APPENDIX ‘G’

GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

AECOM Canada Ltd.
99 Commerce Drive
Winnipeg MB R3P 0Y7
Canada

T: 204.477.5381
F: 431.800.1210
aecom.com

Mr. Ryan Cunningham
AECOM Canada Ltd.
99 Commerce Drive
Winnipeg, MB R3P 0Y7

May 05, 2023

Project #
60697893

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

Subject: City of Winnipeg 2023 Regional Streets Renewal: Logan Avenue - Geotechnical Data Report

This geotechnical data report provides the results of a geotechnical investigation performed by AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) for the proposed reconstruction of Logan Avenue from Main Street to Disraeli Freeway as part of the City of Winnipeg's 2023 Regional Streets Renewal Program. The main objective of the geotechnical investigation was to determine the subsurface conditions below the existing pavement structure.

Three test holes were completed along the roadway section.

Soil logs providing detailed descriptions of subsurface conditions encountered at the test hole locations are presented in **Appendix A**.

Test hole drilling was completed by Paddock Drilling Ltd. using a truck-mounted rig equipped with solid stem augers (SSA), and pavement thicknesses were measured within the augered hole. A summary of test holes is provided in **Table 01** in **Appendix B**.

Test holes were drilled to a depth of approximately 2.7 m below the existing road surface. During the drilling, AECOM personnel observed subsurface conditions and visually classified the collected soil samples. Other pertinent information such as groundwater and drilling conditions were also recorded. Disturbed soil samples collected during the site investigation were transported to AECOM Winnipeg Geotechnical Laboratory in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

The laboratory soil testing consisted of determination of moisture contents (ASTM D2216), Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318), Grain Size Distribution (ASTM D7928), Standard Proctor (ASTM D698), and California Bearing Ratio (ASTM D1883). Laboratory soil test results are shown on the test hole logs in **Appendix A,** summarized in **Appendix B**, and attached in **Appendix C**.

Sincerely,
AECOM Canada Ltd.

Prepared by:

Enrico Manimbao, E.I.T.
Laboratory Manager

Reviewed by:

German Leal, M.Sc., P. Eng.
Discipline Lead, Geotechnical

Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the "Report") has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. ("Consultant") for the benefit of the client ("Client") in accordance with the agreement between Consultant and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the "Agreement").

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the "Information"):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the "Limitations");
- represents Consultant's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to Consultant which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

Consultant shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. Consultant accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

Consultant agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but Consultant makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by Consultant represent Consultant's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since Consultant has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, Consultant, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by Consultant and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

Consultant accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information ("improper use of the Report"), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of Consultant to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

AECOM: 2015-01-06

Appendix A

Test Hole Logs

AECOM Canada Ltd.

GENERAL STATEMENT

NORMAL VARIABILITY OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The scope of the investigation presented herein is limited to an investigation of the subsurface conditions as to suitability for the proposed project. This report has been prepared to aid in the evaluation of the site and to assist the engineer in the design of the facilities. Our description of the project represents our understanding of the significant aspects of the project relevant to the design and construction of earth work, foundations and similar. In the event of any changes in the basic design or location of the structures as outlined in this report or plan, we should be given the opportunity to review the changes and to modify or reaffirm in writing the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

The analysis and recommendations presented in this report are based on the data obtained from the borings and test pit excavations made at the locations indicated on the site plans and from other information discussed herein. This report is based on the assumption that the subsurface conditions everywhere are not significantly different from those disclosed by the borings and excavations. However, variations in soil conditions may exist between the excavations and, also, general groundwater levels and conditions may fluctuate from time to time. The nature and extent of the variations may not become evident until construction. If subsurface conditions differ from those encountered in the exploratory borings and excavations, are observed or encountered during construction, or appear to be present beneath or beyond excavations, we should be advised at once so that we can observe and review these conditions and reconsider our recommendations where necessary.

Since it is possible for conditions to vary from those assumed in the analysis and upon which our conclusions and recommendations are based, a contingency fund should be included in the construction budget to allow for the possibility of variations which may result in modification of the design and construction procedures.

In order to observe compliance with the design concepts, specifications or recommendations and to allow design changes in the event that subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated, we recommend that all construction operations dealing with earth work and the foundations be observed by an experienced soils engineer. We can be retained to provide these services for you during construction. In addition, we can be retained to review the plans and specifications that have been prepared to check for substantial conformance with the conclusions and recommendations contained in our report.

EXPLANATION OF FIELD & LABORATORY TEST DATA

The field and laboratory test results, as shown for each hole, are described below.

1. NATURAL MOISTURE CONTENT

The relationship between the natural moisture content and depth is significant in determining the subsurface moisture conditions. The Atterberg Limits for a sample should be compared to its natural moisture content and plotted on the Plasticity Chart in order to determine the soil classification.

2. SOIL PROFILE AND DESCRIPTION

Each soil stratum is classified and described noting any special conditions. The Modified Unified Classification System (MUCS) is used. The soil profile refers to the existing ground level at the time the hole was done. Where available, the ground elevation is shown. The soil symbols used are shown in detail on the soil classification chart.

3. TESTS ON SOIL SAMPLES

Laboratory and field tests are identified by the following and are on the logs:

N - Standard Penetration Test (SPT) Blow Count. The SPT is conducted in the field to assess the in-situ consistency of cohesive soils and the relative density of non-cohesive soils. The N value recorded is the number of blows from a 63.5 kg hammer dropped 760 mm which is required to drive a 51 mm split spoon sampler 300 mm into the soil.

SO_4 - Water Soluble Sulphate Content. Expressed in percent. Conducted primarily to determine requirements for the use of sulphate resistant cement. Further details on the water-soluble sulphate content are given in Section 6.

γ_D - Dry Unit Weight. Usually expressed in kN/m^3.

γ_T - Total Unit Weight. Usually expressed in kN/m^3.

Q_U - Unconfined Compressive Strength. Usually expressed in kPa and may be used in determining allowable bearing capacity of the soil.

C_U - Undrained Shear Strength. Usually expressed in kPa. This value is determined by either a direct shear test or by an unconfined compression test and may also be used in determining the allowable bearing capacity of the soil.

C_{PEN} - Pocket Penetrometer Reading. Usually expressed in kPa. Estimate of the undrained shear strength as determined by a pocket penetrometer.

The following tests may also be performed on selected soil samples and the results are given on separate sheets enclosed with the logs:

- Grain Size Analysis
- Standard or Modified Proctor Compaction Test
- California Bearing Ratio Test
- Direct Shear Test
- Permeability Test
- Consolidation Test
- Triaxial Test

4. SOIL DENSITY AND CONSISTENCY

The SPT test described above may be used to estimate the consistency of cohesive soils and the density of cohesionless soils. These approximate relationships are summarized in the following tables:

Table 1 Cohesive Soils

N	Consistency	C_u (kPa) approx.
0 - 1	Very Soft	<10
1 - 4	Soft	10 - 25
4 - 8	Firm	25 - 50
8 - 15	Stiff	50 - 100
15 - 30	Very Stiff	100 - 200
30 - 60	Hard	200 - 300
>60	Very Hard	>300

Table 2 Cohesionless Soils

N	Density
0 - 5	Very Loose
5 - 10	Loose
10 - 30	Compact
30 - 50	Dense
>50	Very Dense

5. SAMPLE CONDITION AND TYPE

The depth, type, and condition of samples are indicated on the logs by the following symbols:



6. WATER SOLUBLE SULPHATE CONCENTRATION

The following table, from CSA Standard A23.1-14, indicates the requirements for concrete subjected to sulphate attack based upon the percentage of water-soluble sulphate as presented on the logs. CSA Standard A23.1-14 should be read in conjunction with the table.

Table 3 Requirements for Concrete Subjected to Sulphate Attack*

Class of exposure	Degree of exposure	Water-soluble sulphate (SO_4)† in soil sample, %	Sulphate (SO_4) in groundwater samples, mg/L‡	Water soluble sulphate (SO_4) in recycled aggregate sample, %	Cementing materials to be used§††	Performance requirements§,§§		
						Maximum expansion when tested using CSA A3004-C8 Procedure A at 23 °C, %		Maximum expansion when tested using CSA A3004-C8 Procedure B at 5 °C, % †††
						At 6 months	At 12 months††	At 18 months‡‡
S-1	Very severe	> 2.0	> 10 000	> 2.0	HS** ,HSb, HSLb*** or HSe	0.05	0.10	0.10
S-2	Severe	0.20–2.0	1500–10 000	0.60–2.0	HS**, HSb, HSLb*** or HSe	0.05	0.10	0.10
S-3	Moderate (including seawater exposure*)	0.10–0.20	150–1500	0.20–0.60	MS, MSb, MSe, MSLb***, LH, LHb, HS**, HSb, HSLb*** or HSe	0.10		0.10

*For sea water exposure, also see Clause 4.1.1.5.
†In accordance with CSA A23.2-3B.
‡In accordance with CSA A23.2-2B.
§Where combinations of supplementary cementing materials and portland or blended hydraulic cements are to be used in the concrete mix design instead of the cementing materials listed, and provided they meet the performance requirements demonstrating equivalent performance against sulphate exposure, they shall be designated as MS equivalent (MSe) or HS equivalent (HSe) in the relevant sulphate exposures (see Clauses 4.1.1.6.2, 4.2.1.1, and 4.2.1.3, and 4.2.1.4).
**Type HS cement shall not be used in reinforced concrete exposed to both chlorides and sulphates, including seawater. See Clause 4.1.1.6.3.

††The requirement for testing at 5 °C does not apply to MS, HS, MSb, HSb, and MSe and HSe combinations made without portland limestone cement.
‡‡ If the increase in expansion between 12 and 18 months exceeds 0.03%, the sulphate expansion at 24 months shall not exceed 0.10% in order for the cement to be deemed to have passed the sulphate resistance requirement.
§§For demonstrating equivalent performance, use the testing frequency in Table 1 of CSA A3004-A1 and see the applicable notes to Table A3 in A3001 with regard to re-establishing compliance if the composition of the cementing materials used to establish compliance changes.
***Where MSLb or HSLb cements are proposed for use, or where MSe or HSe combinations include Portland-limestone cement, they must also contain a minimum of 25% Type F fly ash or 40% slag or 15% metakaolin (meeting Type N pozzolan requirements) or a combination of 5% Type SF silica fume with 25% slag or a combination of 5% Type SF silica fume with 20% Type F fly ash. For some proposed MSLb, HSLb, and MSe or HSe combinations that include Portland-limestone cement, higher SCM replacement levels may be required to meet the A3004-C8 Procedure B expansion limits. Due to the 18-month test period, SCM replacements higher than the identified minimum levels should also be tested. In addition, sulphate resistance testing shall be run on MSLb and HSLb cement and MSe or HSe combinations that include Portland-limestone cement at both 23 °C and 5 °C as specified in the table.
†††If the expansion is greater than 0.05% at 6 months but less than 0.10% at 1 year, the cementing materials combination under test shall be considered to have passed.

7. SOIL CORROSIVITY

The following table, from the Handbook of Corrosion Engineering (Roberge, 1999) indicates the corrosivity rating can be obtained from the soil resistivity, presented on the logs.

Table 4 Corrosivity Ratings Based on Soil Resistivity

Soil Resistivity (ohm-cm)	Corrosivity Rating
>20,000	Essentially non-corrosive
10,000 – 20,000	Mildly corrosive
5,000 – 10,000	Moderately corrosive
3,000 – 5,000	Corrosive
1,000 – 3,000	Highly corrosive
<1,000	Extremely corrosive

8. GROUNDWATER TABLE

The groundwater table is indicated by the equilibrium level of water in a standpipe installed in a testhole or test pit. This level is generally taken at least 24 hours after installation of the standpipe. The groundwater level is subject to seasonal variations and is usually highest in the spring. The symbol on the logs indicating the groundwater level is an inverted solid triangle (▼).

TABLE 1 Soil Classification Chart

Criteria for Assigning Group Symbols and Group Names Using Laboratory Tests[A]				Soil Classification	
				Group Symbol	Group Name[B]
COARSE-GRAINED SOILS	Gravels (More than 50 % of coarse fraction retained on No. 4 sieve)	Clean Gravels (Less than 5 % fines[C])	Cu ≥ 4.0 and 1 ≤ Cc ≤ 3.0[D]	GW	Well-graded gravel[E]
			Cu < 4.0 and/or [Cc < 1 or Cc > 3.0][D]	GP	Poorly graded gravel[E]
		Gravels with Fines (More than 12 % fines[C])	Fines classify as ML or MH	GM	Silty gravel[E,F,G]
			Fines classify as CL or CH	GC	Clayey gravel[E,F,G]
More than 50 % retained on No. 200 sieve	Sands (50 % or more of coarse fraction passes No. 4 sieve)	Clean Sands (Less than 5 % fines[H])	Cu ≥ 6.0 and 1.0 ≤ Cc ≤ 3.0[D]	SW	Well-graded sand[I]
			Cu < 6.0 and/or [Cc < 1.0 or Cc > 3.0][D]	SP	Poorly graded sand[I]
		Sands with Fines (More than 12 % fines[H])	Fines classify as ML or MH	SM	Silty sand[F,G,I]
			Fines classify as CL or CH	SC	Clayey sand[F,G,I]
FINE-GRAINED SOILS	Silts and Clays Liquid limit less than 50	inorganic	PI > 7 and plots on or above "A" line[J]	CL	Lean clay[K,L,M]
			PI < 4 or plots below "A" line[J]	ML	Silt[K,L,M]
		organic	$\frac{\text{Liquid limit – oven dried}}{\text{Liquid limit – not dried}} < 0.75$	OL	Organic clay[K,L,M,N] / Organic silt[K,L,M,O]
50 % or more passes the No. 200 sieve	Silts and Clays Liquid limit 50 or more	inorganic	PI plots on or above "A" line	CH	Fat clay[K,L,M]
			PI plots below "A" line	MH	Elastic silt[K,L,M]
		organic	$\frac{\text{Liquid limit – oven dried}}{\text{Liquid limit – not dried}} < 0.75$	OH	Organic clay[K,L,M,P] / Organic silt[K,L,M,Q]
HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS	Primarily organic matter, dark in color, and organic odor			PT	Peat

[A] Based on the material passing the 3-in. (75-mm) sieve.
[B] If field sample contained cobbles or boulders, or both, add "with cobbles or boulders, or both" to group name.
[C] Gravels with 5 to 12 % fines require dual symbols:
GW-GM well-graded gravel with silt
GW-GC well-graded gravel with clay
GP-GM poorly graded gravel with silt
GP-GC poorly graded gravel with clay
[D] $Cu = D_{60}/D_{10}$ $Cc = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}}$
[E] If soil contains ≥15 % sand, add "with sand" to group name.
[F] If fines classify as CL-ML, use dual symbol GC-GM, or SC-SM.
[G] If fines are organic, add "with organic fines" to group name.
[H] Sands with 5 to 12 % fines require dual symbols:
SW-SM well-graded sand with silt
SW-SC well-graded sand with clay
SP-SM poorly graded sand with silt
SP-SC poorly graded sand with clay
[I] If soil contains ≥15 % gravel, add "with gravel" to group name.
[J] If Atterberg limits plot in hatched area, soil is a CL-ML, silty clay.
[K] If soil contains 15 to <30 % plus No. 200, add "with sand" or "with gravel," whichever is predominant.
[L] If soil contains ≥30 % plus No. 200, predominantly sand, add "sandy" to group name.
[M] If soil contains ≥30 % plus No. 200, predominantly gravel, add "gravelly" to group name.
[N] PI ≥ 4 and plots on or above "A" line.
[O] PI < 4 or plots below "A" line.
[P] PI plots on or above "A" line.
[Q] PI plots below "A" line.

C136 Test Method for Sieve Analysis of Fine and Coarse Aggregates
C702 Practice for Reducing Samples of Aggregate to Testing Size
D653 Terminology Relating to Soil, Rock, and Contained Fluids
D1140 Test Methods for Determining the Amount of Material Finer than 75-µm (No. 200) Sieve in Soils by Washing
D2216 Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass
D2488 Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedures)
D3740 Practice for Minimum Requirements for Agencies Engaged in Testing and/or Inspection of Soil and Rock as Used in Engineering Design and Construction
D4083 Practice for Description of Frozen Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure)
D4318 Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils
D4427 Classification of Peat Samples by Laboratory Testing



FIG. 4 Plasticity Chart



$$Cu = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} = \frac{15}{0.075} = 200 \qquad Cc = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}} = \frac{(2.5)^2}{0.075 \times 15} = 5.6$$

FIG. 5 Cumulative Particle-Size Plot

Site Investigation Requirements for Public Works Street Projects

General

This guideline provides basic principles and requirements for site investigations and testing with which to guide the designer in the preparation of proposals and completion of their investigations. Irrespective of the requirements listed in this document, it is important that the Engineer clearly outlines what assumptions were made in estimating the effort and resources necessary to complete the scope of work. A proposal should be submitted for approval to the City's Project Manager.

When using this guideline, the designer remains responsible for the proposed plan in accordance to good engineering standards that address the specific needs and site conditions of the project. Without limiting that broad and general obligation, this guideline should be the minimum requirement.

Boreholes and pavement core spacing, and material testing guidelines presented in this guide are only applicable to pavement investigations. Site investigation and testing may also be conducted as per common industry practice for other road elements such as sidewalks, boulevards, and medians. The City's Project Manager should be notified of any unusual conditions or difficulties encountered, and any changes made in the investigation program.

New Construction and Reconstruction Projects

The number of boreholes can be calculated using Table 1.

Table 1 : Number of Boreholes and Depths

Lanes/Locals	Industrials and Collectors	Arterials
Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.45}$ A minimum of two boreholes, 2 m ± 150 mm depth from the bottom of the proposed or the existing pavement per project location.	Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.46}$ A minimum of three boreholes, 2.5 m ± 150 mm depth from the bottom of the proposed or the existing pavement per project location.	Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.48}$ A minimum of three boreholes, 2.5 m ± 150 mm depth from the bottom of the proposed or the existing pavement per project location.

[1]If previous soil information is available and relevant, the number of boreholes can be reduced - confirm with the City's Project Manager.
[2]Additional boreholes should be undertaken where adverse soil conditions are expected or encountered during the course of field drilling.

Offset the boreholes as appropriate to provide coverage across the full width of the proposed construction. Boreholes should not be advanced on utility cut patching. The locations of the boreholes should be shown clearly on a scaled plan map of the site under investigation.

The following factors should be considered while selecting borehole locations:

- Visual sub-grade variability;
- Significant pavement failures (rutting, fatigue cracking, settlement and faulting) which are often associated with sub-grade issues to diagnose the cause of these conditions; and,
- Exiting buried infrastructure.

Information regarding the sampler type, date and time of sampling, sample type and color, sample depth, ground water elevations, boreholes location, etc. should be shown in log form using notations and a graphical system. The log form should distinguish between visual evaluations of soil samples in the field versus a more precise laboratory evaluation supported by tests. Detailed boring logs including the results of laboratory tests should be included in the geotechnical report.

Measure and identify pavement materials (thickness and types of pavement structure materials). Photograph core samples recovered from the pavement surface (concrete, asphalt or composite).

Visual identification of the soil must be reported at the following depths from the bottom of the proposed or the existing pavement – 0.6 m, 0.9 m, 1.2 m, 1.6 m, 2.0 m, and 2.5 m (if required). Ensure that each soil type encountered in the boreholes is identified. The visual identification should describe the existing pavement structure, if any, including the materials encountered and the layer thicknesses.

Backfill boreholes with granular fill. Patch pavement surface with an approved cold patch asphalt or rapid set cementitious product to match the surface pavement type.

Where significant embankments are proposed along the roadway, specific testing and recommendations for the fill materials and placement should be made including expected settlements, load compensation requirements, and potential buoyancy of the embankment. The size, complexity and extent of the testing program will depend primarily on the type, height and size of embankment as well as the expected imported soil conditions – confirm with the City's Project Manager.

For embankments less than 100 m in length, a minimum of two boreholes are required. For embankments more than 100 m in length, the spacing between boreholes along the length of the embankment should not exceed 75 m with a minimum of two (2) boreholes. Extend the boreholes depths to a minimum of 2 m $\pm$ 150 mm below the proposed sub-grade level. At critical locations and where embankment heights exceed 1.0 m, a minimum of two (2) boreholes are required in the transverse direction to define the existing geological conditions for stability analyses.

Laboratory Testing Program

Determine the moisture content of the soils encountered in every borehole in accordance with ASTM D2216 Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass, at the following depths from the bottom of the proposed or existing pavement – 0.6 m, 0.9 m, 1.2 m, 1.6 m, 2.0 m, and 2.5 m (if required).

Classify and test the anticipated sub-grade soil in accordance with Table 2. The sub-grade soil is the material on which the pavement structure will be built; 0.6 m, 0.9 m, and 1.2 m may be used for locals, collectors, and arterials, respectively – confirm with the City's Project Manager.

Table 2: Boreholes Testing Frequency

Lanes/Locals	Collectors	Arterials
Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.4}$ A minimum of two boreholes should be tested per project location.	Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.41}$ A minimum of three boreholes should be tested per project location.	Number of boreholes = 0.1 × (Street area (m^2))$^{0.42}$ A minimum of three boreholes should be tested per project location.

The testing program should include:

- Particle Size Analysis – ASTM D6913 Standard Test Methods for Particle-Size Distribution (Gradation) of Soils Using Sieve Analysis and ASTM D7928 Standard Test Method for Particle-Size Distribution (Gradation) of Fine-Grained Soils Using the Sedimentation (Hydrometer) Analysis;
- Atterberg Limits – ASTM D4318 Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils; and,
- California Bearing Ratio (CBR) – ASTM D1883 Standard Test Method for California Bearing Ratio (CBR) of Laboratory-Compacted Soils. CBR test shall be performed at 95 % maximum dry density and optimum water content. All samples shall be soaked prior to testing.

The sub-grade classification should be in accordance with:

- ASTM D3282 - Standard Practice for Classification of Soils and Soil-Aggregate Mixtures for Highway Construction Purposes; and,
- ASTM D2487 - Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes.

The designer should consider the site specific factors listed above for borehole locations while selecting testing location and frequency.

More advanced testing may be required depending upon site conditions including direct shear tests, triaxial tests, unconfined compressive tests, permeability tests, consolidation tests, point load tests, slaking tests, pinhole dispersion tests or other tests as deemed appropriate and justified by the designer – confirm with the City's Project Manager.

Rehabilitation Projects

For any rehabilitation projects (Concrete, Asphalt or Composite), measure and identify pavement materials (thickness and types of pavement structure materials). Photograph core samples recovered from the pavement.

For concrete rehabilitation projects, 150 mm-diameter cores shall be taken at joints to identify proper rehabilitation strategies (i.e. mill/fill, partial depth repair, full depth repair). The number and location of cores will be determined by the designer after visiting the site – confirm with the City's Project Manager. A minimum of two (2) cores shall be collected mid-slab to determine the existing pavement thickness and concrete strength in accordance with CSA A23.2-14C – wet condition.

Factors that should be considered while selecting pavement core locations include but are not limited to:

- Significant variation in joint condition;
- Pumping slabs, cracks or distress and perceived moisture issues from side slopes/edge cracking; and,
- Significant changes in pavement structure thickness.

Non-destructive testing (i.e. Falling Weight Deflectometer and Ground Penetrating Radar) can be used to identify layer thicknesses and structural adequacy, load transfer at joints, and appropriate rehabilitation strategies, including partial depth repairs, full depth repairs, slab replacement, and overlays – confirm with the City's Project Manager.

Appendix B

Test Hole Summary

PROJECT: 2023 Regional Streets Renewal	CLIENT: City of Winnipeg	TESTHOLE NO: TH23-01
LOCATION: Logan Ave. - 6.0m S of N curb, 30.0m E of Main St.		PROJECT NO.: 60697893
CONTRACTOR: Paddock Drilling Ltd.	METHOD: Truck Mounted Rig - 150 mm SSA	ELEVATION (m):

SAMPLE TYPE: GRAB | SHELBY TUBE | SPLIT SPOON | BULK | NO RECOVERY | CORE

DEPTH (m)	USCS	SOIL SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE #	SPT (N)	COMMENTS	DEPTH
0	ASPH		ASPHALT					
	ML		SILT (ML) - trace sand - tan, firm, moist		G1 G2			
1			Fat CLAY (CH) - dark grey, firm, moist		G3 B3 G4		(B3) Soaked CBR: 2.7%, SPMDD: 1635 kg/m3, OMC: 20.8% (G4): Gravel 0.1%, Sand 0.2%, Clay 75.1%, Silt 24.6%	1
2	CH				G5			2
					G6			
3			END OF TEST HOLE AT 2.74 m IN CLAY Notes: 1. No seepage observed during augering. 2. No sloughing observed during augering. 3. Test hole backfilled with auger cuttings and sand 4. Replaced asphalt to original ground surface.					3
4								4
5								5
6								6
7								7
8								8
9								9
10								

PENETRATION TESTS: ✳ Becker ✳ | ◇ Dynamic Cone ◇ | ◆ SPT (Standard Pen Test) ◆ (Blows/300mm) 0 20 40 60 80 100 | ■ Total Unit Wt ■ (kN/m^3) 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Plastic MC Liquid 20 40 60 80 100

UNDRAINED SHEAR STRENGTH: + Torvane + | × QU/2 × | ☐ Lab Vane ☐ | △ Pocket Pen. △ | ⬘ Field Vane ⬘ (kPa) 50 100 150 200

AECOM

LOGGED BY: Enrico Manimbao	COMPLETION DEPTH: 2.74 m
REVIEWED BY: German Leal	COMPLETION DATE: 23-4-18
PROJECT ENGINEER: Ryan Cunningham	Page 1 of 1

LOG OF TEST HOLE 2023 REGIONAL STREETS RNEWAL (LOGAN).GPJ UMA WINN.GDT 23-5-10

PROJECT: 2023 Regional Streets Renewal	CLIENT: City of Winnipeg	TESTHOLE NO: TH23-02
LOCATION: Logan Ave. - 6.0m N of S curb, 30.0m W of Martha St.		PROJECT NO.: 60697893
CONTRACTOR: Paddock Drilling Ltd.	METHOD: Truck Mounted Rig - 150 mm SSA	ELEVATION (m):

SAMPLE TYPE: GRAB | SHELBY TUBE | SPLIT SPOON | BULK | NO RECOVERY | CORE

DEPTH (m)	USCS	SOIL SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE #	SPT (N)	COMMENTS	DEPTH
0	ASPH		ASPHALT					
	SW		WELL GRADED SAND (base course) - brown		G1			
			Clay Fill - trace silt, trace sand - grey, firm, moist, some silt inclusions - high plasticity - some silt below 1.40m		G2 G3 B4 G4 G5		(B4) Soaked CBR: 3.2%, SPMDD: 1490 kg/m3, OMC: 25.6%	
1	FILL							1
2	CH		Fat CLAY (CH) - dark grey, firm, moist		G6			2
3			END OF TEST HOLE AT 2.74 m IN CLAY Notes: 1. No seepage observed during augering. 2. No sloughing observed during augering. 3. Test hole backfilled with auger cuttings and sand 4. Replaced asphalt to original ground surface.					3
4								4
5								5
6								6
7								7
8								8
9								9
10								

PENETRATION TESTS: ✳ Becker ✳ | ◇ Dynamic Cone ◇ | ◆ SPT (Standard Pen Test) ◆ (Blows/300mm) 0 20 40 60 80 100 | ■ Total Unit Wt ■ (kN/m^3) 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Plastic MC Liquid 20 40 60 80 100

UNDRAINED SHEAR STRENGTH: + Torvane + | × QU/2 × | ☐ Lab Vane ☐ | △ Pocket Pen. △ | ⬘ Field Vane ⬘ (kPa) 50 100 150 200

AECOM

LOGGED BY: Enrico Manimbao	COMPLETION DEPTH: 2.74 m
REVIEWED BY: German Leal	COMPLETION DATE: 23-4-18
PROJECT ENGINEER: Ryan Cunningham	Page 1 of 1

LOG OF TEST HOLE 2023 REGIONAL STREETS RNEWAL (LOGAN).GPJ UMA WINN.GDT 23-5-10

PROJECT: 2023 Regional Streets Renewal	CLIENT: City of Winnipeg	TESTHOLE NO: TH23-03
LOCATION: EB Lane on Logan Ave. - 2.5m S of N curb, 30.0m W of Disraeli Fwy		PROJECT NO.: 60697893
CONTRACTOR: Paddock Drilling Ltd.	METHOD: Truck Mounted Rig - 150 mm SSA	ELEVATION (m):

SAMPLE TYPE: GRAB | SHELBY TUBE | SPLIT SPOON | BULK | NO RECOVERY | CORE

PENETRATION TESTS: Becker | Dynamic Cone | SPT (Standard Pen Test) (Blows/300mm) 0 20 40 60 80 100 | Total Unit Wt (kN/m³) 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Plastic MC Liquid 20 40 60 80 100

UNDRAINED SHEAR STRENGTH: Torvane | QU/2 | Lab Vane | Pocket Pen. | Field Vane (kPa) 50 100 150 200

DEPTH (m)	USCS	SOIL SYMBOL	SOIL DESCRIPTION	SAMPLE TYPE	SAMPLE #	SPT (N)	COMMENTS	DEPTH
0	ASPH CONC		ASPHALT CONCRETE					0
	ML		SILT (ML) - trace sand - tan, firm, moist		G1 G2 G3 B5			
1								1
			Fat CLAY (CH) - grey, firm, moist, some silt inclusions		G4 G5		(G4): Gravel 0.0%, Sand 0.4%, Clay 49.1%, Silt 50.5%	
2	CH							2
					G6			
3			END OF TEST HOLE AT 2.74 m IN CLAY Notes: 1. No seepage observed during augering. 2. No sloughing observed during augering. 3. Test hole backfilled with auger cuttings and sand 4. Replaced asphalt to original ground surface.					3
4								4
5								5
6								6
7								7
8								8
9								9
10								

AECOM

LOGGED BY: Enrico Manimbao	COMPLETION DEPTH: 2.74 m
REVIEWED BY: German Leal	COMPLETION DATE: 23-4-18
PROJECT ENGINEER: Ryan Cunningham	Page 1 of 1

LOG OF TEST HOLE 2023 REGIONAL STREETS RNEWAL (LOGAN).GPJ UMA WINN.GDT 23-5-10

City of Winnipeg

2023 Regional Streets Renewal - Geotechnical Investigation

Table 01 – Test Hole Summary

Test Hole No.	Test Hole Location	Pavement Structure			Remarks	Sample Depth (m)	Moisture Content (%)	Hydrometer Analysis				Atterberg Limits		
		Type	Thickness (mm)	Compressive Strength (MPa)				Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt (%)	Clay (%)	Liquid Limit (%)	Plastic Limit (%)	Plasticity Index (%)
TH23-01	Logan Ave. W bound – 6.0 m S of N curb, 30.0 m E of Main St.	Asphalt	360	-		0.30								
						0.60	25.9							
						0.90	23.1							
		Concrete	0	-		1.20	32.8	0.1	0.2	24.6	75.1	63.3	18.8	44.5
						1.50	36.4							
						2.60	5..8							
TH23-02	Logan Ave. E bound – 6.0 m N of S curb, 30.0 m W of Martha St.	Asphalt	178	-		0.30	23.7							
						0.60	33.5							
						0.90	29.8							
		Concrete	0	-		1.20	33							
						1.50	33.5							
						2.60	51.9							
TH23-03	Logan Ave. E bound – 2.5 m S of N curb, 30.0 m W of Disraeli Fwy.	Asphalt	50	-		0.30	4.5							
						0.60	22.9							
						0.90	25.7							
		Concrete	230	-		1.20	29.1							
						1.50	39.9							
						2.60	45.8	0.0	0.4	50.5	49.1	63.8	19.0	44.8

Appendix C

Laboratory Test Results

AECOM Canada Ltd.
Winnipeg Geotechnical Laboratory
99 Commerce Drive
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3P 0Y7
Phone: 204 477 5381 Fax: 204 284 2040

Project Name:	2023 Regional Streets Renewal	Supplier:	AECOM
Project Number:	60697893	Specification:	N/A
Client:	City Of Winnipeg	Field Technician:	EManimbao
Sample Location:	Logan Ave, Winnipeg, MB	Sample Date:	April 17, 2023
Sample Depth:	Varies	Lab Technician:	LBoughton
Sample Number:	Varies	Date Tested:	April 20, 2023

Moisture Content (ASTM D2216-10)

Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass

Location	Sample	Depth (m)	**Moisture Content (%)**
TH23-01	G1	0.30 - 0.46 m	**-**
	G2	0.61 - 0.76 m	**25.9%**
	G3	0.91 - 1.07 m	**23.1%**
	G4	1.22 - 1.37 m	**32.8%**
	G5	1.52 - 1.68 m	**36.4%**
	G6	2.59 - 2.74 m	**53.8%**
	B3	0.61 - 1.52 m	**29.8%**
TH23-02	G1	0.30 - 0.46 m	**23.7%**
	G2	0.61 - 0.76 m	**33.5%**
	G3	0.91 - 1.07 m	**29.8%**
	G4	1.22 - 1.37 m	**33.0%**
	G5	1.52 - 1.68 m	**33.5%**
	G6	2.59 - 2.74 m	**51.9%**
	B4	0.61 - 1.52 m	**22.2%**
TH23-03	G1	0.30 - 0.46 m	**4.5%**
	G2	0.61 - 0.76 m	**22.9%**
	G3	0.91 - 1.07 m	**25.7%**
	G4	1.22 - 1.37 m	**29.1%**
	G5	1.52 - 1.68 m	**39.9%**
	G6	2.59 - 1.52 m	**45.8%**
	B5	0.61 - 1.52 m	**-**

Location	Sample	Depth (m)	**Moisture Content (%)**

AECOM Canada Ltd.
Winnipeg Geotechnical Laboratory
99 Commerce Drive
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3P 0Y7
Phone: 204 477 5381 Fax: 204 284 2040

CERTIFIED BY CCIL

Project Name:	2023 Regional Streets Renewal (Logan)	Supplier:	AECOM
Project Number:	60697893	Specification:	N/A
Client:	City of Winnipeg	Field Technician:	EManimbao
Sample Location:	TH23-01	Sample Date:	April 17, 2023
Sample Depth:	1.22 - 1.37 m	Lab Technician:	LBoughton
Sample Number:	G4	Date Tested:	April 25, 2023

Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318)

Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils

Liquid Limit			
Blows	30	21	15
Wet Sample (g)	14.9	11.4	10.2
Dry Sample (g)	9.2	6.9	6.1
Water Content (%)	61.8%	64.9%	67.2%

Plastic Limit		
Trial	1	2
Wet Sample (g)	5.5	5.7
Dry Sample (g)	4.7	4.8
Water Content (%)	18.7%	18.9%



Liquid Limit (%): 63.3%	Plastic Limit (%): 18.8%	Plasticity Index (%): 44.5%

AECOM Canada Ltd.
Winnipeg Geotechnical Laboratory
99 Commerce Drive
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3P 0Y7
Phone: 204 477 5381 Fax: 204 284 2040

CERTIFIED BY CCIL

Project Name:	2023 Regional Streets Renewal (Logan)	Supplier:	AECOM
Project Number:	60697893	Specification:	N/A
Client:	City Of Winnipeg	Field Technician:	EManimbao
Sample Location:	TH23-03	Sample Date:	April 17, 2023
Sample Depth:	2.59 - 2.74 m	Lab Technician:	LBoughton
Sample Number:	G6	Date Tested:	April 25, 2023

Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318)

Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils

Liquid Limit			
Blows	35	25	18
Wet Sample (g)	11.6	12.4	11.7
Dry Sample (g)	7.2	7.6	7.0
Water Content (%)	61.9%	63.0%	66.7%

Plastic Limit		
Trial	1	2
Wet Sample (g)	5.3	5.9
Dry Sample (g)	4.5	5.0
Water Content (%)	19.0%	19.0%



Liquid Limit (%): 63.8%	Plastic Limit (%): 19.0%	Plasticity Index (%): 44.8%

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION
(ASTM D422-63)

AECOM
WINNIPEG GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY
99 Commerce Dr., Winnipeg, MB R3P 0Y7 Canada
tel (204) 477-5381 **fax** (431) 800-1210

CERTIFIED BY CCIL

Job No.:	60689096	Hole No.:	TH23-01
Client:	COW	Sample No.:	G4
Project :	2023 Regional Streets Renewal (Logan)	Depth:	1.22 - 1.37 m
Date Tested:	25-Apr-23	Date Sampled:	Varies
Tested By:	LBoughton	Sampled By:	AECOM

GRAVEL SIZES		SAND SIZES		FINES	
Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing	Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing	Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing
50.0	100.0	4.75	99.9	0.0750	99.7
38.0	100.0	2.00	99.7	0.0499	99.7
25.0	100.0	0.825	99.7	0.0353	99.7
19.0	100.0	0.425	99.7	0.0254	96.5
12.5	100.0	0.18	99.7	0.0181	94.9
9.5	100.0	0.15	99.7	0.0130	91.8
4.75	99.9	0.075	99.7	0.0098	87.0
				0.0069	87.0
				0.0050	83.9
				0.0036	80.7
				0.0026	77.5
				0.0018	74.4
				0.0011	68.0

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION CURVE



Gravel	**0.1%**	**Silt**	**24.6%**
Sand	**0.2%**	**Clay**	**75.1%**

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION
(ASTM D422-63)

AECOM
WINNIPEG GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY
99 Commerce Dr., Winnipeg, MB R3P 0Y7 Canada
tel (204) 477-5381 **fax** (431) 800-1210

CERTIFIED BY CCIL

Job No.:	60689096	Hole No.:	TH23-03
Client:	CoW	Sample No.:	G6
Project :	2023 Regional Streets Renewal (Logan)	Depth:	2.59 - 2.74 m
Date Tested:	25-Apr-23	Date Sampled:	Varies
Tested By:	LBoughton	Sampled By:	AECOM

GRAVEL SIZES		SAND SIZES		FINES	
Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing	Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing	Grain Size (mm.)	Total Percent Passing
50.0	100.0	4.75	100.0	0.0750	99.6
38.0	100.0	2.00	99.9	0.0535	87.2
25.0	100.0	0.825	99.9	0.0378	87.2
19.0	100.0	0.425	99.8	0.0268	87.2
12.5	100.0	0.18	99.8	0.0189	87.2
9.5	100.0	0.15	99.7	0.0136	84.1
4.75	100.0	0.075	99.6	0.0102	77.7
				0.0073	74.5
				0.0054	65.0
				0.0039	58.7
				0.0028	52.3
				0.0020	49.1
				0.0012	46.0

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION CURVE



Gravel	**0.0%**	**Silt**	**50.5%**
Sand	**0.4%**	**Clay**	**49.1%**

AECOM WINNIPEG GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY
99 Commerce Drive, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3P 0Y7
tel (204) 477-5381 **fax** (431) 800-1210

Client:	City of Winnipeg	**Job No:**	60697893
Project:	2023 Regional Streets	**Sample:**	Fat CLAY (CH)
Lab No.	Logan TH23-01; B3	**Supplier:**	AECOM
Date Tested:	21-Apr-23	**Source:**	Winnipeg, MB

ASTM D698

TRIAL NUMBER	1	2	3	4	5
Wet Unit Weight (kg/cu.m.)	1909	1960	1997	1979	
Dry Unit Weight (kg/cu.m.)	1615	1629	1632	1588	
Moisture Content (%)	18.2	20.3	22.4	24.7	



Description / Remarks:	
As received moisture content (%)	N/A
Specific Gravity (Assumed)	2.66
Method Used	A
Method of Preparation	Moist
Type of Rammer	Manual

MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY: **1635 KG/M^3**
OPTIMUM MOISTURE (%): **20.8**
PROCTOR NO: **1929**

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (CBR) TEST

ASTM D1883

AECOM

Client: City of Winnipeg	Test Hole ID: TH23-01		
Project Name: 2023 Regional Streets Renewal	Sample ID: B3	Sample Depth (m): 0.6 - 1.50	
Project Number: 60697893	Soil Description: Fat CLAY (CH)		
Location: Logan Avenue, Winnipeg, MB	Tested By: EM	Tested Date: 4/24/23	

PROCTOR DATA		CBR DATA	10 blows	25 blows	56 blows
Optimum Moisture Content (%)	20.8	Moisture Content, MC (%)			21.5%
Maximum Dry Density (kg/m3)	1635	Wet Density (kg/m3)			1921.2
Proctor Test Method	Standard	Dry Density (kg/m3)			1581.4
Tested by:	EM	Compaction Degree (%)			97%
Remark:		Surcharge Weight (g)			4506
		Soaked for (days)			4
		Swell (%)			2.2%





PENETRATION DATA

Penetration (mm)	Pressure (MPa)		
0			0.0
0.635			0.08
1.27			0.13
1.905			0.16
2.54			**0.18**
3.175			0.20
3.81			0.21
4.445			0.22
5.08			**0.23**
6.35			0.25
7.62			0.27
10.16			0.31
12.7			0.35
Corrected Pressure (MPa)			
at 2.54 mm			0.19
at 5.08 mm			0.23
Corrected Bearing Ratio			
at 2.54 mm			2.7
at 5.08 mm			2.2

Standard pressure: 6.9 Mpa at 2.54 mm penetration
10.3 Mpa at 5.08mm penetration

CBR Value

CBR as-compacted
Dry density, kg/m3: 1581
CBR: 2.7

Note:
As requested, the sample was tested at 100% Standard Proctor Maximum Dry Density (SPMDD).
Proctor used was identified as Proctor No. 1929, sample TH23-01; B3. CBR values was calculated using the 2.54 mm penetration.

AECOM WINNIPEG GEOTECHNICAL LABORATORY
99 Commerce Drive, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3P 0Y7
tel (204) 477-5381 **fax** (431) 800-1210

Client:	City of Winnipeg	**Job No:**	60697893
Project:	2023 Regional Streets	**Sample:**	Clay Fill (CH)
Lab No.	Logan TH23-02; B4	**Supplier:**	AECOM
Date Tested:	21-Apr-23	**Source:**	Winnipeg, MB

ASTM D698

TRIAL NUMBER	1	2	3	4	5
Wet Unit Weight (kg/cu.m.)	1831	1861	1883	1873	
Dry Unit Weight (kg/cu.m.)	1479	1488	1487	1452	
Moisture Content (%)	23.8	25.1	26.6	29.0	



Description / Remarks:	
As received moisture content (%)	N/A
Specific Gravity (Assumed)	2.63
Method Used	A
Method of Preparation	Moist
Type of Rammer	Manual

MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY: **1490 KG/M^3**
OPTIMUM MOISTURE (%): **25.6**
PROCTOR NO: **1930**

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (CBR) TEST

ASTM D1883

AECOM

Client: City of Winnipeg	Test Hole ID: TH23-02		
Project Name: 2023 Regional Streets Renewal	Sample ID: B4	Sample Depth (m): 0.6 - 1.50	
Project Number: 60697893	Soil Description: Clay Fill (CH)		
Location: Logan Avenue, Winnipeg, MB	Tested By: EM	Tested Date: 4/24/23	

PROCTOR DATA		CBR DATA	10 blows	25 blows	56 blows
Optimum Moisture Content (%)	25.6	Moisture Content, MC (%)			25.3%
Maximum Dry Density (kg/m3)	1490	Wet Density (kg/m3)			1868.2
Proctor Test Method	Standard	Dry Density (kg/m3)			1490.5
Tested by:	EM	Compaction Degree (%)			100%
Remark:		Surcharge Weight (g)			4506
		Soaked for (days)			4
		Swell (%)			3.6%





PENETRATION DATA

Penetration (mm)	Pressure (MPa)		
0			0.0
0.635			0.09
1.27			0.16
1.905			0.20
2.54			**0.22**
3.175			0.23
3.81			0.24
4.445			0.25
5.08			**0.26**
6.35			0.28
7.62			0.29
10.16			0.33
12.7			0.36
Corrected Pressure (MPa)			
at 2.54 mm			0.22
at 5.08 mm			0.26
Corrected Bearing Ratio			
at 2.54 mm			3.2
at 5.08 mm			2.5

Standard pressure: 6.9 Mpa at 2.54 mm penetration
10.3 Mpa at 5.08mm penetration

CBR Value

CBR as-compacted
Dry density, kg/m3: 1491
CBR: 3.2

Note:
As requested, the sample was tested at 100% Standard Proctor Maximum Dry Density (SPMDD).
Proctor used was identified as Proctor No. 1930, sample TH23-02; B4. CBR values was calculated using the 2.54 mm penetration.