture content of the clay varies from 30 to 96 percent. It has a unit weight of 16.1 to 17.8 kN/m<sup>3</sup>.

Three grain-size analyses performed on the clay samples yielded a composition of 71 to 73 percent clay, 25 to 29 percent silt and 0 to 2 percent sand (Figures 10 to 12).

Atterberg Limit tests performed on the clay samples indicated its plastic limit as 25 to 26 percent and liquid limit of 40 to 56 percent. The results of the Atterberg Limit tests have been plotted on Figure 13. The test results indicate that the on-site silty clay is inorganic and of medium to high plasticity. The results of the Atterberg Limit tests were plotted on the Bray et al Chart (Figure 14) to determine if the clay is liquefiable during a seismic event. The test results indicate that the clay is not liquefiable to moderately liquefiable.

The geotechnical properties of the soil strata established have been summarized on Table II.

**Table II: Summary of Geotechnical Properties of Soils**

Type of Soil	Moisture Content	$\gamma$ (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )	Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)	Atterberg Limit Test Results			Grain-size Analyses (%)				N Values
				Natural Moisture Content (%)	Plastic Limit (%)	Liquid Limit (%)	Clay	Silt	Sand	Gravel	
Fill	16										7
Silty Sand	10-48						--	0 - 100	0 - 100	--	2 - 9
Clay	30-96	17.8-16.1	180 – 19	67 – 74	25 – 26	40 – 56	71 – 73	25 – 29	0 – 2	--	HW* - 12

\* HW denotes Hammer Weight

### 3.4.1 Consolidation Characteristics of Clay

Two one-dimensional oedometer tests were performed on clay samples from two boreholes drilled as part of the Humanics' subdivision located south of the site and reported as part of **exp** Report OTT-00019355-A0 dated February 2, 2016. The test results have been included in Appendix A and have been tabulated on Table III below.

<b>Table III: Results of Consolidation Tests</b>						
<b>Borehole No.</b>	<b>Sample Depth</b>	<b>Effective Overburden Pressure <math>p_o'</math> (kPa)</b>	<b>Effective Consolidation Pressure <math>p_c'</math> (kPa)</b>	<b>Compression Index (<math>C_c</math>)</b>	<b>Re-Compression Index (<math>C_r</math>)</b>	<b>Over-consolidation Pressure (kPa)</b>
2	3.0 – 3.6	45	175	0.957	0.086	130
1	4.6 – 5.2	55	190	1.014	0.0864	135

A review of Table III indicates that the sample from Borehole No. 2 is pre-consolidated to 175 kPa, whereas its effective overburden pressure is 45 kPa. Therefore, this sample is over consolidated by 130 kPa (pre-consolidation pressure minus effective overburden pressure). The sample from Borehole No. 1 is pre-consolidated to 190 kPa. Its effective overburden pressure is 55 kPa. Therefore, this sample is over consolidated by 135 kPa. The compression index ( $C_c$ ) of the clay varies from 0.957 to 1.014. Its re-compression index ( $C_r$ ) is 0.086.

### 3.5 Bedrock

A dynamic cone penetration test performed in the bottom of each borehole met refusal at 30.2 m to 34.8 m depth. This refusal is likely to have been met on the bedrock. Available geological information indicates that the bedrock in the areas is shale of Rockcliffe Formation.

### 3.6 Groundwater

Water level observations were made in the boreholes during drilling and after the completion of drilling in standpipes installed in Borehole Nos. 1 to 4. The groundwater observations made to date are given on Table IV.

<b>Table IV: Groundwater Observations in Boreholes</b>				
<b>Borehole No.</b>	<b>Date Drilled</b>	<b>Observation Date</b>	<b>Groundwater Depth (m)</b>	<b>Elevation of Groundwater Table (m)</b>
1	November 30, 2015	December 14, 2015	5.3	55.3
		April 20, 2016	2.2	58.4
2	December 3 & 04, 2015	-	-	-
		April 20, 2016	4.3	58.0
3	December 3, 2015	-	-	-
		April 20, 2016	3.7	58.8
4	November 31, 2015	December 14, 2015	5.0 (not stabilized)	54.6
		April 20, 2016	Seal broken	

A review of Table IV indicates that the groundwater table at the site was measured at depths of 2.2 m to 4.3 m (Elevations 58.0 m to 58.8) approximately fifteen and one hundred thirty-six days following the completion of the drilling.

Water levels were determined in the boreholes at the times and under the conditions stated in the scope of services. Note that fluctuations in the level of groundwater may occur due to a seasonal variation such as precipitation, snowmelt, rainfall activities, and other factors not evident at the time of measurement and therefore may be at a higher level during wet weather periods.



## 4 Site Re-grading

It is noted that the site contains a deep deposit of clay (in the order of 30 m to 35 m) and that the clay at the site is prone to consolidation settlements if fill is placed on the site. This may result in settlements and cracking of any structures founded in the clay if the clay is overstressed. To evaluate if the grade at the site can be raised, two one-dimensional oedometer tests undertaken on the clay samples collected from the boreholes drilled as part of the Humanics' subdivision located south of the site and reported as part of **exp** Report OTT-00019355-A0 dated February 2, 2016 were used. The test results summarized in Table III indicate that clay is over-consolidated by 130 kPa to 135 kPa. It is therefore considered that the additional load that can be applied on the clay for the settlements to be within normally tolerated limits of 25 mm total and 19 mm differential is in the order of 100 kPa (assumed 80 percent of over-consolidation pressure).

It has been stated in Section 5 of the report that footings of the proposed residences should be set above the groundwater table. As such, lowering of the groundwater table at the site will not result due to proposed development. Therefore, an allowance for groundwater lowering is not required. Allowing for the Serviceability Limit State (SLS) bearing pressure recommended in Section 5, it is considered that the grade at the site may be raised by up to 2.0 m.

The site grading plan prepared by **exp** under Project Number OTT-00229886-A0 Drawing SGP dated January 25, 2017 was reviewed. It indicates that the proposed grade raises are less than permitted in the geotechnical investigation report for this project and therefore meet the requirements of the geotechnical investigation.

## 5 Foundation Considerations

The investigation has revealed that the geotechnical conditions at the site are suitable for construction of the proposed one- to two-storey structures with one level of basement on spread and strip footing foundations. As required by the City of Ottawa, it is recommended that the footings of the proposed structures should be set above the groundwater table, i.e. at a maximum depth of 2.2 m below the existing ground surface. Footings founded on the clay below any loose silty sand at a maximum depth of 2.2 m below the existing ground surface may be designed for Serviceability Limit State (SLS) bearing pressure of 95 kPa and factored geotechnical resistance at Ultimate Limit State (ULS) of 140 kPa. To compute the SLS bearing pressure of the soil, the undrained shear strength was reduced by 15 percent in accordance with Section 6.6.3.2 (7) of the Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual.

The recommended bearing capacities have been calculated by **exp** from the borehole information for the preliminary design stage only. The investigation and comments are necessarily on-going as new information of underground conditions becomes available. For example, more specific information is available with respect to conditions between boreholes, when foundation construction is underway. The interpretation between boreholes, and the recommendations of this report must therefore be checked through field monitoring provided by an experienced geotechnical engineer to validate the information for use during the construction stage.

A minimum of 1.5 m of earth cover should be provided to all the exterior footings of heated structures to protect them from damage due to frost penetration. Where earth cover is less than 1.5 m, an equivalent combination of earth fill and rigid polystyrene insulation (i.e. Styrofoam HI-40) should be provided. Footings of unheated structure should be provided with a cover of 2.1 m if snow would not be cleared from their vicinity. If the snow would be cleared from the vicinity of the footings, they should be provided with 2.4 m of earth cover.

All the footing beds should be examined by a geotechnical engineer/geotechnician to ensure that the founding soil is capable of supporting the design bearing pressure and that the footings beds have been prepared satisfactorily.

Settlements of the structures founded on strip and spread footings design according to the above recommendations are expected to be within the normally tolerated limits of 25 mm total and 19 mm differential movements.

## **6 Floor Slab and Drainage Requirements**

The lowest level floors of the proposed structures may be constructed as slabs-on-grade provided they are set on beds of well-compacted 19 mm clear stone at least 200 mm thick placed on the natural soil or on well-compacted fill. The clear stone would prevent the capillary rise of moisture from the sub-soil to the floor slab. Adequate saw cuts should be provided in the floor slabs to control cracking. Any underfloor fill required should conform to OPSS 1010 for Granular B, Type II and should be placed in 300 mm lift thickness and each lift compacted to at least 98 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD).

Perimeter as well as underfloor drains should be provided for structures with basements (Figure 14). The perimeter and sub-surface drains for the structure will be connected to storm sewers. All subsurface walls should be properly damp-proofed. The exterior grade should be sloped away from the structures at an inclination of 1 to 2 percent to prevent the ingress of surface runoff.

## 7 Lateral Earth Pressure Against Subsurface Walls

The subsurface walls should be backfilled with free draining material, such as OPSS 1010 for Granular B, Type II and equipped with a perimeter drainage system to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure behind the walls. The walls will be subjected to lateral static and dynamic (seismic) earth forces.

For design purposes, the lateral static earth thrust against the subsurface walls may be computed from the following equation:

$$P = K_0 H (q + \frac{1}{2} \gamma H)$$

where  $P$  = lateral earth thrust acting on the subsurface wall; kN/m  
 $K_0$  = lateral earth pressure coefficient for 'at rest' condition for Granular B Type II backfill material = 0.5  
 $\gamma$  = unit weight of free draining granular backfill; Granular B = 22 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 $H$  = Height of backfill adjacent to foundation wall, m  
 $q$  = surcharge load, kPa

The lateral seismic thrust may be computed from the equation given below:

$$\Delta P_E = 0.3 \gamma H^2$$

where  $\Delta P_E$  = resultant thrust due to seismic activity; kN/m  
 $\gamma$  = unit weight of free draining granular backfill; Granular B Type II = 22 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 $H$  = height of backfill behind wall, (m)

The  $\Delta P_E$  value does not take into account the surcharge load. The resultant load should be assumed to act at 0.6 H from the bottom of the wall.

## **8 Excavations**

Excavations for construction of spread and strip footings are expected to extend to a maximum depth of 2.2 m below the existing ground surfaces and may be deeper if engineered fill is placed to raise the grade. These excavations are expected to terminate in the clay. They are expected to be above the groundwater table.

Excavations above the groundwater table in the engineered grade raise fill, silty sand and clay are expected to be stable when cut back at 45 degrees.

Seepage of surface and subsurface water into the excavations is anticipated. However, it should be possible to collect any water entering the excavations in perimeter ditches and to remove it by pumping from sumps. Although this investigation has estimated the groundwater levels at the time of the field work, and commented on dewatering and general construction problems, conditions may be present which are difficult to establish from standard boring techniques and which may affect the type and nature of dewatering procedures used by the contractor in practice. These conditions include local and seasonal fluctuations in the groundwater table, erratic changes in the soil profile, thin layers of soil with large or small permeabilities compared with the soil mass, etc. Only carefully controlled tests using pumped wells and observation wells will yield the quantitative data on groundwater volumes and pressures that are necessary to engineer construction dewatering systems adequately.

Many geologic materials deteriorate rapidly upon exposure to meteorological elements. Unless otherwise specifically indicated in this report, walls and floors of excavations must be protected from moisture, desiccation, and frost action throughout the course of construction.

The clay at the site is susceptible to disturbance due to the movement of construction equipment, and personnel on its surface. It is therefore recommended that the excavation at the site should be undertaken by equipment, which does not travel on the excavated surface e.g. a gradall, or mechanical shovel. It is anticipated that temporary granular roads may be required to gain access to the site. A 50-mm mud slab is also recommended to be placed on top of the founding clay immediately following approval.

It is anticipated that Permit to Take Water will not be required since the excavations will not extend below the groundwater table.

## **9 Backfilling Requirements and Suitability of On-Site Soils for Backfilling Purposes**

The backfill against subsurface walls should consist of free draining material preferably conforming to OPSS 1010 for Granular B, Type II. It should be compacted to 95 percent of the SPMDD.

The backfill in footing trenches and service trenches should be compactible i.e. free of organics and debris and with natural moisture content, which is within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content. It should be compacted to 95 percent of the SPMDD.

The material to be excavated during construction of the footings and installation of services is silty sand and clay. These materials are generally too wet for adequate compaction and should be only used for general grading purposes. Any fill imported for backfill footing trenches, service trenches, etc. should preferably conform to OPSS 1010 for Granular B, Type II. It should be placed in 300 mm lift thickness and compacted to 95 percent of the SPMDD. In this case, clay dykes should be provided at upstream end of the manholes to prevent drainage of the granular backfill and lowering of the groundwater table. The clay dykes should be constructed in accordance with OPSD 802.095 requirements.

## 10 Access Roads

Pavement structure thicknesses required for unpaved parking areas and access roads were computed. The pavement structure is shown on Table V. The thicknesses are based upon an estimate of the subgrade soil properties determined from visual examination, textural classification and grain-size analyses of the soil samples and functional design life of 25 to 30 years. The proposed functional design life represents the number of years to the first rehabilitation, assuming regular maintenance is carried out. Gravel surfaced facilities are expected to require regular maintenance.

<b>Table V: Recommended Pavement Structure Thicknesses</b>			
<b>Pavement Layer</b>	<b>Compaction Requirements</b>	<b>Parking Lot(s)</b>	<b>Access Road(s)</b>
		<b>Unpaved</b>	<b>Unpaved</b>
OPSS 1010 Granular 'A' Base (crushed limestone)	100% SPMDD*	200 mm	250
OPSS 1010 Granular 'B', Type II Sub-base	100% SPMDD*	550 mm	550
Subgrade	Engineered fill/approved fill as per specifications		
<p><u>Notes:</u>                      SPMDD denotes standard Proctor maximum dry density, ASTM, D-698-12e2                      The upper 300 mm of the subgrade fill must be compacted to 98% SPMDD.</p>			

An existing access roadway is located on the site. However, its structure is not known. It is understood that this road is to be upgraded so that the recommended roadway structure is met.

Construction procedures for the pavement structure are discussed below.

The entire road should be excavated to the subgrade level. The subgrade should be crowned with a centre to edge slope of at least 2 percent. It should then be proof rolled with a heavy roller. Any soft areas that become evident should be sub-excavated and replaced with approved native fill or free draining granular material. All subgrade fill should be placed in maximum 300 mm lifts and compacted to 95 percent of SPMDD. In-place density tests should be performed at regular intervals to ensure that the specified degree of compaction is being achieved.

It is stressed that the overall satisfactory performance of the recommended pavement structure is contingent upon the provisions of good drainage. It is therefore recommended that roadside ditches should be provided on both sides of the pavement to drain the subgrade. Granular infiltration trenches may be located beneath the ditches to reduce run-off volumes and promote groundwater infiltration. The infiltration trenches will drain to a positive outlet.

Additional comments on construction of the roadways are as follows:

- 1.) The most severe loading conditions on pavement subgrades may occur during construction. Consequently, special provisions such as restricted lanes, may be required, especially if construction is carried out during wet weather conditions, i.e. during spring and fall seasons
- 2.) The finished pavement surface should be free of depressions and should be sloped to provide effective surface drainage towards catch basins, the drainage ditches and roadside subdrain. Surface water should not be allowed to pond adjacent to the outside edges of paved areas.
- 3.) The granular materials used for pavement construction should conform to OPSS 1010 for Granular A and Granular B, Type II and should be compacted to 100 percent of the SPMDD.

It is recommended that a geotechnical engineer be retained to review the final pavement structure design at construction to ensure that it is consistent with the recommendations of this report.



## 11 Subsurface Concrete Requirements

Subsurface concrete will be used to construct basements of the residences. Chemical tests limited to pH and sulphate tests were performed on two selected soil samples. The results are given on Table VI.

<b>Borehole No.</b>	<b>Depth</b>	<b>pH</b>	<b>Sulphate (%)</b>
3	1.5 – 2.1	6.88	0.0012
4	2.1 – 2.7	6.44	0.0009

The test results indicate the clay contains a sulphate content of less than 0.1 percent. This concentration of sulphates in the soil would have a negligible potential of sulphate attack on subsurface concrete. It is therefore considered that normal Portland cement may be used in the basement walls of the residences. The concrete for the site should be designed in accordance with the requirements of CSA A23.1-14.

## **12 Seismic Site Classification and Liquefaction Potential of On-Site Soils**

The surficial soil at the site is silty sand, which is underlain by silty clay. The silty sand is located above the groundwater table and as such is not liquefiable during a seismic event.

The investigation also revealed that the predominant soil at the site is clay, which extends to 30.2 m to 34.8 m depth. The clay is expected to be underlain by bedrock at this level. The average shear strength of the clay was computed as 73 kPa.

The liquefaction potential of the clay on the site was assessed by plotting the results of Atterberg Limit Tests on Bray et al plot. A review of this figure (Figure 13) indicates that the clay is moderately susceptible to not susceptible to liquefaction during a seismic event.

The site has been classified as Class D for seismic site response in accordance with Table 4.1.8.4 (A) of the Ontario Building Code, 2012.

## 13 Tree Planting

The clay in the Ottawa area is prone to shrinkage on drying. This process is largely not reversible. Therefore, settlement and cracking of the structures can result if trees are planted too close to the residences. During dry seasons, the tree roots draw moisture from the clay thereby resulting in the clay drying and shrinking.

City of Ottawa guidelines indicate that fast-growing, high-water demand trees must not be plant closer to a building than a distance equal to their height at maturity. Only one of the small-sized trees listed on Table VII can be placed a minimum distance of 7.5 m away from any buildings, including when planting along road allowances (see Table VII). In addition, newly planted trees must be a minimum of 2.5 m from the curb and have a small-sized canopy at maturity to allow sufficient space for snow and ice control purposes.

<b>Table VII: List of Trees Suitable for Planting On Site (City of Ottawa Guidelines)</b>	
<b>Species</b>	<b>Water Demand</b>
Amur Maple ( <i>Acer ginnala</i> )	Moderate
Serviceberry ( <i>Amelanchier canadensis</i> )	Low
Crabapple ( <i>Malus</i> spp.)	Moderate
Japanese Lilac ( <i>Syringa reticulata</i> )	Moderate
Green Colorado Spruce or any conifer species ( <i>Picea pungens</i> )	Low

For further information, an arborist should be consulted.

## 14 Slope Stability

### 14.1 Slope Stability Analysis

The stability of the existing slopes was analyzed by using Morgenstern-Price Method, GeoStudio /Geoslope office, Version 8.13 computerized system. The purpose of the analysis was to assess the stability of the existing slopes and to determine the required set back of the proposed structures from the crest of the slopes. A total of seven cross-sections were analyzed. These cross-sections have been shown as Sections A-A, B-B, C-C, D-D, E-E, F-F, and G-G on Figure 2.

These cross-sections were obtained from the 2015 Lidar Survey of the site.

The natural slope inclinations at the cross-sections analyzed were determined, and the results have been presented on Table VIII.

<b>Table VIII: Natural Slope Inclination of Cross-sections Analyzed</b>				
<b>Section</b>	<b>Crest of Slope (m)</b>	<b>Toe of Slope (m)</b>	<b>Height of Slope (m)</b>	<b>Overall Slope Inclination</b>
A-A	62.0	49.0	13.0	2.7H:1V
B-B	60.0	49.0	11	3.2H:1V
C-C	62.0	50.5	11.5	3.1H:1V
D-D	60.0	49.0	11.0	2.9H:1V
E-E	61.0	49.0	12.0	3.3H:1V
F-F	59.0	49.0	10.0	2.9H:1V
G-G	58.3	50.0	8.25	7.6H:1V

The slopes were analyzed for the following conditions:

- 1.) Effective stress analysis.
- 2.) Total stress analysis; and
- 3.) Total stress analysis with seismic loading;

The following assumptions were made:

- 1.) The crest of the existing slopes varies from Elevation 58.25 m to 62.0 m whereas the toe of the slopes is at Elevation 49.0 m to 50.5 m (Table VIII).
- 2.) The soil stratigraphy for the various cross-sections is shown on Figure Nos. 15 to 36 inclusive. The soil stratigraphy was established from the boreholes drilled at the site.
- 3.) The unit weight of the various soils was established from laboratory tests. The undrained shear strength of the clay was established by performing in-situ field vane tests. The shear strength parameters were selected based on literature search. Previous work undertaken on the Ottawa

Area Clays by Mitchell (1970), Sangrey & Paul (1971), Eden, Fletcher and Mitchell (1971), Eden & Jarret 1971, Mitchell & Eden 1972 was reviewed. In addition, a certain number of back analysis of the natural slopes in Champlain clay have been presented in the literature: Crawford & Eden (1967), Eden & Mitchell (1970), Lefebvre & La Rochelle (1974), Lo & Lee (1974), Silvestri (1980), Lefebvre, G. (1981), Tavenas & Leroueil (1981) and Lefebvre, G., Pare, J.J. and Dascal, O. (1987) were reviewed. The review indicated that values of the effective cohesion ( $c'$ ) and effective angle of internal friction ( $\phi'$ ) of the clay obtained by the various researchers varied from 5.3 kPa to 11.5 kPa and 31 degrees to 35 degrees respectively. The effective cohesion ( $c'$ ) and effective angle of internal friction ( $\phi'$ ) values applicable in this case depend on the stress conditions in the slopes. Based on the review of the literature and site conditions, and using somewhat conservative approach, an effective cohesion of 9.8 kPa and effective angle of internal friction of 36 degrees was used in the analysis.

The average undrained shear strength used in the analysis was computed from the field-vane test results, which varied from 180 kPa to 46 kPa. The undrained shear strength was reduced by 15 percent in accordance with Section 6.6.3.2 (7) of the Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual.

- 4.) The slopes were assumed to be fully submerged i.e. the groundwater table in the slope coincides with the existing ground surface.
- 5.) Building loads were not taken into consideration in the analyses since the structures would be located away from the slopes.

The computed factors of safety of all the cross-sections analyzed for effective stress analysis were less than 1.5 except for sections E-E and G-G, which were stable. Therefore, the required slope inclination was computed for each section analysed to achieve a minimum factor of safety of 1.5 using reiterative slope stability analysis as follows:

<b>Section</b>	<b>Required Slope Inclination for FS = 1.5</b>
A-A	3.7H:1V
B-B	3.3H:1V
C-C	3.4H:1V
D-D	3.3H:1V
G-G	3.4H:1V
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.42H:1V</b>

The reiterative slope stability analysis, which yielded factor of safety of less than 1.5, have not been included in the report.

The results of the analyses are given on Figures 16 to 36 inclusive and have also been tabulated on Table IX.

<b>Table IX: Results of Slope Stability Analysis</b>				
<b>Section</b>	<b>Condition Analysed</b>	<b>Factor of Safety</b>	<b>Geotechnical Set Back from Toe of Slope</b>	<b>Figure No.</b>
A-A	Effective stress analysis and set back determination	1.50	48.0	16
	Total stress analysis	1.75	-	17
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.12	-	18
B-B	Effective stress analysis and set back determination	1.51	37.0	19
	Total stress analysis	2.13	-	20
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	2.12	-	21
C-C	Effective stress analysis and set back determination	1.52	39.0	22
	Total stress analysis	1.97	-	23
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.17	-	24
D-D	Effective stress analysis and setback determination	1.50	36.0	25
	Total stress analysis	2.14	-	26
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.34	-	27
E-E	Effective stress analysis and set back determination	1.67	40.0	28
	Total stress analysis	2.06		29
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.26		30
F-F	Effective stress analysis and set back determination	1.50	34.0	31
	Total stress analysis	2.23		32
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.38		33
G-G	Effective stress analysis and setback determination	2.90	63.0	34
	Total stress analysis	3.82		35
	Total stress analysis with seismic loading	1.70		36

Current practice of the City of Ottawa requires a minimum acceptable factor of safety of 1.5 for static loading conditions. The minimum acceptable factor of safety for seismic loading conditions is 1.1 (Mitchell 1983).

It is noted that the ravines located adjacent to the north property boundary and in the southeast part of the site are covered with vegetation and trees. The vegetation and trees provide stability to the slopes and

should not be disturbed in anyway. It is understood that the owner is willing to give an undertaking to preserve the vegetation on these slopes and to enhance the vegetative cover using local species.

During construction, the following precautions should be taken so that the stability of the slopes is not adversely affected:

- 1.) Care should be exercised during construction to ensure that the existing slopes are not steepened by placement of fill close to the crest of the slope since this would reduce the stability of the slope.
- 2.) Excavations should not be undertaken at the toe of the slopes since this would adversely affect the stability of the slopes.
- 3.) Natural drainage paths should not be blocked by placement of fill on the slope. If fill must be placed on the slope, adequate drainage should be provided to prevent buildup of pore pressures in the soil.
- 4.) Vegetation should not be removed from the faces of the slopes to prevent erosion. Additional vegetation should be planted on the slopes wherever necessary.

## 14.2 Behaviour of Slopes During Earthquakes

Lafebvre, G. (1981)<sup>1</sup> has stated that if the clay is not liquefiable, liquefaction during dynamic loading of earthquake will not be a concern. It has been previously demonstrated that the clay at the site is moderately to not susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore, it is concluded that the stability of the slopes at the site will not be adversely affected during a seismic event.

## 14.3 Flow Slides

Mitchell and Markall (1974)<sup>2</sup> have developed a method based on undrained shear strength to estimate the likelihood of flow slides. The undrained shear strength of the clay was measured using field shear vane. Based on analyzing the data for more than 40 sites, they established that flow slides will only occur in soils with total overburden pressure more than six times the undrained shear strength of the soil, i.e.:

$$\frac{\gamma H}{S_u} > 6$$

Where  $\gamma$  is the bulk density of soil,

H is the height of the slope, and

$S_u$  is the undrained shear strength of the soil.

The undrained shear strength used in the above expression was 85 percent of the measured shear strength to mitigate future cyclic loading. The ratio of total overburden pressure to reduced undrained shear strength

---

<sup>1</sup> Lefebvre, G. (1981), "Fourth Canadian Geotechnical Colloquium: Strength and Slope Stability in Canadian Soft Clay Deposits", Can. Geot. J., Vol 18, pgs. 8420-422.6

<sup>2</sup> Mitchell, R..J. and Markell, A.R. 1974, "Flow Slides in Sensitive Soils", Can Geot. J11, pgs. 423-454.

of the on-site clay was computed as 4.9. Therefore, it is concluded that the clay at the site is not prone to flow slides.



## 15 Limit of Hazardous Lands

It is noted that to establish the limit of hazardous lands, in addition to the geotechnical set back, two other factors must be taken into consideration. These are toe erosion allowance and erosion access allowance. The magnitude of the toe erosion allowance depends on the soil types, the state of erosion along the creek/river bank and upon the width of the channel. The Ministry of Natural Resources procedures permit either the installation of erosion protection or alternatively to consider a toe erosion allowance.

The north and south slopes of the creek located on the site were examined by geotechnical engineers from **exp** to determine if creek banks are eroding. The examination of the slopes did reveal some evidence of erosion of both the creek banks as shown on photos in Appendix B. Boreholes drilled have indicated that the natural soil in the vicinity of the creek bottom is stiff clay. Based on this information, it is considered that a toe erosion allowance of 8 m should be provided.

In addition to the toe erosion allowance, an erosion access allowance of 6 m is normally required.

Based on the cross-sections analyzed, the limit of hazardous land was computed by the addition of required geotechnical set back, the erosion allowance and erosion access allowance. The exception to this is between Section F-F and the concrete culvert located close to Section G-G (see Figure 2) and between two culverts along Section G-G where the erosion protection will be provided and the limit of hazardous lands was obtained by the addition of required geotechnical set back and access allowance.

The required limit of hazardous lands has been tabulated on Table X at cross-section locations and has been plotted on Site Plan, Figure 2. The crest of the slope was assumed at the location where the ground surface flattens to inclination of 10H:1V. The limit of hazardous lands should be staked out in the field by a registered Ontario Land Surveyor as shown in Figure 2. No development should take place within the hazardous lands limits.

<b>Table X: Limit of Hazardous Lands at Cross-Section Locations</b>					
<b>Section</b>	<b>Geotechnical Setback from the Toe (m)</b>	<b>Erosion Set Back (m)</b>	<b>Available Erosion Allowance in Valley Floor (m)</b>	<b>Erosion Access Allowance (m)</b>	<b>Total Setback from creek or toe of the slope (Limit of Hazardous Lands) (m)</b>
A-A	48	8	0	6	62 from creek
B-B	37	8	8	6	51 from creek
C-C	39	8	17	6	62 from creek
D-D	37	8	0	6	51 from creek
E-E	40	8	0	6	54 from creek
F-F	34	8	12	6	52 from creek
G-G	67	0	0	6	73 from creek

## 16 Pathway

Pathways have been constructed part way up the slopes by excavating into the slopes. It is understood that these pathways were constructed approximately 10 years ago and that very little to no maintenance was required during this period. A visual examination of these slopes was undertaken. It revealed that construction of the pathway has resulted in localized steepening of the slope uphill of the pathway. This has led to cave-in and/or erosion of the soil at some locations resulting in undermining of the toe of the upper slope. This was observed at Locations 1 to 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24 and 25 as shown on Figure 27 and in photos of the same number except at Location 16 where a photo was not taken.

Some erosion and/or sloughing of the slope downhill of the pathway was also observed at Locations 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 20, 22 and 23 as shown in photos of the corresponding number.

It is considered that cave-in and undermining of the toe of the upper slope is likely due to steepening of the slope and removal of vegetation from the face of the slope. The cave-in and undermining of the upper slope is expected to continue if not remediated and may result in eventual failure of the slope. Potential remedies may consist of armour stone retaining walls, gabion baskets, coir logs, etc.

For repair purposes, the upper slopes at the location of Photos 1, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 24 have been divided into three categories as follows:

- a.) Significant slopes – These are slopes with a height of greater than 1 m. These slopes should be stabilized by constructing retaining walls as per City of Ottawa requirements as soon as possible.
- b.) Somewhat significant – These are slopes with a height of more than 0.5 m to 1.0 m. These slopes should be monitored and repaired as necessary.
- c.) Less significant slopes – These are slopes with a height of 0.5 m or less. These slopes will likely remain stable and are expected to require little to no repairs or maintenance.

It is recommended that the above slopes should be stabilized by construction of armour stone retaining walls, gabion baskets, coir logs, etc.

It is understood that at some locations, the slopes were cut into to borrow material for construction of the pathways. The owner has indicated that these areas will be rehabilitated by construction of retaining walls, etc.

The owner has already constructed retaining walls at several locations. These include the pond area (Photo 26), across from the pond and the pathway (Photo 27), the Buddhist section (Photos 28) and the Christian Meditation area located in the northeast portion of the site where the slope has been terraced with armour stone retaining walls (Photo 29). Similarly, a retaining wall has been constructed at the entrance to the sanctuary (Photo 30). The construction of these retaining walls would increase the stability of the slopes and prevent slope failures in the areas.

The potential erosion areas located downhill of the pathway (areas represented by Photos 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 20, 22 and 23) should be stabilized by removing all the loose soil that has sloughed from the face of the slope and dressing the slope with rip rap, bushes with deep rooted growth, live stakes, etc.

It is noted that the creek banks are also eroding in some areas. Most significant areas are located along the meanders in the creek. It is considered that these areas may be repaired by construction of armour

stone retaining walls, placement of rip rap, etc. A permit would be required from the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) prior to undertaking any work.

Detailed design of the retaining walls, rip rap, etc., is beyond the terms of reference in this investigation. It is recommended that a detailed plan for the remedial walls should be prepared, approval obtained from the RVCA and implemented.


## **17 General Comments**

The comments given in this report are intended only for the guidance of design engineers. The number of boreholes required to determine the localized underground conditions between boreholes affecting construction costs, techniques, sequencing, equipment, scheduling, etc., would be much greater than has been carried out for the design purposes. Contractors bidding on or undertaking the works should, in this light, decide on their own investigations, as well as their own interpretations of the factual borehole results, so that they may draw their own conclusions as to how the subsurface conditions may affect them.

The information contained in this report is not intended to reflect on environmental aspects of the soils. Should specific information be required, including for example, the presence of pollutants, contaminants or other hazards in the soil, additional testing may be required.

We trust that the information contained in this report will be satisfactory for your purposes. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

## **Figures**



Filename: r:\220000\229886-a0\3400 old montreal\229886 fig 1 loc plan.dwg  
 Last Saved: 1/6/2016 4:53:38 PM  
 Last Plotted: 1/8/2016 10:32:17 AM  
 Pen Table: row standard, july 01, 2004.ctb  
 Plotted by: nugenim




**exp Services Inc.**

t: +1.613.688.1899 | f: +1.613.225.7337  
 2650 Queensview Drive, Suite 100  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6  
 Canada

www.exp.com

- BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY •
- INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY •

scale	NTS	CLIENT:	<b>HUMANICS UNIVERSAL INC.</b>	project no.	OTT-00229886-A0
date	JAN. 2016	TITLE:	<b>SITE LOCATION PLAN, HUMANICS SANTUARY &amp; SCULPTURE PARK</b>		
drawn by	M.N.		<b>3400 OLD MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON</b>		<b>FIG 1</b>



**LEGEND**


- BH1 BOREHOLE NUMBER AND LOCATION
- TP1 TEST PIT NUMBER, LOCATION AND ELEVATION
- LIMIT OF DEVELOPMENT LINE
- LIMIT OF HAZARDOUS LANDS
- STABLE SLOPE ALLOWANCE
- ENVIRONMENTAL SETBACK
- CREST OF SLOPE
- EROSION ALLOWANCE
- TOE OF SLOPE
- A  
A LOCATION OF CROSS SECTIONS ANALYZED

- NOTES:**
1. THE BOUNDARIES AND SOIL TYPES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED ONLY AT BOREHOLE AND TEST PIT LOCATIONS. BETWEEN BOREHOLES AND TEST PITS THEY ARE ASSUMED AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO CONSIDERABLE ERROR.
  2. SOIL SAMPLES WILL BE RETAINED IN STORAGE FOR THREE MONTHS AND THEN DESTROYED UNLESS THE CLIENT ADVISES THAT AN EXTENDED TIME PERIOD IS REQUIRED.
  3. TOPSOIL QUANTITIES SHOULD NOT BE ESTABLISHED FROM THE INFORMATION PROVIDED AT THE BOREHOLE AND TEST PIT LOCATIONS.
  4. BOREHOLE AND TEST PIT ELEVATIONS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO DESIGN BUILDING(S) OR FLOOR SLABS OR PARKING LOT(S) GRADES.
  5. THIS DRAWING FORMS PART OF THE REPORT PROJECT NUMBER AS REFERENCED AND SHOULD BE USED ONLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS REPORT.
  6. LIDAR BASE PLAN OBTAINED FROM THE CITY OF OTTAWA. LEGAL BASE FROM FAIRHALL MOFFATT & WOODLAND LIMITED. JOB. NO. H19200.

**NOTES**  
 THE POSITION OF ALL POLE LINES, CONDUITS, WATERMANS, SEWERS AND OTHER UNDERGROUND AND OVERGROUND UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES IS NOT NECESSARILY SHOWN ON THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS, AND WHERE SHOWN, THE ACCURACY OF THE POSITION OF SUCH UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES IS NOT GUARANTEED. BEFORE STARTING WORK, DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL SUCH UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES AND ASSUME ALL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE TO THEM.

NO.	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	APPD.
3	REVISED ENVIRONMENTAL SETBACK AS PER LETTER, APRIL 14, 2022	24/11/22	SAB	IT
2	REVISED	25/01/17	MN	IT
1	ISSUED FOR COORDINATION	14/01/16	MN	IT

NO.	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	APPD.



DESIGNED BY: HUMANICS UNIVERSAL INC.  
 601 BROOKRIDGE CRES.,  
 ORLEANS, ON., K4A 1Z6 613-824-1525


exp. Services Inc.  
 1-1-613-668-1899 | F-1-613-225-7330  
 3055 St. Lawrence Drive, Unit 100  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8R6  
 Canada  
 www.exp.com  
 • BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY •  
 • INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY •

DESIGN: SA	<b>HUMANICS SANCTUARY AND SCULPTURE PARK</b> 3400 OLD MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON.  <b>BOREHOLE LOCATION PLAN AND LIMIT OF HAZARDOUS LANDS</b>	PROJ. NO.: OTT-00229886-AG
CHECKED: SA		DATE: DEC. 2015
DRAWN: JR/MN		DRAWING NO.: FIG 2
PROJ. MAN: SA		
APPROVED: SA		

Filename: I:\2000\02\0229886-AG-3400-Old Montreal\2000\fig\_2\_mf37\_2022-11-24.dwg  
 User: JRM  
 Date Plotted: 11/24/2022 3:12:35 PM  
 Plotted by: jrm  
 Plot Name: I:\2000\02\0229886-AG-3400-Old Montreal\2000\fig\_2\_mf37\_2022-11-24.dwg  
 Plot Number: 2000-02-0229886-AG-3400-Old Montreal\2000\fig\_2\_mf37\_2022-11-24.dwg

## Notes On Sample Descriptions

- All sample descriptions included in this report follow the Canadian Foundations Engineering Manual soil classification system. This system follows the standard proposed by the International Society for Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering. Laboratory grain size analyses provided by **exp** Services Inc. also follow the same system. Different classification systems may be used by others; one such system is the Unified Soil Classification. Please note that, with the exception of those samples where a grain size analysis has been made, all samples are classified visually. Visual classification is not sufficiently accurate to provide exact grain sizing or precise differentiation between size classification systems.



- Fill:** Where fill is designated on the borehole log it is defined as indicated by the sample recovered during the boring process. The reader is cautioned that fills are heterogeneous in nature and variable in density or degree of compaction. The borehole description may therefore not be applicable as a general description of site fill materials. All fills should be expected to contain obstruction such as wood, large concrete pieces or subsurface basements, floors, tanks, etc., none of these may have been encountered in the boreholes. Since boreholes cannot accurately define the contents of the fill, test pits are recommended to provide supplementary information. Despite the use of test pits, the heterogeneous nature of fill will leave some ambiguity as to the exact composition of the fill. Most fills contain pockets, seams, or layers of organically contaminated soil. This organic material can result in the generation of methane gas and/or significant ongoing and future settlements. Fill at this site may have been monitored for the presence of methane gas and, if so, the results are given on the borehole logs. The monitoring process does not indicate the volume of gas that can be potentially generated nor does it pinpoint the source of the gas. These readings are to advise of the presence of gas only, and a detailed study is recommended for sites where any explosive gas/methane is detected. Some fill material may be contaminated by toxic/hazardous waste that renders it unacceptable for deposition in any but designated land fill sites; unless specifically stated the fill on this site has not been tested for contaminants that may be considered toxic or hazardous. This testing and a potential hazard study can be undertaken if requested. In most residential/commercial areas undergoing reconstruction, buried oil tanks are common and are generally not detected in a conventional geotechnical site investigation.
- Till:** The term till on the borehole logs indicates that the material originates from a geological process associated with glaciation. Because of this geological process the till must be considered heterogeneous in composition and as such may contain pockets and/or seams of material such as sand, gravel, silt or clay. Till often contains cobbles (60 to 200 mm) or boulders (over 200 mm). Contractors may therefore encounter cobbles and boulders during excavation, even if they are not indicated by the borings. It should be appreciated that normal sampling equipment cannot differentiate the size or type of any obstruction. Because of the horizontal and vertical variability of till, the sample description may be applicable to a very limited zone; caution is therefore essential when dealing with sensitive excavations or dewatering programs in till materials.



# Log of Borehole BH1



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 3

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 1 of 2

Location: 3400 Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date Drilled: November 30, 2015

Split Spoon Sample

Combustible Vapour Reading

Drill Type: CME55 Track

Auger Sample

Natural Moisture Content

SPT (N) Value

Atterberg Limits

Datum: Geodetic

Dynamic Cone Test


Undrained Triaxial at % Strain at Failure

Shelby Tube

Shear Strength by Penetrometer Test

Logged by: MD Checked by: SA

Shear Strength by Vane Test



Continued Next Page

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

### WATER LEVEL RECORDS

Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
Completion	16.3	
Dec 14, 2015	5.3	
April 20, 2016	2.2	

### CORE DRILLING RECORD

Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

# Log of Borehole BH1



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 3

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 2 of 2

G W L	S O I L	SOIL DESCRIPTION	Geodetic Elevation m	Standard Penetration Test N Value				Combustible Vapour Reading (ppm)			S O I L T E S T A S E	Natural Unit Wt. kN/m <sup>3</sup>
				20	40	60	80	250	500	750		
				Shear Strength kPa				Natural Moisture Content % Atterberg Limits (% Dry Weight)				
		<b>DYNAMIC CONE TEST (continued)</b>	40.6	20								
				21								
				22								
				23								
				24								
				25								
				26								
				27								
				28								
				29								
			30.4	30								
		<b>Refusal to Cone Test at 30.2 m</b>										

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

NOTES:  
 1. Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others  
 2. A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion  
 3. Field work supervised by an exp representative.  
 4. See Notes on Sample Descriptions  
 5. This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
Completion	16.3	
Dec 14, 2015	5.3	
April 20, 2016	2.2	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

# Log of Borehole BH2



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 4

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 1 of 2

Location: 3400 Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date Drilled: December 3 and 4, 2015

Split Spoon Sample

Combustible Vapour Reading

Drill Type: CME55 Track

Auger Sample

Natural Moisture Content

SPT (N) Value

Atterberg Limits

Datum: Geodetic

Dynamic Cone Test


Undrained Triaxial at % Strain at Failure

Shelby Tube

Shear Strength by Penetrometer Test

Logged by: BV Checked by: SA

Shear Strength by Vane Test



Continued Next Page

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - Borehole backfilled upon completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
April 20, 2016	4.3	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

# Log of Borehole BH2



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 4

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 2 of 2

G W L	S O B Y L	SOIL DESCRIPTION	Geodetic Elevation m	Standard Penetration Test N Value				Combustible Vapour Reading (ppm)			Natural Unit Wt. kN/m <sup>3</sup>
				Shear Strength kPa				Natural Moisture Content % Atterberg Limits (% Dry Weight)			
				20	40	60	80	250	500	750	
		<b>DYNAMIC CONE TEST (continued)</b>	42.3								
				20							
				21							
				22							
				23							
				24							
				25							
				26							
				27							
				28							
				29							
				30							
				31							
				32							
				33							
				34							
		<b>Refusal to Cone Test at 34.8 m</b>	27.5								

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - Borehole backfilled upon completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
April 20, 2016	4.3	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

# Log of Borehole BH3



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 5

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 1 of 2

Location: 3400 Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date Drilled: December 3, 2015

Split Spoon Sample

Combustible Vapour Reading

Drill Type: CME55 Track

Auger Sample

Natural Moisture Content

SPT (N) Value

Atterberg Limits

Datum: Geodetic

Dynamic Cone Test


Undrained Triaxial at % Strain at Failure

Shelby Tube

Shear Strength by Penetrometer Test

Logged by: BV Checked by: SA

Shear Strength by Vane Test



Continued Next Page

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - Borehole backfilled upon completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
April 20, 2016	3.7	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

# Log of Borehole BH3



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 5

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 2 of 2

G W L	S O B Y L	SOIL DESCRIPTION	Geodetic Elevation m	Standard Penetration Test N Value				Combustible Vapour Reading (ppm)			Natural Unit Wt. kN/m <sup>3</sup>	
				Shear Strength				Natural Moisture Content % Atterberg Limits (% Dry Weight)				
				20	40	60	80	250	500	750		
		<b>DYNAMIC CONE TEST (continued)</b>	42.5	20	50	100	150	200	20	40	60	
				21								
				22								
				23								
				24								
				25								
				26								
				27								
				28								
				29								
				30								
				31								
				32								
				33								
		<b>Refusal to Cone Test at 33.5 m</b>	29.0									

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - Borehole backfilled upon completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
April 20, 2016	3.7	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

# Log of Borehole BH4



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 6

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 1 of 2

Location: 3400 Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date Drilled: November 31, 2015

Split Spoon Sample

Combustible Vapour Reading

Drill Type: CME55 Track

Auger Sample

Natural Moisture Content

SPT (N) Value

Atterberg Limits

Datum: Geodetic

Dynamic Cone Test


Undrained Triaxial at % Strain at Failure

Shelby Tube

Shear Strength by Penetrometer Test

Logged by: MD Checked by: SA

Shear Strength by Vane Test



Continued Next Page

- NOTES:
- Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others
  - A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion
  - Field work supervised by an exp representative.
  - See Notes on Sample Descriptions
  - This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
1 Day	4.9	
Dec 14, 2015	5.0	Not Stabilized

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

# Log of Borehole BH4



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 6

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 2 of 2

G W L	S O B Y L	SOIL DESCRIPTION	Geodetic Elevation m	D e p t h m	Standard Penetration Test N Value				Combustible Vapour Reading (ppm)			S A M P L E S	Natural Unit Wt. kN/m <sup>3</sup>
					20	40	60	80	250	500	750		
					Shear Strength kPa				Natural Moisture Content % Atterberg Limits (% Dry Weight)				
		<b>DYNAMIC CONE TEST (continued)</b>	39.6	20									
				21									
				22									
				23									
				24									
				25									
				26									
				27									
				28									
				29									
				30									
		<b>Refusal to Cone Test at 30.9 m</b>	28.7										

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 12-22-16

NOTES:  
 1. Borehole/Test Pit data requires Interpretation by exp. before use by others  
 2. A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion  
 3. Field work supervised by an exp representative.  
 4. See Notes on Sample Descriptions  
 5. This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
1 Day	4.9	
Dec 14, 2015	5.0	Not Stabilized

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %



# Log of Borehole BH1



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 3

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 1 of 2

Location: 3400 Old Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date Drilled: November 30, 2015

Split Spoon Sample

Combustible Vapour Reading

Drill Type: CME55 Track

Auger Sample

Natural Moisture Content

SPT (N) Value

Atterberg Limits

Datum: Geodetic

Dynamic Cone Test


Undrained Triaxial at % Strain at Failure

Shelby Tube

Shear Strength by Penetrometer Test

Logged by: MD Checked by: SA

Shear Strength by Vane Test



LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 1-31-17

NOTES:  
 1. Borehole data requires interpretation by exp. before use by others  
 2. A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion  
 3. Field work supervised by an exp representative.  
 4. See Notes on Sample Descriptions  
 5. This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0

WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
Completion	16.3	
Dec 14, 2015	5.3	
April 20, 2016	2.2	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

Continued Next Page

# Log of Borehole BH1



Project No: OTT-00229886-A0

Figure No. 3

Project: Geotechnical Investigation, Humanics Sanctuary & Sculpture Park

Page. 2 of 2

G W L	S O B Y L	SOIL DESCRIPTION	Geodetic m	Standard Penetration Test N Value				Combustible Vapour Reading (ppm)			Natural Unit Wt. kN/m <sup>3</sup>									
				20	40	60	80	250	500	750										
				Shear Strength kPa				Natural Moisture Content % Atterberg Limits (% Dry Weight)												
		<b>DYNAMIC CONE TEST (continued)</b>	40.6	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30						
		<b>Refusal to Cone Test at 30.2 m</b>	30.4																	

LOG OF BOREHOLE LOGS OF BOREHOLES CUMBERLAND.GPJ TROW OTTAWA.GDT 1-31-17

NOTES:  
 1. Borehole data requires interpretation by exp. before use by others  
 2. A 19 mm standpipe was installed in the borehole following completion  
 3. Field work supervised by an exp representative.  
 4. See Notes on Sample Descriptions  
 5. This Figure is to read with exp. Services Inc. report OTT-00229886-A0


WATER LEVEL RECORDS		
Elapsed Time	Water Level (m)	Hole Open To (m)
Completion	16.3	
Dec 14, 2015	5.3	
April 20, 2016	2.2	

CORE DRILLING RECORD			
Run No.	Depth (m)	% Rec.	RQD %

## Method of Test for Sieve Analysis of Aggregate

MTO Test Method LS - 602, Rev. No. 23

Grain Size Distribution Curve



<b>CLAY</b>	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse
	<b>SILT</b>			<b>SAND</b>			<b>GRAVEL</b>		
<b>Modified M.I.T. Classification</b>									

<b>Trow Project No.:</b>	OTT-00229886-A0	<b>Project Name :</b>	Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park		
<b>Client :</b>	Humanics Universal Inc	<b>Project Location :</b>	3400 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland		
<b>Date Sampled :</b>	November 2015	<b>Borehole/Test Pit #:</b>	TP1 SS1	<b>% Pass 75 um</b> 2.7	
<b>Sample Description :</b>	Fine to Medium Sand			Coarse Grained	<b>X</b>


Figure 7



## Method of Test for Sieve Analysis of Aggregate

MTO Test Method LS - 602, Rev. No. 23

Grain Size Distribution Curve



<b>CLAY</b>	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse
	<b>SILT</b>			<b>SAND</b>			<b>GRAVEL</b>		
<b>Modified M.I.T. Classification</b>									

<b>Trow Project No.:</b>	OTT-00229886-A0	<b>Project Name :</b>	Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park				
<b>Client :</b>	Humanics Universal inc	<b>Project Location :</b>	3400 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland				
<b>Date Sampled :</b>	November 2015	<b>Borehole/Test Pit #:</b>	TP2 SS2	<b>% Pass 75 um</b>	98.6	<b>Fine Grained</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Sample Description :</b>	Silt, trace Sand				<b>Coarse Grained</b>		


Figure 8



## Method of Test for Sieve Analysis of Aggregate

MTO Test Method LS - 602, Rev. No. 23

Grain Size Distribution Curve



<b>CLAY</b>	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse
	<b>SILT</b>			<b>SAND</b>			<b>GRAVEL</b>		
<b>Modified M.I.T. Classification</b>									

<b>Trow Project No.:</b>	OTT-00229886-A0	<b>Project Name :</b>	Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park		
<b>Client :</b>	Humanics Universal Inc	<b>Project Location :</b>	3400 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland		
<b>Date Sampled :</b>	November 2015	<b>Borehole/Test Pit #:</b>	TP9 SS1	<b>% Pass 75 um</b> 2.7	
<b>Sample Description :</b>	Fine to Medium Sand			Coarse Grained	<b>X</b>

Figure 9



# Grain-Size Distribution Curve


**exp Services Inc.**  
 100-2650 Queensview Drive  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6

## Method of Test for Particle Size Analysis of Soil

MTO Test Method LS - 702, Rev. No. 19

### Modified M.I.T. Classification

CLAY	SILT			SAND			GRAVEL		
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse



Exp Project No.:	OTT-00229886-A0	Project Name :	Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park		
Client :	Humanics Universal Inc.	Project Location :	3400 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland		
Date Sampled :	November 30, 2015	Borehole/Test Pit No.:	BH1	Sample No.:	SS7
Sample Description :	Silty Clay			Depth (m) :	4.6-5.0
				Figure :	10





# Grain-Size Distribution Curve


**exp Services Inc.**  
 100-2650 Queensview Drive  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6

## Method of Test for Particle Size Analysis of Soil

MTO Test Method LS - 702, Rev. No. 19

### Modified M.I.T. Classification


CLAY	SILT			SAND			GRAVEL		
	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse	Fine	Medium	Coarse



Exp Project No.:	OTT-00229886-A0	Project Name :	Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Parkn		
Client :	Humanics Universal Inc.	Project Location :	3400 Old Montreal Rd, Cumberland		
Date Sampled :	December 4, 2015	Borehole/Test Pit No.:	BH2	Sample No.:	SS6
Sample Description :	Silty Clay			Depth (m) :	6.1-6.7
				Figure :	12



PLASTICITY CHART (AFTER CASAGRANDE, 1948)



exp Services Inc.

t: +1-613-888-1899 | f: +1-613-225-7337

2650 Queensview Drive, Suite 100  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6  
 Canada

www.exp.com

- BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY •
- INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY •

scale N.T.S.

date DEC. 2016

drawn by M.N.

CLIENT:

**HUMANICS UNIVERSAL INC.**

TITLE:

HUMANICS SANCTUARY & SCULPTURE PARK


3400 OLD MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON

project no.

OTT-00229886-A0

FIG 13

Filename: r:\220000\229886-a0 3400 old montreal\fig 14 liquefaction assessment.r2.dwg  
 Last Saved: 12/21/2016 2:36:07 PM  
 Last Plotted: 12/21/2016 2:37:07 PM  
 Pen Table: row standard, july 01, 2004.ctb  
 Plotted by: NugentM



**BRAY ET AL. (2004) CRITERIA FOR LIQUEFACTION  
 ASSESSMENT OF FINE-GRAINED SOILS**




**exp Services Inc.**

t: +1.613.688.1899 | f: +1.613.225.7337  
 2650 Queensview Drive, Suite 100  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6  
 Canada

www.exp.com

- BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY •
- INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY •

scale	N.T.S.	CLIENT:	project no.
date	DEC. 2016	<b>HUMANICS UNIVERSAL INC.</b> HUMANICS SANTUARY & SCULPTURE PARK 3400 OLD MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON	OTT-00229886-A0
drawn by	M.N.		<b>FIG 14</b>



**Notes**

1. Drainage tile to consist of 100 mm (4") diameter weeping tile or equivalent perforated pipe leading to a positive sump or outlet. Invert to be a minimum of 150 mm (6") below underside of floor slab.
2. Pea gravel - 150 mm (6") top and side of drain. If drain is not on footing, place 100 mm (4 inches) of pea gravel below drain . 20 mm (3/4") clear stone is an alternative provided it is surrounded by an approved porous plastic membrane (Terrafix 270R or equivalent).
3. C.S.A. fine concrete aggregate to act as filter material. Minimum 300 mm (12") top and side of tile drain. This may be replaced by an approved porous plastic membrane as indicated in (2).
4. Free Draining backfill - OPSS Granular B or equivalent compacted to the specified density. Do not use heavy compaction equipment within 450 mm (18") of the wall. Use hand controlled light compaction equipment within 1.8 m (6') of wall.
5. Impermeable backfill seal - compacted clay, clayey silt or equivalent. If original soil is free-draining, seal may be omitted.
6. Do not backfill until wall is supported by basement and floor slabs or adequate bracing.
7. Moisture barrier to be at least 200 mm (8") of compacted clear 20 mm (3/4") stone or equivalent free draining material.
8. Basement wall to be damp-proofed.
9. Exterior grade to slope away from building.
10. Slab on grade should not be structurally connected to the wall or footing.
11. Underfloor drain invert to be at least 300 mm(12") below underside of floor slab. Drainage tile placed in parallel rows 6 to 8 m (20 to 25') centres one way. Place drain on 100 m (4") pea gravel with 150 mm(6") of pea gravel on top and sides. Provide filter material as noted in (3) if moisture barrier is not clear crushed stone.
12. Do not connect the underfloor drains to perimeter drains.
13. If the 20 mm (3/4") stone requires surface blinding, use 6 mm (1/4") clear stone chips.

**DRAINAGE AND BACKFILL RECOMMENDATIONS**

(not to scale)

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.


Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - A-A - Effective Stress Analysis  
Set Back Determination

Figure 16

Name: CLAY  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion': 9.8 kPa  
Phi': 36 °

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion': 0 kPa  
Phi': 40 °


Name: Clayey Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion': 1 kPa  
Phi': 20 °



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - A-A - Total Stress Analysis




Name: Clay 1  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Silt  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Maximum: 85 kPa


Figure 17



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section - A-A - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic




Name: Clay 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Silt  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa

Figure 18



PROJECT: 011-00229000-AU  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.


Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - B-B - Effective Stress Analysis  
Set Back Determination

Figure 19

Name: CLAY  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 9.8 kPa  
Phi: 36 °

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °

Name: Sandy Silt and Clay  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 26 °



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - B-B - Total Stress Analysis




Figure 20



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - B-B - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic




Figure 21

Name: CLAY 1  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 75 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °

Name: Fill  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 26 °

Name: CLAY 2  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Maximum: 85 kPa

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.


Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - C-C - Effective Stress Analysis  
Set Back Determination

Figure 22

Name: CLAY  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 9.8 kPa  
Phi: 36 °

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °

Name: Silty Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 30 °



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - C-C - Total Stress Analysis





Figure 23

Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 95 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion': 0 kPa  
Phi': 40 °

Name: Silty Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion': 0 kPa  
Phi': 30 °

Name: CLAY 2  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Maximum: 85 kPa



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section - C-C - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic





Figure 24

Name: CLAY 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 95 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Silty Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 30 °

Name: CLAY 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa




Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.


Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section -D-D - Effective Stress Analysis  
Set Back Determination

Figure 25




Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -D-D - Total Stress Analysis

Figure 26





Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -D-D - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic

Figure 27



- Name: CLAY 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 85 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa
- Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °
- Name: Fill  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 26 °
- Name: CLAY 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa






Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section - E-E - Effective Stress Analysis  
 Set Back Determination

Figure 28

Name: CLAY  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 9.8 kPa  
 Phi: 36 °

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °





Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -E-E - Total Stress Analysis





Figure 29

Name: Clay 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -E-E - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic




Figure 30

Name: Clay 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa




Figure 31

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
Section - F-F - Effective Stress Analysis  
Set Back Determination

Name: CLAY  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 9.8 kPa  
Phi: 36 °  
Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °  
Name: Clayey Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 20 °





Figure 32

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -F-F - Total Stress Analysis




Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
 SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT  
 3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.  
 Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope  
 Section -F-F - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic




Figure 33

Name: Clay 1  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 90 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 0 kPa  
 Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
 Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 Cohesion: 1 kPa  
 Phi: 20 °

Name: Clay 2  
 Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
 C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
 C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
 C-Maximum: 85 kPa





Figure 34

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope & Proposed Retaining Wall  
Section - G-G - Effective Stress Analysis



Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope & Proposed Retaining Wall  
Section - G-G - Total Stress Analysis




Figure 35

Name: Clay 1  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 60 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °

Name: Clayey Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 20 °

Name: Free Draining Backfill  
Unit Weight: 22 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 36 °

Name: Clay 2  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Maximum: 85 kPa

Project : OTT-00229886-A0  
SLOPE STABILITY ASSESSMENT

3400 Old Montreal Road, Cumberland, On.

Slope Stability Analysis - Existing Slope & Proposed Retaining Wall  
Section - G-G - Total Stress Analysis - Seismic




Figure 36


Name: Clay 1  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 60 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: -9 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Minimum: 40 kPa

Name: Till/Bedrock  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 40 °


Name: Clayey Sand  
Unit Weight: 20 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 1 kPa  
Phi: 20 °

Name: Free Draining Backfill  
Unit Weight: 22 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
Cohesion: 0 kPa  
Phi: 36 °


Name: Clay 2  
Unit Weight: 17.5 kN/m<sup>3</sup>  
C-Top of Layer: 40 kPa  
C-Rate of Change: 3 (kN/m<sup>2</sup>)/m  
C-Maximum: 85 kPa







**LEGEND**

 OBSERVED SLOPE EROSION AREAS AND PHOTO NO.

6

**NOTES**

THE POSITION OF ALL POLE LINES, CONDUITS, WATERMANS, SEWERS AND OTHER UNDERGROUND AND OVERGROUND UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES IS NOT NECESSARILY SHOWN ON THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS, AND WHERE SHOWN, THE ACCURACY OF THE POSITION OF SUCH UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES IS NOT GUARANTEED. BEFORE STARTING WORK, DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL SUCH UTILITIES AND STRUCTURES AND ASSUME ALL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE TO THEM.

NO.	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	APPD	NO.	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	APPD
1	REVISED	25/01/17	MN	IT					

SCALE

HORIZ 1:500

0 5m 10m 20m


HORIZONTAL 1:500

DESIGNED BY

REVIEWED BY

CLIENT

**HUMANICS UNIVERSAL INC.**  
 601 BROOKRIDGE CRES.,  
 ORLEANS, ON., K4A 1Z6 613-824-1525




exp. Services Inc.  
 2111 GERRARD ST. E. #113-225 T20  
 2650 Queenview Drive, Unit 100  
 Ottawa, ON K2B 6H6  
 Canada  
 www.exp.ca  
 • BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY •  
 • INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY •

ROLE/PLAN	DATE
DESIGN SA	
CHECKED SA	
DWG JR/MN	
PROJ. MAN SA	
APPROVED SA	

**HUMANICS SANCTUARY AND SCULPTURE PARK**  
 3400 OLD MONTREAL ROAD, OTTAWA, ON

**OBSERVED SLOPE EROSION AREAS & PHOTO NO.**

PROJ. NO. OTT-00229886-A0

SURVEY 

DATE DEC. 2015

DRAWING NO. **FIG 37**


Humanics: 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 20150125 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM  
 User: Humanics 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM 1/25/2015 10:25:00 AM  
 Reference: X:\01\Humanics\2015\0125\0125\_1025\_00.dwg Xref Concept for 2015\_1025\_00.dwg

## **Explanation of Terms Used on Borehole Logs**

## **Appendix A: One-dimensional Oedometer Test Results from Report OTT-00019355-A0**

One Dimensional Consolidation Test Results  
Borehole 6 - 3.0 m to 3.6 m Depth


Graph - e vs log P



$P'_c$  = 175 kPa  
 $P'_o$  = 45 kPa  
 $C_{cr}$  = 0.086  
 $C_c$  = 0.957

One Dimensional Consolidation Test Results  
Borehole 1 - 4.6 m to 5.2 m Depth

Graph - e vs log P



$P'_c$  = 190 kPa  
 $P'_o$  = 55 kPa  
 $C_{cr}$  = 0.0864  
 $C_c$  = 1.014

## **Appendix B – Pathways & Erosion Photos**



**Photo No. 1 – Erosion of cut uphill of the pathway.  
Cut approximately 18 m long x 0.3 m high**



**Photo No. 2 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway. Cut approximately 9 m long x 0.4 m high.**



**Photo No. 3 – Erosion above pathway approximately 5 m long x 0.4 to 1.0 m high**



**Photo No. 4 – Erosion above pathway. Approximately 3 m deep and 0.6 m to 1.3 m high.**





**Photo No. 5 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway. Cut approximately 12 m long x 0.9 m high.**



**Photo No. 6 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway.  
Cut approximately 16 m long x 0.5 m to 1 m high.**



**Photo No. 7 – Erosion of slope downhill of pathway.  
Area approximately 30 m long x 1 m to 3 m high.**



**Photo No. 8 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway.  
Cut approximately 42 m long x 0.5 m to 1.3 m high.**



**Photo No. 9 – Erosion of slope downhill of pathway.  
Area approximately 30 m long by 2 m to 3 m high.**



**Photo No. 10 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway.  
Cut approximately 20 m long x 0.4 m to 1.2 m high.**



**Photo No. 11 – Erosion of slope downhill of pathway.  
Approximately 18 m long x 1 m to 2 m high.**



**Photo No. 12 – Erosion of slope uphill of pathway.**



**Photo No. 13 – Erosion of slope uphill of pathway.  
Area approximately 5 m long and 1 m to 1.5 m high.**



**Photo No. 14 – Erosion of slope downhill of pathway.  
Note placement of logs to prevent erosion.**



**Photo No. 15 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway.  
Area approximately 7 m long and 0.8 m to 1.6 m high.**



**Photo No. 17 – Erosion of cut downhill of pathway.  
Cut approximately 30 m long x 0.3 m high.**



**Photo No. 18 – Erosion of cut uphill of pathway. Cut approximately 3 m long x 1.2 m high.**



**Photo No. 19 – Erosion of cut above pathway. Cut approximately 7 m long x 0.8 m high.**



**Photo No. 20 – Deep cut downhill of pathway.  
Cut approximately 12 m long x 0.5 m to 1 m high.**



**Photo No. 21 – Erosion of cut above pathway.  
Cut approximately 45 m long x 0.3 m to 0.8 m high.**





**Photo No. 22 – Erosion below pathway. Cut approximately 30 m long x 0.5 to 2 m high.**



**Photo No. 23 – Erosion of slope downhill of pathway.  
Area approximately 12 m long x 1.5 m to 2 m high.**



**Photo No. 24 – Erosion of cut above pathway. Cut approximately 20 m long x 0.4 m high.**



**Photo No. 25 – Erosion of cut above pathway. Cut approximately 4 m long x 0.6 m high.**



**Photo No. 26 –Retaining wall at pond location.**



**Photo No. 27 –Retaining walls across from the pond and the pathway.**



**Photo No. 28 – Terraced retaining wall at the Buddhist Meditation section.**



**Photo No. 29 – Terraced retaining wall at the Christian Meditation area.**



**Photo No. 30 – Retaining wall at the entrance to the sanctuary.**

*Humanics Universal Inc.  
Geotechnical Investigation and Slope Stability Assessment  
Proposed Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park  
3400 Old Montreal Road  
Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Old Survey  
Ottawa (Formerly Township of Cumberland), Ontario  
Project Number: OTT-00229886-A0  
November 25, 2022, 3<sup>rd</sup> Revision*

## **Appendix C: Bernie Muncatser Letter , April 14, 2022**



Muncaster  
Environmental  
Planning Inc.

April 14, 2022

Dr. Ranjit Perera  
President, Humanics Universal Inc.  
601 Brookridge Crescent  
Orleans, Ontario  
K4A 1Z6

Dear Dr. Perera:

**RE: Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park  
Scoped Environmental Impact Statement – Two Gazebos**

Great to catch up this week and many thanks for your assistance. On April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022 I reviewed the proposed locations and adjacent lands of two gazebos in the north portion of the Humanics Sanctuary and Sculpture Park, south of Old Montreal Road. The municipal address is 3468 Old Montreal Road. The field survey was completed from 08:00 to 09:20 under good weather conditions, with sunny skies, a light air, and a temperature of 11°C.

Map 1 below is an excerpt from the Site Servicing and Grading Plan prepared by exp Services Inc. (revised December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021) which shows the proposed locations of the two gazebos. The north gazebos, closest to Old Montreal Road, is referred to as the ‘Islamic gazebo’, while the gazebo to the south is known as the ‘Charter of Rights and Freedom gazebo’. As shown on the Site Servicing and Grading Plan the proposed locations of the gazebos are within the Environmental Setback (brown dashed line). The Environmental Setback is defined as 15 metres from the Crest of Slope (black dashed line) associated with a ravine containing a tributary of Beckett’s Creek. The purpose of this scoped EIS is to assess potential impacts associated with placing the two gazebos within the outer portion of the 15 metre setback.

Islamic Gazebo

The north Islamic gazebo will be small, approximately 3.6 metres in diameter, and octagonal in shape. It will be built on a concrete slab, and made of wood and brick with a small copper dome. With the dome, the Islamic gazebo will be approximately 4.5 metres in height. The gazebo will be ‘walk-in and walk-out’ in nature, with interpretative panels. The gazebo has been situated to provide a clear site line in the direction facing towards Mecca. No servicing will be required for the operation of the gazebo.

### Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms Gazebo

The south gazebo will be approximately eight metres to the south of the Islamic gazebo. This rectangular gazebo will also be small, approximately 3.6 x 4.3 metres. It will also be built on a concrete slab, and made of wood and brick. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms gazebo will be also 'walk-in and walk-out' in nature and have interpretative panels. No servicing will be required for the operation of this gazebo.

### Existing Conditions

Significant woodlands and valleylands were identified by McIntosh Perry (2017) in association with the Beckett's Creek tributary ravine to the west of gazebo locations. No wetlands or channels were observed on or adjacent to the proposed gazebo locations. Sandy soils dominate the tablelands, with clay soils more common within the ravine.

The footprint of both gazebos will be at the outer edge of an upland mixed forest. This forest was described by McIntosh Perry (2017) as a dry-fresh hardwood – hemlock mixed forest. The concrete slab for the south gazebo is existing (Photo 2) and the location of the north gazebo currently contains a small stockpiling area of larger cobbles (Photo 1). No additional trees will be removed for the gazebo construction. Examples of the larger adjacent trees to be retained include sugar maples up to 25cm diameter at breast height (dbh), bur oaks and white spruce in the 35 – 40cm dbh range and a 50cm dbh white pine. Smaller yellow birch, red maple, and poplars are also present. There are dirt and wood chip pathways in the vicinity of the gazebo locations (Photo 3), along with the gravel driveway entrance south off Old Montreal Road to the east of the gazebo locations. The driveway, parking areas, and pathways are all made of permeable material.

No Species at Risk were identified by McIntosh Perry (2017) in the vicinity of the proposed gazebo locations. Four butternuts were identified by McIntosh Perry (2017) on the overall site, with all of the butternuts assessed as unhealthy (Category 1) by McIntosh Perry (2017). The closest of these Category 1 butternuts is more than 25 metres from the gazebo locations. No healthy butternuts were observed within 50 metres of the gazebo locations during the April 12<sup>th</sup> survey.

The gazebos will be located a minimum of 10 metres from the crest of slope. The crest of slope is well treed as are the portions of the valley leading to the tributary of Beckett's Creek. The tableland setback from the crest of slope is forested closer to the crest save for the permeable pathways, with intermittent tree cover in the outer portions of the setback.





*Photo 1 – Proposed location of the Islamic gazebo (north gazebo).  
View looking north towards Old Montreal Road*



*Photo 2 – Proposed location of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms gazebo (south gazebo).  
View looking west towards the crest of slope and Beckett's Creek tributary ravine*



*Photo 3 – Typical condition of setback between the proposed gazebo locations and the crest of slope (to left) with a permeable pathway. View looking north towards Old Montreal Road*

### Assessment

Although the two gazebo locations will be within the outer limit of the 15 metre setback associated with the crest of slope of the Beckett's Creek tributary valley, the construction and operation of the two gazebos is not anticipated to result in a detectable impact on the natural environment including the features and functions of the Beckett's Creek tributary ravine due to:

- the small size and relatively benign use of the gazebos, with no servicing or excavations required. The gazebo size will not generate a noticeable amount of roof runoff;
- the gazebos are located at the outer edge of the crest of slope setback and will not require tree removal for construction or operation; and,
- the setback has a gentle slope and is well treed with permeable pathways present. With the sandy soils, any minor runoff is anticipated to infiltrate before reaching the crest of slope. There will be a minimum of ten metres between the footprints of the gazebos and the crest of slope.

Conclusion

This scoped EIS assesses the proposed construction and operation of two gazebos located in the outer portion of the 15 metre crest of slope setback from the Beckett's Creek tributary ravine to the west. Significant natural heritage features in proximity to the proposed gazebos include the significant woodlands and valleylands associated with the ravine and the fish habitat within the tributary. No Species at Risk issues were identified for the gazebo locations.

The construction and operation of the two gazebos is not anticipated to result in a detectable impact on the natural environment including the features and functions of the Beckett's Creek tributary ravine due to:

- the small size and relatively benign use of the gazebos with no servicing or excavations required. The gazebo size will not generate a noticeable amount of roof runoff;
- the gazebos are located at the outer edge of the crest of slope setback and will not require tree removal for construction or operation; and,
- the setback has a gentle slope and is well treed with permeable pathways present. With the sandy soils, any minor runoff is anticipated to infiltrate before reaching the crest of slope. There will be a minimum of ten metres between the footprints of the gazebos and the crest of slope.

Based on this assessment it is concluded that an Environmental Setback of 10 metres from the crest of slope is sufficient for the footprints of the proposed gazebos.

Reference

McIntosh Perry Consulting Engineers Ltd. 2017. Environmental Impact Statement & Tree Conservation Report. Application for Site Plan Approval & Zoning By-law Amendment 3400 Old Montreal Road, City of Ottawa. Amended June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017. 36 pp & append.

Please call if you have any questions or comments on this scoped assessment.



Yours Sincerely,  
**MUNCASTER ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INC.**



Bernie Muncaster  
Principal

humanicspergola 22

Map 1 – Portion of Grading Plan by exp Services Inc. (2021)  
With Proposed Gazebo Locations



### LEGEND

	PROPERTY LINE
	EXISTING OVERHEAD HYDRO & POLE
	EXISTING HYDRO EASEMENT
	EXISTING CHAINLINK FENCE
	PROPOSED TERRACING TO MATCH EXISTING GRADE (SLOPE 3:1 MAX.)
	PROPOSED SWALE
	PROPOSED INFILTRATION TRENCH
	PROPOSED CULVERT
	WELL LOCATION
	TEST PIT LOCATION
	BOREHOLE LOCATION
	FINISHED FLOOR ELEVATION
	UNDERSIDE OF FOOTING ELEVATION
	EXISTING CONTOUR
	PROPOSED LIMIT OF DEVELOPMENT
	CREST OF SLOPE
	LIMIT OF HAZARDOUS LANDS
	STABLE SLOPE ALLOWANCE
	ENVIRONMENTAL SETBACK
	EROSION ALLOWANCE
	TOE OF SLOPE

## List of Distribution

### Report Distributed To:

Dr. Ranjit Perera, Humanics Universal Inc. - [dr.rperera@rogers.com](mailto:dr.rperera@rogers.com)

**Exp** Infrastructure Services; [Bruce.Thomas@exp.com](mailto:Bruce.Thomas@exp.com)