



UPDATED REPORT

TO

HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

ON

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

WITH ADDITIONAL BOREHOLES

FOR

PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

AT

GOULBURN BASE HOSPITAL

130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

27 September 2017
Ref: 30116V2rpt Goulburn



JK Geotechnics
GEOTECHNICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERS

PO Box 976, North Ryde BC NSW 1670
Tel: 02 9888 5000 Fax: 02 9888 5001
www.jkgeotechnics.com.au

Jeffery & Katauskas Pty Ltd, trading as
JK Geotechnics ABN 17 003 550 801

Date: 27 September 2017
Report No: 30116V2rpt Goulburn
Revision No: 0

Report prepared by:



Arthur Billingham
Geotechnical Engineer

Report reviewed by:



Fernando Vega
Senior Associate I Geotechnical Engineer

For and on behalf of
JK GEOTECHNICS
PO Box 976
NORTH RYDE BC NSW 1670

© Document Copyright of JK Geotechnics.

This Report (which includes all attachments and annexures) has been prepared by JK Geotechnics (JKG) for its Client, and is intended for the use only by that Client.

This Report has been prepared pursuant to a contract between JKG and its Client and is therefore subject to:

- a) JKG's proposal in respect of the work covered by the Report;
- b) the limitations defined in the Client's brief to JKG;
- c) the terms of contract between JK and the Client, including terms limiting the liability of JKG.

If the Client, or any person, provides a copy of this Report to any third party, such third party must not rely on this Report, except with the express written consent of JKG which, if given, will be deemed to be upon the same terms, conditions, restrictions and limitations as apply by virtue of (a), (b), and (c) above.

Any third party who seeks to rely on this Report without the express written consent of JKG does so entirely at their own risk and to the fullest extent permitted by law, JKG accepts no liability whatsoever, in respect of any loss or damage suffered by any such third party.

At the Company's discretion, JKG may send a paper copy of this report for confirmation. In the event of any discrepancy between paper and electronic versions, the paper version is to take precedence. The USER shall ascertain the accuracy and the suitability of this information for the purpose intended; reasonable effort is made at the time of assembling this information to ensure its integrity. The recipient is not authorised to modify the content of the information supplied without the prior written consent of JKG.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE	2
3	RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION	4
3.1	Site Description	4
3.2	Geology and Subsurface Conditions	5
3.3	Laboratory Test Results	8
4	COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
4.1	Summary of Main Findings and Geotechnical Issues	9
4.2	Further Geotechnical Work	10
4.3	Site Classification	10
4.4	Foundation Design Parameters	11
4.5	Existing Footing Bearing Pressure as exposed in Test Pit 101	12
4.6	Earthquake Design Parameters	13
4.7	Pavements	13
4.8	Earthworks: Subgrade Preparation for Floor Slabs and Pavements	14
4.9	Engineered Fill Specification	16
4.10	Excavation Conditions, Batters and Retention	17
5	GENERAL COMMENTS	20

STS TABLE A: MOISTURE CONTENT, ATTERBERG LIMITS & LINEAR SHRINKAGE TEST REPORT

STS TABLE B: FOUR DAY SOAKED CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST REPORT

STS TABLE C: POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX TEST REPORT

BOREHOLE LOGS 101 TO 112 INCLUSIVE (WITH CORE PHOTOGRAPHS)

BOREHOLE LOGS 1 TO 4 INCLUSIVE

DYNAMIC CONE PENETRATION TEST RESULTS (101 AND 112)

FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION PLAN

FIGURE 2: BOREHOLE LOCATION PLAN

FIGURE 3: TEST PIT 101 CROSS-SECTIONAL SKETCH

FIGURE 4A and 4B: GRAPHICAL BOREHOLE SUMMARIES

VIBRATION EMISSION DESIGN GOALS

REPORT EXPLANATION NOTES



1 INTRODUCTION

This updated report contains the results of additional geotechnical boreholes as well as the previous boreholes and test results of a geotechnical investigation for the proposed hospital redevelopment at Goulburn Base Hospital, 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW. The additional borehole investigation was commissioned by email on 16 August 2017 by the senior project manager, Ms Jennifer Peters of TSA Management, as a variation to NSW Health Infrastructure Consultancy Agreement, Contract No. HI16591 dated 13 January 2017. The additional geotechnical work commission was on the basis of our fee proposal P45301V1 Goulburn dated 18 July 2017.

We have previously completed a limited scope geotechnical investigation in January to April 2017 in the areas of the proposed new Acute Services building which is part of Phase D of the proposed works sequence. The results of our previous investigation (Report Ref: 30116V1rpt dated 26 April 2017) have been supplemented by additional rock cored boreholes around the proposed new Acute Services building and by additional boreholes over the remaining development areas within the Hospital which constitute later phases of the proposed redevelopment works.

A summary of the principal geotechnical issues, based on findings of this additional investigation, is provided in Section 4.1.

The proposed works at the hospital are at preliminary planning stage. Based on the BLP's Concept Design Drawings (SK-B2-00, SK-B2-01, SK-B2-02, SK-B2-03), we understand that following demolition of some of the existing site buildings, that a new building, with four levels, will be built to house the Acute Services unit of the Hospital. The proposed development area is shown on attached Figures 1 and 2. Development details, including finished levels, had not been finalised at the time of this investigation but it was indicated that due to the prevailing site slope, that excavation ranging from zero to 3m in depth is likely to be required to achieve development levels. Recommendations on earthworks including retention, and engineered fill specification has been provided. Structural loads have not been supplied and therefore, light to moderate column loads have been assumed for this type of development.

The scope of the investigation was to obtain geotechnical information on subsurface conditions at nominated and agreed test borehole locations as shown on attached Figure 2. Based on the test results, this report essentially provides the following geotechnical information, comments and recommendations on the following main items:



- Detailed logs of the boreholes with penetration test results and groundwater observations;
- Interpretation of Subsurface Profile;
- AS2870-2011 Site Classification;
- Suitable Footings Systems and Options;
- Foundation strata and depth;
- Allowable Bearing Pressures;
- Allowable Shaft Adhesions;
- Batter Slopes;
- Excavation Conditions;
- Retaining Wall Parameters;
- Subgrade Preparation;
- Engineered Fill Specification;
- CBR and modulus of subgrade reaction values for Pavement Thickness Design;
- Earthquake Design Factors;
- Inspections during Construction.

Additional environmental site screening of the in-situ soil materials has been carried out by our specialist environmental consulting division, Environmental Investigation Services (EIS), based on samples obtained from the geotechnical test boreholes, as well as additional boreholes complete by EIS themselves. EIS will submit a separate report with the results, Ref: E30116Krpt 2.1 & 2.2, dated 22 September 2017, which should be read in conjunction with this geotechnical report. A hazardous building materials survey was also undertaken by EIS on only the buildings within the site and as specified by TSA Management on behalf of the client. The results of the Hazmat survey are presented in a separate EIS reports Ref: E30116Krpt2-HAZ.

2 INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE

The additional fieldwork comprised drilling and testing twelve boreholes, BHs 101 to 112, and excavating a test pit (101), between 22 and 24 August 2017, at the locations shown on the attached Figure 2, which is based on survey plans by Cardno (Drawing No. 117806501 Revision 01 dated 11/12/15). The boreholes were set out at locations nominated by TSA Management. The borehole locations were set out by taped measurements from existing surface features and inferred site boundaries. The approximate reduced level (RL) at each borehole location, as shown on the borehole logs, was interpolated from spot heights and contours from the survey plan. The height



datum is Australian Height Datum. Should any of these features be critical to the proposed development, we recommend they be located more accurately using instrument survey techniques. The original fieldwork for the investigation was carried out 31 January 2017 and comprised auger drilling and testing four boreholes, BHs 1 to 4, at the locations also shown on the attached Figure 2.

Prior to commencement of the fieldwork, the investigation locations were electromagnetically scanned by a specialist subcontractor so that all borehole locations could be located clear of buried services. Reference to 'Dial Before You Dig' plans was also completed. Safe work measures and procedures were implemented during the course of the fieldwork.

Boreholes (BHs) 101 to 104, were initially drilled using our track-mounted JK205 rig with spiral auger techniques and a tungsten carbide (TC) drill bit to depths between 2.83m and 5.92m. These boreholes were then extended to depths between 6.81m and 9.33m using rotary diamond coring techniques with water flush.

BHs 105 to 111 were drilled to termination depth entirely using spiral auger techniques and TC bit. BH112 was drilled using hand auger techniques to refusal at 0.93m depth.

One test pit, TP101, was excavated to expose footings along the eastern external wall of the two-storey heritage Central Building (refer to Figure 2). Two Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) tests (DCP101 and DCP112) were completed at the location of TP101 and BH112, which was drilled by hand auger due to access constraints for the rig.

The apparent compaction of the fill and strength of cohesive soils were assessed from Standard Penetration Test (SPT) 'N' values, augmented by hand penetrometer tests carried out on cohesive samples recovered by the SPT split tube sampler. The strength of the bedrock in the auger drilled portion of each borehole was assessed from observation of the drilling resistance of a twin pronged TC drill bit attached to the augers, tactile examination of rock cuttings and correlation with the results of subsequent laboratory moisture content tests. It should be noted that strengths assessed in this way are approximate and variances of one strength order should not be unexpected.

In BH101 to BH104 the recovered rock core was returned to our NATA registered laboratory (Soil Test Services (STS)) for photographing and Point Load Strength Index (Is_{50}) testing. Using established correlations, the approximate Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) of the bedrock was then calculated from the Is_{50} results. The Point Load Strength index test results are



summarised in the attached Table C and are also plotted on the cored borehole logs. Copies of the colour core photographs are provided with the borehole logs.

Groundwater observations were made in the boreholes during auger drilling and at completion of the auger drilling. We note that water is introduced into the borehole during coring and therefore the water levels measured at completion of coring will be artificially high and have not been recorded on the logs. No longer-term groundwater monitoring was carried out.

Selected samples were returned to STS and Envirolab Services Pty Ltd, both NATA registered laboratories, to determine Atterberg Limits, Moisture contents pH, sulphate, chloride contents and minimum resistivity. The results are summarised in the attached STS Table A and B and the Envirolab Services Certificate No. 174327.

The fieldwork was completed in the full-time presence of our geotechnical engineer (Arthur Billingham) who set out the borehole locations, nominated the testing and sampling, and prepared the attached borehole logs. For more details of the investigation procedures and their limitations, reference should be made to the attached Report Explanation Notes.

Copies of the borehole logs and laboratory test results from our previous geotechnical investigation are attached to this report.

3 RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION

3.1 Site Description

The site, Goulburn Base Hospital, is located as shown on attached Figures 1 and 2. The site is located at 130 Goldsmith Street and situated to the west of the geographic centre of Goulburn. The site is approximately 38,000m² in area.

The site is situated over a large, roughly rectangular in plan shape, block on the north-eastern side of a local hill that rises to a crest approximately 2.5km from the site along Ridge Street. The Hospital is surrounded by roads which from the north-west corner (in a clockwise direction) are Goldsmith Street, Faithfull Street, Clifford Street and Albert Street. Goldsmith Street slopes down to the east at approximately 2°. Faithfull Street slopes down to the south at approximately 1°.

Goulburn Base Hospital comprises numerous one and two-storey buildings generally of brick construction surrounded by concrete and asphalt pavements. Garden beds generally lined the edge



of buildings with lawn areas around the perimeter of the hospital. Buildings across the hospital generally appeared to be in fair to good condition with some wider external cracking (up to 5mm) observed on the northern wall of Springfield House and the western wall of the Maternity Ward. In the north-west corner of the site is the heritage-listed Central Building and Pavilions which are of brick and mortared sandstone block construction. These heritage buildings appeared to be in good condition upon cursory external observation.

Asphalt pavements around the hospital were in variable condition with apparently newer pavements in good condition and older pavements, generally spray seal, in poor condition with potholing and cracking. Concrete pavements across the site were in fair to good condition with some cracking observed.

The area of the proposed Acute Services Building itself, as described in the previous geotechnical report, consists of an area in the north-eastern corner of Hospital currently occupied by a 'C-plan' two-storey brick building, surrounding car parking and environs. The brick building, which appears to be over 50 years old, appeared in good condition upon cursory visual observation. To the north and east of the building was asphalt paved car parking which appeared in poor condition with potholing and loosened material. To the south of the building is an asphalt driveway that slopes down at 2° to Faithfull Street. In the south-east corner between the car park and driveway are a couple of concrete block retaining walls with heights up to 1m. To the west and south of the site are a number of brick hospital buildings. Set back between 3.8m and 6.0m to the west from the 'C-plan' building is a two storey brick building (Pathology) which sits between 0.9m and 1.3m below adjacent levels on site. To the southwest of the site is a three-storey brick building (Theatres). To the south, beyond the asphalt driveway, is a one-storey workshop building and two-storey asset management building.

3.2 Geology and Subsurface Conditions

The 1:100,000 Geological Series Sheet 'Goulburn' indicates that the site is underlain by the Rhyanna Formation which consists of "varicoloured very thin- to thick-bedded, generally fine- to medium-grained, normally graded, ash rich, volcanoclastic sandstone and siltstone, and massive, dark brown, volcanoclastic mudstone; blue-grey to off-white, generally massive to planar laminated, tin- to thick-bedded silicified, volcanic mudstone; minor fine-grained, lithic-quartz sandstone".

The boreholes encountered a general profile of fill covering residual clays grading into weathered bedrock typical of the aforementioned Rhyanna Formation, consisting of tuffaceous sandstone, silicified claystone, which corresponds to the mudstone within the geological description, and



siltstone at shallow to moderate depths. Graphical borehole summaries in section are shown on the attached Figures 4A and 4B.

A summary of the subsurface profile encountered in the test boreholes is given below; however, for a more detailed description reference should be made to the attached borehole logs.

Pavements and Fill

Asphalt spray seal pavement of 3mm to 5mm thickness was encountered at surface in BH105, 108 and 111 which were completed in existing road and car park areas. Asphaltic concrete of 30mm thickness was encountered from surface in BH109 which appeared to be a more recently constructed road. Below the asphalt pavements was fill consisting mostly of sands and gravels to depths up to 0.5m with significant clay content at some locations. Asphalt pavement of 20mm and 45mm thickness was penetrated at surface in BH1 and BH2 respectively. Concrete pavements were encountered at surface in BH104 and 112 with thicknesses of 110mm and 340mm respectively.

Fill was encountered at surface in all boreholes except BH107 and generally extended to an average 0.5m depth. Exceptions were BH102, 110 and 111, and BHs 1 and 2, where fill extended to depths between 0.7m and 2.0m. In these boreholes the fill comprised silty sand with inclusions of brick, gravel and ash and was assessed as being poorly to moderately compacted based on the SPT results. Below the pavements a sandy gravel fill extended to approximately 0.4m depth. Underlying this gravelly fill, and at surface in BH3 and BH4, variable fill consisting of silty sand and silty clay was typical across the site.

The fill was assessed as being variably compacted with varying inclusions including igneous gravel and slag; the fill below pavements as in BHs 1 and 2 appeared well compacted but the fill from surface as in BHs 3 and 4 appeared poorly compacted. This compaction assessment is based on in-situ SPT readings and/or our observations during drilling, which do not give a precise determination of in-situ densities since they are affected by friction during driving/pushing, the presence of gravel within the fill and the moisture content of the clay fill. Nonetheless, they provide a qualitative guide.

Residual Clays

Residual soils were encountered in the boreholes typically comprising upper layers of gravelly clay of medium plasticity underlain by silty clay, with lesser gravel content, of high plasticity. The residual



clays were assessed to be of very stiff to hard strength. Gravels within the clays were ferruginous and generally fine- to medium-grained in size.

Weathered Bedrock

The bedrock encountered across the site varied both in type and strength across the site which correlates with the complex geology of the Rhyanna Formation. Rock types encountered within the cored and augered boreholes consisted of tuffaceous sandstone, silicified claystone and siltstone. The rock coring revealed the bedrocks to be of generally poor quality due to their highly fractured nature, with closely spaced defects and significant core losses, even though the individual rock cores were at least of low to medium strengths, with many high strength zones.

Tuffaceous sandstone was encountered in most boreholes within the north-east portion of the Hospital specifically within BHs 101 to 103, 110 and 111. The sandstone was encountered from depths between 1.6m (BH105) and 4.8m (BH102) with the initial 0.5m to 3.5m consisting of extremely low to very low strength rock. Below this the rock increased to low strength from depths between 2.1m and 4.8m. Medium strength sandstone was cored in BH101 and 102 below 7.0m and 7.2m respectively. The cored sandstone was highly fractured with closely spaced (typically 50mm to 100mm) defects predominantly comprised of smooth, planar joints bedded at between 30° and 90° and clay/extremely weathered seams of between 5mm and 20mm thickness. Significant core loss was experienced in BH102 at a depth of 5.85m and also in BH103 at a depth of 8m (discussed further below); these core losses are indicative of the generally poor quality of the bedrock together with its highly fractured nature even though individually the rock cores tested were of at least low to medium strengths.

Silicified claystone and siltstone occurred across the site and were encountered in all boreholes except BH101, 102, 105 and 110. The claystone was encountered below the tuffaceous sandstone in BH103 and 111 from depths of 7.0m and 3.5m respectively. In BH104 and 106 claystone was encountered at shallow depths of 0.5m and 0.8m elsewhere the claystone/siltstone was encountered at moderate depths ranging between 1.2m and 2.2m. In some boreholes a thin (generally 0.2m to 0.5m thick) extremely weathered layer overlay medium to high strength bedrock with the exception of BH107 where only low strength rock was encountered to the termination depth of 6.0m. The cored claystone in BH104 was of high strength though highly fractured with defects consisting primarily of smooth, planar joints bedded between 40° and 90°. In BH103 the cored claystone was also highly fractured with most of the core being fragmented with significant core loss possibly a result of this fragmentation.



Groundwater

No groundwater was observed during, on or up to 5 hours after completion of drilling. No longer-term groundwater monitoring was allowed for as part of this investigation.

3.3 Laboratory Test Results

The results of moisture content tests (attached Table A) on selected samples of the bedrock correlate reasonably well with the field strength assessment.

The results of the Atterberg Limits and Linear shrinkage tests (Table A) confirmed that the residual clays to be of medium and high plasticity and indicate these clays to be have a moderate to high shrink/swell reactive potential with moisture content change.

The four day soaked CBR test on 4 no. bulk samples of the residual clays resulted in CBR values of 5% to 7% at a compaction ratio of 98% of its Standard Maximum Dry Density (SMDD). However, test completed during previous investigation on a residual clay sample from BH3 resulted in a high CBR value of 10% at a compaction ratio of 98% of its Standard Maximum Dry Density (SMDD). We attribute the high CBR value for the residual clay sample due to the presence of numerous gravel.

The results of the soil aggression testing are presented in the table below; these results were extracted from:

- Envirolab Certificate Report No.: 174327
- Envirolab Services Report No.: 161246

BH	Sample depth (m)	Sample Description	pH	Chloride Content (mg/kg)	Sulphate Content (mg/kg)	Resistivity (Ω.m)
101	1.5-1.95	Silty clay	8.1	100	10	90
103	4.2-4.5	XW sandstone	7.9	<10	<10	130
107	0.5-0.8	Clayey gravel	7.1	<10	140	110
108	0.5-0.95	Silty clay	7.2	10	79	100
110	0.5-0.95	Fill (Silty sand)	7.9	31	24	83
111	0.5-0.95	Fill (Silty sand)	8.2	23	150	40
2	0.7-0.95	Gravelly clay	6.8	50	83	65
3	1.5-1.95	Gravelly clay	6.8	20	82	110
4	1.5-1.95	XW Mudstone	7.6	32	40	120



The above results indicate that, in accordance with Table 6.4.2(C) and Table 6.5.2(C) of AS2159-2009, the soils on site have a 'non-aggressive' exposure classification for both concrete and steel elements. The results of the pH tests indicate the soils on site are alkaline in nature.

The results of the Point Load Strength Index tests on selected rock core (Table C) resulted in approximate Unconfined Compressive Strengths (UCS) in the range of 2MPa to 20MPa for the majority core tested, corresponding to the predominant low to medium strength of the bedrock observed; however, there were several results in the 22MPa to 44MPa which corresponds to the high strength rock mostly disclosed in BHs 103 and 104.

4 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Summary of Main Findings and Geotechnical Issues

As discussed in more detail in Section 3.2, the boreholes penetrated a variable subsurface profile, essentially comprising variably compacted fill to depths in the range of 0.2m to 2m, underlain by residual gravelly and silty clays of medium and high plasticity, of generally very stiff to hard strengths, that grade into extremely weathered bedrocks of tuffaceous sandstone, claystone, siltstone and mudstone at depths in the range of 0.5m to 2.5m below existing site surface. The strength of the bedrock improves with increasing depth. The rock coring revealed the bedrocks to be of generally poor quality due to their highly fractured nature, with closely spaced defects and significant core losses, even though the individual rock cores were at least of low to medium strengths, with many high strength zones. Groundwater was not encountered in the boreholes.

Based on the known borehole and test results, our observations and the proposed development concept (refer to Section 1), we consider the following to be the principal geotechnical issues to be considered in the planning, design and construction of the development:

1. The presence of fill of variable compaction and depth across the site makes it a Class P in accordance with AS2870-2011. The fill is deemed unsuitable as a bearing stratum for footings. The fill is subject to proof rolling and further assessment to decide if it is suitable to act as a supporting subgrade under ground floor slabs and pavements.
2. The residual clays of high plasticity have a high potential for shrink/swell with changes in moisture content, i.e. Class H2 in terms of AS2870-2011.
3. The most competent foundation stratum at the site is the bedrock. In view of the shallow to moderate depths to bedrock and the high reactivity of the residual clays of high plasticity,



we recommend that new structures are supported on a combination of deep pad footings and/or bored pier footings founded into the bedrock.

4. All cut and/or fill faces that might be incorporated in the proposed development must be rendered stable by appropriate batters and/or retention systems. All fill placed on site to replace existing or unstable areas must be engineered, controlled fill.
5. In regards to waste and contamination classification issues are likely to be required in order to classify the material to be excavated for waste disposal purposes in accordance with the NSW DEC (formerly EPA) guidelines as inert, solid, industrial or hazardous waste, reference should be made to the separate EIS reports (refer to Section 1).

Further comments on the above issues are provided in the subsequent sections of this report.

4.2 Further Geotechnical Work

With the additional borehole information, we believe sufficient information has been gained to be reasonably confident as to subsurface conditions. However, it will be essential during excavation and construction works that regular geotechnical inspections be commissioned to check initial assumptions about excavation and foundation conditions and possible variations that may occur between inspected and tested locations and to provide further relevant geotechnical advice. Irregular or 'milestone' inspections by a geotechnical engineer are often not adequate for excavation, shoring and foundation works. It is recommended that the Client be made aware of the need to commission a geotechnical engineer for regular frequent inspections. The recommendations provided in this report should be reviewed once more clear details of the proposed development are known, as mentioned above and also, following any additional geotechnical inspection work. It is likely that further advice/input will be required during the structural design to address issues that may not have been addressed in this report. To some degree, this is an "iterative" process between evaluation of the geotechnical site conditions and the structural design. Further comments on the above issues are provided in the subsequent sections of this report.

4.3 Site Classification

The site classification for this site in accordance with Section 2 of AS2870-2011 '*Residential Slabs and Footings*' is 'Class P' due to the presence of fill of variable depth and compaction across the site. Based on the field assessment of plasticity and linear shrinkage test results, the natural soils (residual clays) on this site are likely to exhibit characteristic surface movements in the order of a Class H2 clay site. We advise that in the strict sense AS2870 site classification does not apply to



the proposed buildings or structures larger than specified in the code, but it is a useful guide in highlighting the potential foundation problems of this site. The standard footing designs in AS2870-2011 are unlikely to be relevant to this project and therefore, the footing design must be carried out using engineering principles.

4.4 Foundation Design Parameters

The most competent foundation stratum beneath the site for the development is the sandstone and claystone/siltstone bedrocks, as identified by the test boreholes. In view of the presence of fill and the high reactivity potential of the residual clays, we recommend that the building structure is supported on footings uniformly founded within the bedrock profile. In view of the depth variations of the bedrock, we expect a combination of deep pads and bored piers could be used to reach a suitable rock foundation stratum.

The bedrock is the recommended foundation stratum for any proposed structure with movement sensitive finishes or items and/or for structures that have columns or walls with moderate or heavy loads. Notwithstanding, if required after further development details are known, we can provide the option of using spread footings on the residual clay provided the structure is designed to withstand potential reactive clay movements. However, the use of hybrid foundations for the building is to be avoided.

The following criteria are recommended for design and construction of the footings:

1. The deep pads (where rock is 1.2m or less deep), conventional bored piers or CFA piles may be used and proportioned for an allowable bearing pressure (ABP) of 600kPa when founded with a nominal socket of about 0.3m into the extremely weathered tuffaceous sandstone or mudstone or claystone of extremely low strength.
2. The ABP may be increased to 1000kPa if the piers are drilled deeper to reach the distinctly weathered bedrock (tuffaceous sandstone or claystone) of at least low strength (L on logs).
3. An ABP of 1500kPa may be used if piers are drilled to reach the less weathered bedrock (tuffaceous sandstone/claystone) of at least medium strength (M on logs), which is not underlain by significant defects such as core loss zones.
4. An allowable shaft adhesion (ASA) of equivalent to 10% of the above ABP values may be adopted for design of pier sockets, in compression, through the claystone and sandstone. For uplift or tension, the aforementioned ASA value should be halved. The shaft adhesion values are recommended on condition that cleanliness and roughness of pier sockets and bases are achieved.

- 
5. For piers socketed into the bedrock, large capacity drilling rigs with rock augers (or perhaps coring buckets through high strength rock) would have to be used.
 6. All loose or softened debris should be cleared from the base of all footings prior to concreting. All footings should be poured immediately after excavation/drilling, removal of water (if any), cleaning and inspection.

The ABP values given above is based on a serviceability criteria of deflections at the pile toe of less than or equal to 1% of the pile diameter. Footings on rock can also be designed using 'Limit State Design' principles. For limit state design, higher ultimate bearing capacities could be adopted provided that settlements of 5% of the pile diameter can be tolerated and there is an extensive pile test program undertaken. It should be noted that such ultimate bearing pressures must be used in conjunction with an appropriate geotechnical strength reduction factor (Φ_g). It must be understood that the use of limit state design to adopt relatively high bearing pressures (above the serviceability criteria described above) is not currently standard practice, and there is an increased risk of inadequate pile performance.

If the designer wishes to adopt the Limit State Design methods of the piling code, AS2159-1995, then the ultimate values of end bearing pressures and shaft adhesions may be estimated by multiplying the above recommended allowable values by Factors of Safety of 3 and 2, respectively. We recommend that a geotechnical strength reduction factor, Φ_g , of 0.5 be applied to the maximum pile load applied.

As a minimum requirement, the initial stages of footing excavation should be inspected by a Geotechnical Engineer to ascertain that the recommended foundation has been reached and to check initial assumptions about foundation conditions and possible variations that may occur between borehole locations. The need for further inspections can be assessed following the initial visit.

Suitable pile types are considered to be conventional bored piers and augered, grout injected (CFA) piles. For grout piles, during installation of piles it is recommended that the initial piles be installed as close as practical to our borehole locations to calibrate the equipment and operator to the subsurface conditions by direction comparison of the installation performance and readings to the borehole results. These initial readings can then be used to assist with installation of piles away from the borehole locations to assess that the appropriate foundation material has been reached.

4.5 Existing Footing Bearing Pressure as exposed in Test Pit 101

TP101 was excavated to expose the footing of the eastern external wall of the heritage listed Central Building (for its location refer to Figure 2). The footing and foundation conditions exposed



by TP101 are shown on the cross sectional sketch presented as Figure 3. In summary, the footing comprises a concrete mortared sandstone block footing of about 0.6m thickness. The footing has a very shallow embedment of 0.12m below adjoining ground surface level. The width of the footing could not be determined. The footing was revealed to be founded on residual gravelly clay of hard strength. Adjoining the footing was a conduit and fill associated with the conduit and a retaining wall to a garden. We also note that BH112 and DCP112 was tested to the north-west of TP101 and its results are inconsistent with other boreholes and with TP101 as the DCP112 penetrates with very low blow counts down to 3.46m, indicating the presence of very poorly compacted fill probably associated with adjoining existing lift pit or other excavation of the building; further investigation would be recommended in this area.

In regards to the bearing capacity of the existing external wall footing of heritage listed Central Building, as exposed by TP101, we assess that it would have a limited bearing capacity since its embedment into the residual clay is very limited and some of the bulb stress distribution of the load on the footing would be encroaching into the adjoining fill mass of undetermined geometry and extent. At this stage, we recommend that the allowable bearing pressure of the footing with any additional imposed load should not exceed 150kPa.

4.6 Earthquake Design Parameters

The following parameters can be adopted for earthquake design in accordance with AS1170.4-2007 'Structural Design Actions, Part 4: Earthquake Actions in Australia':

- Hazard Factor (Z) = 0.09
- Site Subsoil Class = Class C_e

4.7 Pavements

We understand that pavements will be required for car parking and access roads for the new development. After stripping to nominal subgrade or formation level, the exposed subgrade in the proposed pavement area should be prepared as outlined in Section 4.8, with respect to proof rolling and compaction.

The design of new pavements will depend on subgrade preparation, subgrade drainage, the nature and composition of fill excavated or imported to the site, as well as vehicle loadings and use. Various alternative types of construction could be used for the pavements. Concrete construction would undoubtedly be the best in areas where heavy vehicles manoeuvre such as bus turning and



manoeuvring. Flexible pavements may have a lower initial cost but maintenance will be higher. These factors should be considered when making the final choice.

Once details of the pavement area layout, levels and traffic loading are determined, we recommend that thickness design of the pavement on residual clay subgrade of high plasticity be carried out on the basis of CBR value of 5% which was the lowest value obtained from the laboratory testing (Table B). An equivalent modulus of subgrade reaction of 30kPa/mm (based on 750mm plate) may be adopted for concrete pavement design.

Concrete pavements should be supported on at least a 100mm thick sub-base of good quality fine crushed rock such as RTA Specification 3051 unbound base (e.g. DGB20) or similar quality, and compacted to a minimum density of 98% of MMDD. The sub-base material will provide more uniform slab support and would reduce “pumping” of subgrade “fines” at joints. Slab joints should be designed to resist shear forces but not bending moments by providing dowelled or keyed joints.

Where the pavement edge is unconstrained by landscaping strips, we recommend that an edge thickening be provided for protection against erosion and the effects of possible future topsoil stripping.

Density tests should be regularly carried out on the sub-base layer to confirm the above specifications are achieved. The frequency of density testing should be at least one test per layer per 1000m², or three tests per layer, or three tests per visit, whichever requires the most tests. Level 2 testing of fill compaction is the minimum permissible in AS3798-2007.

Subsoil drains should be provided along the perimeter of all proposed external pavement areas, with invert levels of at least 300mm below subgrade level. The drainage trenches should be excavated with a uniform longitudinal fall to appropriate discharge points so as to reduce the risk of water ponding. The subgrade should be graded to promote water flow towards the subsoil drains. Discharge from the subsoil drains should be piped to the stormwater system.

4.8 Earthworks: Subgrade Preparation for Floor Slabs and Pavements

The main geotechnical issue with earthworks, including subgrade preparation, under ground floor slabs of the development and external pavement areas, is to do with any areas of existing fill that appears to be variably compacted. Another issue is to do with the reactivity of the residual clay. We suggest that generous time and budget allowances be provided for subgrade improvement works.



In the area of the slabs, we recommend that the compaction of any remaining existing clay fill be further improved to achieve minimum engineered fill standards as detailed below. Notwithstanding, the floor slabs must be designed and constructed to withstand potential shrink/swell movements of the underlying residual clay profile. The clay is considered to be highly reactive and may be subject to free surface movements, equivalent to those quoted in AS2870-2011 for Class H2 clay subgrades; reference to the code is essential.

Alternatively, the slab can be fully suspended on the footings bearing on the bedrock. With the latter option, if the slab is to be fully suspended on bored pier footings then it would be unnecessary to complete any particular subgrade preparation other than stripping any top layer of root affected soil. The suspended slab option is considered the appropriate solution if differential movements (e.g. from reactive clay movements) are unacceptable for the habitable spaces. Void formers of 100mm thickness should be installed below the slabs and beams to allow for potential swell of the silty clays. The void formers should extend at least over the zone where significant potential changes in moisture content of the clay subsoils may occur that would trigger shrink/swell behavior. Given the thickness of the clays above the rock are limited, in the range of about 0.5m-2.9m, then we suggest that the void formers extend for a distance from the inside of external walls of at least 2m-3m below the interior section of the floor slab. In addition, as mentioned further below, an external concrete apron or paving should extend at least over the 2m strip around the building and preferably further; the paving should slope to shed water away from the footings.

As a minimum, if the slab is to be supported on existing subgrade and if some differential movements can be tolerated, the subgrade for the ground floor slab and for external pavements, should undergo the following basic treatment. Earthworks recommendations provided in this report should be complemented by reference to AS3798.

1. Strip the upper layer of fill that contains deleterious materials or organics (roots), and stockpile this separately since these materials are not suitable for re-use as engineered fill. This upper layer is irregular in depth and occurrence but for budgeting purposes allow for an average stripping depth of about 0.2m-0.3m but deeper as deemed necessary after inspection by a geotechnician or geotechnical engineer.
2. The exposed subgrade at the base of the excavation should be proof rolled with at least 8 passes of a heavy (not less than 12 tonne) smooth drum vibratory roller. The purpose of the proof rolling is to detect any soft or heaving areas.



3. The final pass should be undertaken in the presence of a geotechnician or geotechnical engineer, to detect any unstable or soft subgrade areas, and to allow for some further improvement in existing fill compaction.
4. Unstable subgrade detected during proof rolling should be locally excavated down to a stiff or sound base and replaced with engineered fill or further advice should be sought. Any fill placed to raise site levels should also be engineered fill.

Particular attention must be paid to the provision of adequate site drainage. The main objective of the drainage should be to minimise the risk of water entering the clay subgrade and to prevent water from ponding next to the slabs. To minimise the possibility of moisture ingress into the clay subgrade, we recommend that surface and subsurface drains be constructed at an early stage in the program to intercept water from the higher areas of the site. The surface drain should discharge well away from the building area, say, to adjoining stormwater drainage systems. Furthermore, we recommend that close attention be paid to the design and construction of the water and sewage services beneath the proposed buildings, to minimise the risk of breakage, leakage and subsequent moisture ingress into the fill subgrade. These services should be designed with flexible joints and they should be repaired promptly when ruptured.

The clays at the site are highly reactive. The shrink/swell of the clays are triggered by changes in moisture content. Hence, for stabilizing moisture conditions of the clay next to the slabs and external walls can be assisted by paving the surface of this area with concrete and avoid planting gardens and lawns next to the walls and slabs. Concrete apron or paving should extend at least over the 2m strip around the building and preferably further; the paving should slope to shed water away from the footings. Other site, vegetation, drainage and subgrade/foundation maintenance requirements given in AS2870-2011 for highly reactive clay sites should be implemented as appropriate. As noted in previous page, in the case of suspended slabs on bored piers founded on rock, void formers of 100mm thickness should be used under the slabs.

4.9 Engineered Fill Specification

Any fill used to backfill unstable subgrade areas, raise surface levels or backfill service trenches should be engineered fill. Materials preferred for use as engineered fill are well-graded granular materials, such as ripped or crushed sandstone, free of deleterious substances and having a maximum particle size not exceeding 75mm. Such fill should be compacted in layers not greater than 200mm loose thickness, to a minimum density of 98% of Standard Maximum Dry Density (SMDD).



The existing fill at the site are acceptable for re-use on condition that the soils used are clean (i.e. free of organics and inclusions greater than 75mm size), free of contaminants. We suggest against using the residual clay due its high plasticity and high reactivity potential. The existing fill soils should be compacted in maximum 200mm loose layers to a density strictly between 98% and 102% of SMDD and at moisture content within 2% of Standard Optimum. All clay fill should preferably be used in the lower fill layers. Thus, the use of clay materials for engineered fill will entail more rigorous earthwork supervision and compaction control, time for drying out the soils and hence, possibly a greater eventual cost for earthworks.

Density tests should be regularly carried out on the fill to confirm the above specifications are achieved. The frequency of density testing should be at least one test per layer per 500m² or three tests per visit, whichever requires the most tests. We recommend that at least Level 2 control of fill compaction, as defined in AS3798-2007, be adhered to on this site. However, if a floor slab is to rely on engineered fill for support then we recommend a higher compaction control of Level 1. We can complete the abovementioned testing and supervision if required. Preferably, the geotechnical testing authority (GTA) should be engaged directly on behalf of the client and not by the earthworks subcontractor.

During construction of the fill platform runoff should be enhanced by providing suitable falls to reduce ponding of water on the surface of the fill. Ponding of water may lead to softening of the fill and subsequent delays in the earthworks program.

4.10 Excavation Conditions, Batters and Retention

We do not anticipate significant earthworks or excavation on this site; however, any earthworks e.g. ground preparation for any new pavements, and earthworks (such as footing excavations) carried out must be completed in accordance with the Code of Practice 'Excavation Work', Cat No. 312 prepared by WorkCover NSW and AS3798-2007.

We do not have final details whether or not retaining walls or batter slopes are proposed as part of the development. However, it has been indicated that due to the prevailing site slope, that excavation ranging from zero to 3m in depth is likely to be required to achieve development levels. Also, it is likely some trench excavations are expected for installation of service conduits. Hence, we provide some recommendations below on these matters.



It is seen from the boreholes that excavations deeper than 0.5m-2m will encounter bedrock (tuffaceous sandstone, claystone, siltstone or mudstone), which will represent 'hard rock' excavation conditions if they are taken deep through rock of low to medium strengths or greater.

The fill and residual clays and upper layers of extremely weathered bedrock should be able to be excavated using conventional excavation equipment such as bucket attachments on large hydraulic excavators.

The bedrocks of low or greater strengths will present 'hard rock' excavation conditions requiring the use of rock excavation equipment, such as hydraulic rock hammers. The use of excavators with hydraulic impact hammer attachments, albeit small and lightweight, for any sandstone excavation should be approached with considerable caution, as there will likely be direct transmission of ground vibrations to nearby structures and buildings. Guideline levels of vibration velocity for evaluating the effects of vibration in structures are given in the attached Vibration Emission Design Goals sheet. We recommend that the acceptable limit for transmitted vibrations be set at quite a low peak particle velocity of 5mm/s for frequencies of less than 10Hz at foundation level. To fall within these limits, we recommend that the size of rock hammers initially used during the trial not exceed medium sized rock hammer say 900kg such as Krupp 580. If it is found that transmitted vibrations are unacceptable, then it may then be necessary to change to a smaller excavator with a smaller rock hammer, or to a rotary grinder, saws, or jackhammers. If rock hammers are to be used, we recommend that the initial excavation in rock should preferably be commenced away from likely critical areas and instrument vibration monitoring undertaken. The monitoring program should be confirmed when details of the contractor's excavation methods and sequence are known. By monitoring vibrations in this way, it will allow some freedom to the excavation contractor in the equipment he adopts, so that a balance can be made between productivity and vibration reduction.

Unsupported excavations should not be attempted at this site through the variably compacted fill, residual clays as well as the bedrock which were shown in the recovered rock core to be highly fractured and contain defects. The excavations sides will require support by either formation of cut batter sides of the excavations or installation of shoring walls (e.g. shoring boxes for conduit trenches or semi-contiguous bored piers). Short term batters should not be steeper than 1 Vertical (V) to 1 Horizontal (H) may be adopted; but this batter must be flattened to 1V in 2H for long term stability. The batters may be steepened to 1V:0.75H in the bedrock of low or greater strength bedrock subject to inspection by geotechnical engineer. Surcharge loads should be kept well away from the edges of the temporary batters. As a guide, surcharge loadings should be no closer than 2H from the top of any batter or the face of any excavation, where H is the vertical height of the



batter. The temporary batter slope would be applicable for short term situations during construction of various building structures (e.g. retaining walls). If the batter slope is to be left exposed for a period of say more than one month, or is affected by heavy rainfall, we recommend that the batter slope be flattened to 1V to 2H. If permanent batter slopes of soil cuts or of fill platforms are proposed, we recommend that they be graded at no steeper than 1 Vertical (V) on 2 Horizontal (H). Surface erosion protection, for example, quick establishing grass or proprietary systems (such as those provided by Geofabrics Australasia Pty Ltd), must be provided to the permanent batter slopes. Dish drains should be provided along the crest and toe of all permanent batter slopes to intercept surface water run-off. Discharge should be piped to the stormwater system.

Any free standing or cantilevered retaining or shoring walls that are required at the site should be designed for a coefficient of active earth pressure (K_A) of at least 0.35 and a bulk unit weight of 20kN/m³, assuming a horizontal backfill surface. For the above profile areas which are highly sensitive to lateral movement, consideration should be given to the use of a greater lateral pressure coefficient, K , of at least 0.6. For bedrock of low to medium strength or greater strength the K_a value may be taken to be half of the abovementioned value to account for the highly fracture and closely spaced defect nature of the bedrock of this site. The retaining wall should be designed to withstand full hydrostatic pressure unless measures are taken to introduce complete and permanent drainage of the ground behind the walls. All surcharge loads, including footing loads, which affect the walls should be considered in their design. The aforementioned earth pressure parameters apply to a horizontal backfill surface and, if inclined backfill surfaces are to be designed, then the above factors would have to be increased or the inclined section of backfill should be taken as a surcharge load in the design. For the design of walls socketed into the bedrock of at least low strength, it is recommended that a maximum allowable toe resistance of 200kPa may be used below the base of the excavation, including footing and service excavations, to resist the lateral pressure.

During the excavations, care must be taken to not undermine or render unstable any remaining adjoining building footings within the zone of influence of the excavations. The zone of influence is defined by line radiating up from the base of the excavation (including footing/services trenches) at a gradient of 1V in 2H. It may not be practicable to prevent significant vertical and lateral ground displacements immediately beyond the limits of the excavation, so the effects of the inevitable movements on the adjoining building have to be considered. The magnitude of lateral movement is directly related to the stiffness of the retaining system. It may be necessary to underpin adjoining footings before commencing the excavation, in order to protect them from ground displacements. Further comment on this aspect would require details of adjacent building footings to be provided. This may require additional test pit investigation to expose footings if plans are not available.



5 GENERAL COMMENTS

The recommendations presented in this report include specific issues to be addressed during the construction phase of the project. As an example, special treatment of soft spots may be required as a result of their discovery during proof-rolling, etc. In the event that any of the construction phase recommendations presented in this report are not implemented, the general recommendations may become inapplicable and JK Geotechnics accept no responsibility whatsoever for the performance of the structure where recommendations are not implemented in full and properly tested, inspected and documented.

The long term successful performance of floor slabs and pavements is dependent on the satisfactory completion of the earthworks. In order to achieve this, the quality assurance program should not be limited to routine compaction density testing only. Other critical factors associated with the earthworks may include subgrade preparation, selection of fill materials, control of moisture content and drainage, etc. The satisfactory control and assessment of these items may require judgment from an experienced engineer. Such judgment often cannot be made by a technician who may not have formal engineering qualifications and experience. In order to identify potential problems, we recommend that a pre-construction meeting be held so that all parties involved understand the earthworks requirements and potential difficulties. This meeting should clearly define the lines of communication and responsibility.

Occasionally, the subsurface conditions between the completed boreholes may be found to be different (or may be interpreted to be different) from those expected. Variation can also occur with groundwater conditions, especially after climatic changes. If such differences appear to exist, we recommend that you immediately contact this office.

This report provides advice on geotechnical aspects for the proposed civil and structural design. As part of the documentation stage of this project, Contract Documents and Specifications may be prepared based on our report. However, there may be design features we are not aware of or have not commented on for a variety of reasons. The designers should satisfy themselves that all the necessary advice has been obtained. If required, we could be commissioned to review the geotechnical aspects of contract documents to confirm the intent of our recommendations has been correctly implemented.



This report has been prepared for the particular project described and no responsibility is accepted for the use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose. If there is any change in the proposed development described in this report then all recommendations should be reviewed. Copyright in this report is the property of JK Geotechnics. We have used a degree of care, skill and diligence normally exercised by consulting engineers in similar circumstances and locality. No other warranty expressed or implied is made or intended. Subject to payment of all fees due for the investigation, the client alone shall have a licence to use this report. The report shall not be reproduced except in full.



SOIL TEST SERVICES

ABN 43 002 145 173

TABLE A
MOISTURE CONTENT, ATTERBERG LIMITS AND
LINEAR SHRINKAGE TEST REPORT

Client: JK Geotechnics
Project: Proposed Hospital Redevelopment
Location: 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW

Ref No: 30116V2
Report: A
Report Date: 6/09/2017
Page 1 of 1

AS 1289	TEST METHOD	2.1.1	3.1.2	3.2.1	3.3.1	3.4.1
BOREHOLE NUMBER	DEPTH m	MOISTURE CONTENT %	LIQUID LIMIT %	PLASTIC LIMIT %	PLASTICITY INDEX %	LINEAR SHRINKAGE %
101	2.80-3.00	9.0				
101	3.80-4.20	10.7				
102	4.80-5.20	6.6				
102	5.60-5.70	4.4				
103	1.50-1.95	17.0	45	19	26	10.5
103	2.60-3.00	14.3				
103	5.60-5.80	9.5				
104	0.60-0.80	6.0				
104	2.60-2.80	6.3				
105	0.50-0.95	31.0	70	28	42	16.5
105	2.60-3.00	11.7				
106	1.20-1.50	6.5				
106	2.10-2.40	5.3				
107	2.60-3.00	12.2				
107	5.60-6.00	8.3				
108	1.50-1.95	23.5	69	25	44	17.0
108	2.70-3.00	3.5				
109	0.50-0.95	21.4	36	18	18	6.5
109	1.30-1.50	5.3				
110	2.60-3.00	12.3				
111	2.80-3.00	11.6				
111	3.80-4.10	3.1				
111	5.00-5.40	2.4				

Notes:

- The test sample for liquid and plastic limit was air-dried & dry-sieved
- The linear shrinkage mould was 125mm
- Refer to appropriate notes for soil descriptions
- Date of receipt of sample: 25/08/2017



SOIL TEST SERVICES

ABN 43 002 145 173

TABLE A
MOISTURE CONTENT, ATTERBERG LIMITS AND
LINEAR SHRINKAGE TEST REPORT

Client: JK Geotechnics
Project: Proposed New Acute Services Building
Location: Goulburn Base Hospital, 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW

Ref No: 30116V
Report: A
Report Date: 8/02/2017
Page 1 of 1

AS 1289	TEST METHOD	2.1.1	3.1.2	3.2.1	3.3.1	3.4.1
BOREHOLE NUMBER	DEPTH m	MOISTURE CONTENT %	LIQUID LIMIT %	PLASTIC LIMIT %	PLASTICITY INDEX %	LINEAR SHRINKAGE %
1	1.50-1.95	26.9	63	30	33	16.0
1	5.70-6.00	21.2				
2	3.50-4.00	10.4				
2	4.30-4.50	10.7				
3	3.00-3.25	16.7				
3	4.20-4.50	14.7				
4	0.50-0.95	29.1	66	29	37	17.5
4	2.60-3.00	5.7				
4	4.00-4.50	4.4				

Notes:

- The test sample for liquid and plastic limit was air-dried & dry-sieved
- The linear shrinkage mould was 125mm
- Refer to appropriate notes for soil descriptions
- Date of receipt of sample: 25/01/2017

TABLE B
FOUR DAY SOAKED CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST REPORT

Client: JK Geotechnics
Project: Proposed Hospital Redevelopment
Location: 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW

Ref No: 30116V2
Report: B
Report Date: 6/09/2017
Page 1 of 1

BOREHOLE NUMBER	101	103	108	109
DEPTH (m)	0.30 - 1.30	0.30 - 1.30	1.00 - 1.50	0.30 - 1.00
Surcharge (kg)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Maximum Dry Density (t/m ³)	1.81 STD	1.72 STD	1.58 STD	1.64 STD
Optimum Moisture Content (%)	13.8	18.4	21.0	18.1
Moulded Dry Density (t/m ³)	1.77	1.69	1.55	1.61
Sample Density Ratio (%)	98	98	98	98
Sample Moisture Ratio (%)	102	100	101	101
Moisture Contents				
Insitu (%)	9.5	14.3	21.7	25.8
Moulded (%)	14.1	18.4	21.2	18.2
After soaking and				
After Test, Top 30mm(%)	19.8	21.4	22.5	19.0
Remaining Depth (%)	15.1	16.8	22.1	17.4
Material Retained on 19mm Sieve (%)	0	0	0	0
Swell (%)	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
C.B.R. value:				
@2.5mm penetration		5	6	5
@5.0mm penetration	7			

NOTES:

- Refer to appropriate Borehole logs for soil descriptions
- Test Methods :
 - (a) Soaked C.B.R. : AS 1289 6.1.1
 - (b) Standard Compaction : AS 1289 5.1.1
 - (c) Moisture Content : AS 1289 2.1.1
- Date of receipt of sample: 25/08/2017



NATA Accredited Laboratory
Number:1327

Approved Signatory / Date
A. Tatikonda 6/9/17
(A. Tatikonda)



SOIL TEST SERVICES

ABN 43 002 145 173

TABLE B
FOUR DAY SOAKED CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST REPORT

Client:	JK Geotechnics	Ref No:	30116V
Project:	Proposed New Acute Services Building	Report:	B
Location:	Goulburn Base Hospital, 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW	Report Date:	8/02/2017
		Page 1 of 1	

BOREHOLE NUMBER	3
DEPTH (m)	0.30 - 1.00
Surcharge (kg)	4.5
Maximum Dry Density (t/m ³)	1.86 STD
Optimum Moisture Content (%)	13.6
Moulded Dry Density (t/m ³)	1.83
Sample Density Ratio (%)	98
Sample Moisture Ratio (%)	99
Moisture Contents	
Insitu (%)	15.6
Moulded (%)	13.4
After soaking and	
After Test, Top 30mm(%)	18.6
Remaining Depth (%)	16.5
Material Retained on 19mm Sieve (%)	0
Swell (%)	0.0
C.B.R. value:	@2.5mm penetration 10

NOTES:

- Refer to appropriate Borehole logs for soil descriptions
- Test Methods :
 - (a) Soaked C.B.R. : AS 1289 6.1.1
 - (b) Standard Compaction : AS 1289 5.1.1
 - (c) Moisture Content : AS 1289 2.1.1
- Date of receipt of sample: 25/01/2017



SOIL TEST SERVICES

ABN 43 002 145 173

TABLE C
POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX TEST REPORT

Client: JK Geotechnics
Project: Proposed Hospital Redevelopment
Location: 130 Goldsmith Street, Goulburn, NSW

Ref No: 30116V2
Report: C
Report Date: 30/08/2017

Page 1 of 1

BOREHOLE NUMBER	DEPTH	$I_{S(50)}$ MPa	ESTIMATED UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (MPa)
	m		
101	4.74-4.78	0.2	4
	5.04-5.07	0.2	4
	5.63-5.66	0.2	4
	6.20-6.24	0.2	4
	7.02-7.06	0.4	8
	7.55-7.60	0.5	10
	8.05-8.09	0.4	8
	8.59-8.64	0.4	8
102	7.16-7.20	0.4	8
	7.86-7.90	0.5	10
	8.30-8.34	0.2	4
	8.76-8.81	1.1	22
103	5.92-5.95	0.2	4
	6.34-6.38	0.3	6
	6.89-6.93	0.3	6
	7.27-7.32	0.1	2
	7.87-7.89	1.0	20
	9.15-9.18	2.2	44
104	2.95-2.98	1.5	30
	3.53-3.56	1.0	20
	4.12-4.16	1.3	26
	4.62-4.66	0.9	18
	5.07-5.11	1.7	34
	5.46-5.50	1.7	34
	6.00-6.03	1.3	26
	6.47-6.52	2.2	44

NOTES:

1. In the above table testing was completed in the Axial direction.
2. The above strength tests were completed at the 'as received' moisture content.
3. Test Method: RMS T223.
4. For reporting purposes, the $I_{S(50)}$ has been rounded to the nearest 0.1MPa, or to one significant figure if less than 0.1MPa
5. The Estimated Unconfined Compressive Strength was calculated from the point load Strength Index by the following approximate relationship and rounded off to the nearest whole number :
U.C.S. = 20 $I_{S(50)}$



BOREHOLE LOG

Borehole No.

1

1/2

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

Project: PROPOSED NEW ACUTE SERVICES BUILDING

Location: GOULBURN HOSPITAL, 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No. 30116V

Method: SPIRAL AUGER
JK305

R.L. Surface: ≈ 652.2m

Date: 31/1/17

Datum: AHD

Logged/Checked by: A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa.)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS									
DRY ON COMPLETION						0		-	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE: 20mm.t FILL: Sandy gravel, fine to coarse grained igneous gravel, dark grey, fine to medium grained sand, light grey.	D			APPEARS WELL COMPACTED
					N = 18 6,10,8	1		-	FILL: Silty sand, fine to coarse grained, dark grey, with fine to coarse grained igneous gravel, orange and red, trace of slag.	M			
					N = 10 5,4,6	2		CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown.	MC<PL	H	400 410 520	RESIDUAL
					N >39 10,18, 21/90mm REFUSAL	3		-	SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to medium grained, yellow brown, with clay seams.	XW	EL		
						4							
						5							
						6							
						7							
										DW	VL-L		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE WITH MODERATE BANDS

BOREHOLE LOG

[illegible]



BOREHOLE LOG

Borehole No.

2

1/1

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

Project: PROPOSED NEW ACUTE SERVICES BUILDING

Location: GOULBURN HOSPITAL, 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No. 30116V

Method: SPIRAL AUGER
JK305

R.L. Surface: ≈ 653.3m

Date: 31/1/17

Datum: AHD

Logged/Checked by: A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES			Field Tests	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa.)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB									
DRY ON COMPLETION					0		-	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE: 45mm.t	D			APPEARS WELL COMPACTED
				N = 18 7,9,9			CH	FILL: Sandy gravel, fine to coarse grained, dark grey, igneous, fine to medium grained sand, light grey. FILL: Silty clay, low to medium plasticity, brown, with fine grained sand, trace of fine grained igneous gravel.	MC<PL			RESIDUAL
					1		CH	GRAVELLY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown, fine to medium grained, black and red brown, ferruginous gravel.	MC<PL	H	>600 >600	
				N = 13 7,6,7			CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown, with fine to medium grained ferruginous gravel, black and red brown.	MC<PL		>600 580 450	
					2		-	SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, green grey.	XW-DW	EL-VL		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
				N = SPT 15/70mm REFUSAL	3							
					4				DW	VL		
					5			as above, but orange brown.		L		LOW RESISTANCE WITH MODERATE BANDS
					6					M		MODERATE RESISTANCE
					7			END OF BOREHOLE AT 6.0m				



BOREHOLE LOG

Borehole No.

3

1/1

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

Project: PROPOSED NEW ACUTE SERVICES BUILDING

Location: GOULBURN HOSPITAL, 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No. 30116V

Method: SPIRAL AUGER
JK305

R.L. Surface: ≈ 654.7m

Date: 31/1/17

Datum: AHD

Logged/Checked by: A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES			Field Tests	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/Weathering	Strength/Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa.)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB									
DRY ON COMPLETION					0		CH	FILL: Silty clay, low plasticity, dark brown, with fine to medium grained igneous and ironstone gravel.	MC<PL			GRASS COVER
								GRAVELLY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown and orange, fine to medium grained, black and red brown, ferruginous gravel.	MC>PL	VSt	240 260	RESIDUAL
				N = 10 3,5,5	1			GRAVELLY CLAY: high plasticity, light grey, fine to coarse grained, orange brown, siliceous gravel.	MC<PL	H	470 430	
				N = 24 6,8,16	2							
				N > 15 12,15/ 100mm REFUSAL	3		-	SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, yellow brown.	XW	EL		
									XW-DW	EL-VL		
					4			as above, but iron indurated bands.	DW	L		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
					5							
					6			END OF BOREHOLE AT 6.0m				
					7							



BOREHOLE LOG

Borehole No.

4

1/1

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

Project: PROPOSED NEW ACUTE SERVICES BUILDING

Location: GOULBURN HOSPITAL, 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No. 30116V

Method: SPIRAL AUGER
JK305

R.L. Surface: ≈ 652.8m

Date: 31/1/17

Datum: AHD

Logged/Checked by: A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES			Field Tests	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel. Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa.)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB									
DRY ON COMPLETION					0			FILL: Silty sand, fine to medium grained, dark brown, with fine to medium grained igneous gravel.	M			
							CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown.	MC>PL	VSt		RESIDUAL
				N = 11 3,6,5							370 330 260	
					1							
				N > 15 7,15/ 100mm REFUSAL			-	MUDSTONE: grey, with sandstone, fine grained, grey seams and clay seams.	XW	EL		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
					2			MUDSTONE: grey, with iron indurated bands.	DW	L-M		
					3							
					4			MUDSTONE: brown and grey, with iron indurated bands.		M		MODERATE RESISTANCE WITH HIGH BANDS
					5					M-H		MODERATE RESISTANCE
					6							HIGH RESISTANCE
					7			END OF BOREHOLE AT 6.0m				LOW TO MODERATE RESISTANCE





AERIAL IMAGE SOURCE: GOOGLE EARTH PRO 7.1.5.1557
AERIAL IMAGE ©: 2015 GOOGLE INC.

Title: SITE LOCATION PLAN	
Location: GOULBURN HOSPITAL 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW	
Report No: 30116V	Figure No: 1
JK Geotechnics	



This plan should be read in conjunction with the JK Geotechnics report.




This plan should be read in conjunction with the JK Geotechnics report.

Title:		BOREHOLE LOCATION PLAN	
Location:		GOULBURN HOSPITAL 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW	
Report No:		30116V	Figure No: 2
JK Geotechnics			



GRAPHICAL BOREHOLE SUMMARY



	Asphaltic/Bituminous Paving or Coal	N	SPT "N" VALUE
	Sandstone/Greywacke	Nc	SOLID CONE BLOW COUNTS PER 150mm
	Fill		
	Silty Clay		
	Gravelly clay		
	Siltstone, Mudstone, Claystone		

NOTE: REFER TO BOREHOLE LOGS

Scale: 1 : 100 (vert) ; NTS (horiz)

JK Geotechnics

Job No.: 30116V

Figure No.: 3





VIBRATION EMISSION DESIGN GOALS

German Standard DIN 4150 – Part 3: 1986 provides guideline levels of vibration velocity for evaluating the effects of vibration in structures. The limits presented in this standard are generally recognised to be conservative.

The DIN 4150 values (maximum levels measured in any direction at the foundation, OR, maximum levels measured in (x) or (y) horizontal directions, in the plane of the uppermost floor), are summarised in Table 1 below.

It should be noted that peak vibration velocities higher than the minimum figures in Table 1 for low frequencies may be quite 'safe', depending on the frequency content of the vibration and the actual condition of the structure.

It should also be noted that these levels are 'safe limits', up to which no damage due to vibration effects has been observed for the particular class of building. 'Damage' is defined by DIN 4150 to include even minor non-structural effects such as superficial cracking in cement render, the enlargement of cracks already present, and the separation of partitions or intermediate walls from load bearing walls. Should damage be observed at vibration levels lower than the 'safe limits', then it may be attributed to other causes. DIN 4150 also states that when vibration levels higher than the 'safe limits' are present, it does not necessarily follow that damage will occur. Values given are only a broad guide.

Table 1: DIN 4150 – Structural Damage – Safe Limits for Building Vibration

Group	Type of Structure	Peak Vibration Velocity in mm/s			
		At Foundation Level at a Frequency of:			Plane of Floor of Uppermost Storey
		Less than 10Hz	10Hz to 50Hz	50Hz to 100Hz	All Frequencies
1	Buildings used for commercial purposes, industrial buildings and buildings of similar design.	20	20 to 40	40 to 50	40
2	Dwellings and buildings of similar design and/or use.	5	5 to 15	15 to 20	15
3	Structures that because of their particular sensitivity to vibration, do not correspond to those listed in Group 1 and 2 and have intrinsic value (eg. buildings that are under a preservation order).	3	3 to 8	8 to 10	8

Note: For frequencies above 100Hz, the higher values in the 50Hz to 100Hz column should be used.



REPORT EXPLANATION NOTES

INTRODUCTION

These notes have been provided to amplify the geotechnical report in regard to classification methods, field procedures and certain matters relating to the Comments and Recommendations section. Not all notes are necessarily relevant to all reports.

The ground is a product of continuing natural and man-made processes and therefore exhibits a variety of characteristics and properties which vary from place to place and can change with time. Geotechnical engineering involves gathering and assimilating limited facts about these characteristics and properties in order to understand or predict the behaviour of the ground on a particular site under certain conditions. This report may contain such facts obtained by inspection, excavation, probing, sampling, testing or other means of investigation. If so, they are directly relevant only to the ground at the place where and time when the investigation was carried out.

DESCRIPTION AND CLASSIFICATION METHODS

The methods of description and classification of soils and rocks used in this report are based on Australian Standard 1726, the SAA Site Investigation Code. In general, descriptions cover the following properties – soil or rock type, colour, structure, strength or density, and inclusions. Identification and classification of soil and rock involves judgement and the Company infers accuracy only to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice.

Soil types are described according to the predominating particle size and behaviour as set out in the attached Unified Soil Classification Table qualified by the grading of other particles present (e.g. sandy clay) as set out below:

Soil Classification	Particle Size
Clay	less than 0.002mm
Silt	0.002 to 0.075mm
Sand	0.075 to 2mm
Gravel	2 to 60mm

Non-cohesive soils are classified on the basis of relative density, generally from the results of Standard Penetration Test (SPT) as below:

Relative Density	SPT 'N' Value (blows/300mm)
Very loose	less than 4
Loose	4 – 10
Medium dense	10 – 30
Dense	30 – 50
Very Dense	greater than 50

Cohesive soils are classified on the basis of strength (consistency) either by use of hand penetrometer, laboratory testing or engineering examination. The strength terms are defined as follows.

Classification	Unconfined Compressive Strength kPa
Very Soft	less than 25
Soft	25 – 50
Firm	50 – 100
Stiff	100 – 200
Very Stiff	200 – 400
Hard	Greater than 400
Friable	Strength not attainable – soil crumbles

Rock types are classified by their geological names, together with descriptive terms regarding weathering, strength, defects, etc. Where relevant, further information regarding rock classification is given in the text of the report. In the Sydney Basin, 'Shale' is used to describe thinly bedded to laminated siltstone.

SAMPLING

Sampling is carried out during drilling or from other excavations to allow engineering examination (and laboratory testing where required) of the soil or rock.

Disturbed samples taken during drilling provide information on plasticity, grain size, colour, moisture content, minor constituents and, depending upon the degree of disturbance, some information on strength and structure. Bulk samples are similar but of greater volume required for some test procedures.

Undisturbed samples are taken by pushing a thin-walled sample tube, usually 50mm diameter (known as a U50), into the soil and withdrawing it with a sample of the soil contained in a relatively undisturbed state. Such samples yield information on structure and strength, and are necessary for laboratory determination of shear strength and compressibility. Undisturbed sampling is generally effective only in cohesive soils.

Details of the type and method of sampling used are given on the attached logs.

INVESTIGATION METHODS

The following is a brief summary of investigation methods currently adopted by the Company and some comments on their use and application. All except test pits, hand auger drilling and portable dynamic cone penetrometers require the use of a mechanical drilling rig which is commonly mounted on a truck chassis.



Test Pits: These are normally excavated with a backhoe or a tracked excavator, allowing close examination of the insitu soils if it is safe to descend into the pit. The depth of penetration is limited to about 3m for a backhoe and up to 6m for an excavator. Limitations of test pits are the problems associated with disturbance and difficulty of reinstatement and the consequent effects on close-by structures. Care must be taken if construction is to be carried out near test pit locations to either properly recompact the backfill during construction or to design and construct the structure so as not to be adversely affected by poorly compacted backfill at the test pit location.

Hand Auger Drilling: A borehole of 50mm to 100mm diameter is advanced by manually operated equipment. Premature refusal of the hand augers can occur on a variety of materials such as hard clay, gravel or ironstone, and does not necessarily indicate rock level.

Continuous Spiral Flight Augers: The borehole is advanced using 75mm to 115mm diameter continuous spiral flight augers, which are withdrawn at intervals to allow sampling and insitu testing. This is a relatively economical means of drilling in clays and in sands above the water table. Samples are returned to the surface by the flights or may be collected after withdrawal of the auger flights, but they can be very disturbed and layers may become mixed. Information from the auger sampling (as distinct from specific sampling by SPTs or undisturbed samples) is of relatively lower reliability due to mixing or softening of samples by groundwater, or uncertainties as to the original depth of the samples. Augering below the groundwater table is of even lesser reliability than augering above the water table.

Rock Augering: Use can be made of a Tungsten Carbide (TC) bit for auger drilling into rock to indicate rock quality and continuity by variation in drilling resistance and from examination of recovered rock fragments. This method of investigation is quick and relatively inexpensive but provides only an indication of the likely rock strength and predicted values may be in error by a strength order. Where rock strengths may have a significant impact on construction feasibility or costs, then further investigation by means of cored boreholes may be warranted.

Wash Boring: The borehole is usually advanced by a rotary bit, with water being pumped down the drill rods and returned up the annulus, carrying the drill cuttings. Only major changes in stratification can be determined from the cuttings, together with some information from "feel" and rate of penetration.

Mud Stabilised Drilling: Either Wash Boring or Continuous Core Drilling can use drilling mud as a circulating fluid to stabilise the borehole. The term 'mud' encompasses a range of products ranging from bentonite to polymers such as Revert or Biogel. The mud tends to mask the cuttings and reliable identification is only possible from intermittent intact sampling (eg from SPT and U50 samples) or from rock coring, etc.

Continuous Core Drilling: A continuous core sample is obtained using a diamond tipped core barrel. Provided full core recovery is achieved (which is not always possible in very low strength rocks and granular soils), this technique provides a very reliable (but relatively expensive) method of investigation. In rocks, an NMLC triple tube core barrel, which gives a core of about 50mm diameter, is usually used with water flush. The length of core recovered is compared to the length drilled and any length not recovered is shown as CORE LOSS. The location of losses are determined on site by the supervising engineer; where the location is uncertain, the loss is placed at the top end of the drill run.

Standard Penetration Tests: Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) are used mainly in non-cohesive soils, but can also be used in cohesive soils as a means of indicating density or strength and also of obtaining a relatively undisturbed sample. The test procedure is described in Australian Standard 1289, "Methods of Testing Soils for Engineering Purposes" – Test F3.1.

The test is carried out in a borehole by driving a 50mm diameter split sample tube with a tapered shoe, under the impact of a 63kg hammer with a free fall of 760mm. It is normal for the tube to be driven in three successive 150mm increments and the 'N' value is taken as the number of blows for the last 300mm. In dense sands, very hard clays or weak rock, the full 450mm penetration may not be practicable and the test is discontinued.

The test results are reported in the following form:

- In the case where full penetration is obtained with successive blow counts for each 150mm of, say, 4, 6 and 7 blows, as
N = 13
4, 6, 7
- In a case where the test is discontinued short of full penetration, say after 15 blows for the first 150mm and 30 blows for the next 40mm, as
N > 30
15, 30/40mm

The results of the test can be related empirically to the engineering properties of the soil.

Occasionally, the drop hammer is used to drive 50mm diameter thin walled sample tubes (U50) in clays. In such circumstances, the test results are shown on the borehole logs in brackets.

A modification to the SPT test is where the same driving system is used with a solid 60° tipped steel cone of the same diameter as the SPT hollow sampler. The solid cone can be continuously driven for some distance in soft clays or loose sands, or may be used where damage would otherwise occur to the SPT. The results of this Solid Cone Penetration Test (SCPT) are shown as "N_c" on the borehole logs, together with the number of blows per 150mm penetration.

Static Cone Penetrometer Testing and Interpretation:

Cone penetrometer testing (sometimes referred to as a Dutch Cone) described in this report has been carried out using an Electronic Friction Cone Penetrometer (EFCP). The test is described in Australian Standard 1289, Test F5.1.

In the tests, a 35mm diameter rod with a conical tip is pushed continuously into the soil, the reaction being provided by a specially designed truck or rig which is fitted with an hydraulic ram system. Measurements are made of the end bearing resistance on the cone and the frictional resistance on a separate 134mm long sleeve, immediately behind the cone. Transducers in the tip of the assembly are electrically connected by wires passing through the centre of the push rods to an amplifier and recorder unit mounted on the control truck.

As penetration occurs (at a rate of approximately 20mm per second) the information is output as incremental digital records every 10mm. The results given in this report have been plotted from the digital data.

The information provided on the charts comprise:

- Cone resistance – the actual end bearing force divided by the cross sectional area of the cone – expressed in MPa.
- Sleeve friction – the frictional force on the sleeve divided by the surface area – expressed in kPa.
- Friction ratio – the ratio of sleeve friction to cone resistance, expressed as a percentage.

The ratios of the sleeve resistance to cone resistance will vary with the type of soil encountered, with higher relative friction in clays than in sands. Friction ratios of 1% to 2% are commonly encountered in sands and occasionally very soft clays, rising to 4% to 10% in stiff clays and peats. Soil descriptions based on cone resistance and friction ratios are only inferred and must not be considered as exact.

Correlations between EFCP and SPT values can be developed for both sands and clays but may be site specific.

Interpretation of EFCP values can be made to empirically derive modulus or compressibility values to allow calculation of foundation settlements.

Stratification can be inferred from the cone and friction traces and from experience and information from nearby boreholes etc. Where shown, this information is presented for general guidance, but must be regarded as interpretive. The test method provides a continuous profile of engineering properties but, where precise information on soil classification is required, direct drilling and sampling may be preferable.

Portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometers: Portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) tests are carried out by driving a rod into the ground with a sliding hammer and counting the blows for successive 100mm increments of penetration.

Two relatively similar tests are used:

- Cone penetrometer (commonly known as the Scala Penetrometer) – a 16mm rod with a 20mm diameter cone end is driven with a 9kg hammer dropping 510mm (AS1289, Test F3.2). The test was developed initially for pavement subgrade investigations, and correlations of the test results with California Bearing Ratio have been published by various Road Authorities.
- Perth sand penetrometer – a 16mm diameter flat ended rod is driven with a 9kg hammer, dropping 600mm (AS1289, Test F3.3). This test was developed for testing the density of sands (originating in Perth) and is mainly used in granular soils and filling.

LOGS

The borehole or test pit logs presented herein are an engineering and/or geological interpretation of the subsurface conditions, and their reliability will depend to some extent on the frequency of sampling and the method of drilling or excavation. Ideally, continuous undisturbed sampling or core drilling will enable the most reliable assessment, but is not always practicable or possible to justify on economic grounds. In any case, the boreholes or test pits represent only a very small sample of the total subsurface conditions.

The attached explanatory notes define the terms and symbols used in preparation of the logs.

Interpretation of the information shown on the logs, and its application to design and construction, should therefore take into account the spacing of boreholes or test pits, the method of drilling or excavation, the frequency of sampling and testing and the possibility of other than "straight line" variations between the boreholes or test pits. Subsurface conditions between boreholes or test pits may vary significantly from conditions encountered at the borehole or test pit locations.

GROUNDWATER

Where groundwater levels are measured in boreholes, there are several potential problems:

- Although groundwater may be present, in low permeability soils it may enter the hole slowly or perhaps not at all during the time it is left open.
- A localised perched water table may lead to an erroneous indication of the true water table.
- Water table levels will vary from time to time with seasons or recent weather changes and may not be the same at the time of construction.
- The use of water or mud as a drilling fluid will mask any groundwater inflow. Water has to be blown out of the hole and drilling mud must be washed out of the hole or 'reverted' chemically if water observations are to be made.



More reliable measurements can be made by installing standpipes which are read after stabilising at intervals ranging from several days to perhaps weeks for low permeability soils. Piezometers, sealed in a particular stratum, may be advisable in low permeability soils or where there may be interference from perched water tables or surface water.

FILL

The presence of fill materials can often be determined only by the inclusion of foreign objects (eg bricks, steel etc) or by distinctly unusual colour, texture or fabric. Identification of the extent of fill materials will also depend on investigation methods and frequency. Where natural soils similar to those at the site are used for fill, it may be difficult with limited testing and sampling to reliably determine the extent of the fill.

The presence of fill materials is usually regarded with caution as the possible variation in density, strength and material type is much greater than with natural soil deposits. Consequently, there is an increased risk of adverse engineering characteristics or behaviour. If the volume and quality of fill is of importance to a project, then frequent test pit excavations are preferable to boreholes.

LABORATORY TESTING

Laboratory testing is normally carried out in accordance with Australian Standard 1289 'Methods of Testing Soil for Engineering Purposes'. Details of the test procedure used are given on the individual report forms.

ENGINEERING REPORTS

Engineering reports are prepared by qualified personnel and are based on the information obtained and on current engineering standards of interpretation and analysis. Where the report has been prepared for a specific design proposal (eg. a three storey building) the information and interpretation may not be relevant if the design proposal is changed (eg to a twenty storey building). If this happens, the company will be pleased to review the report and the sufficiency of the investigation work.

Every care is taken with the report as it relates to interpretation of subsurface conditions, discussion of geotechnical aspects and recommendations or suggestions for design and construction. However, the Company cannot always anticipate or assume responsibility for:

- Unexpected variations in ground conditions – the potential for this will be partially dependent on borehole spacing and sampling frequency as well as investigation technique.
- Changes in policy or interpretation of policy by statutory authorities.
- The actions of persons or contractors responding to commercial pressures.

If these occur, the company will be pleased to assist with investigation or advice to resolve any problems occurring.

SITE ANOMALIES

In the event that conditions encountered on site during construction appear to vary from those which were expected from the information contained in the report, the company requests that it immediately be notified. Most problems are much more readily resolved when conditions are exposed that at some later stage, well after the event.

REPRODUCTION OF INFORMATION FOR CONTRACTUAL PURPOSES

Attention is drawn to the document 'Guidelines for the Provision of Geotechnical Information in Tender Documents', published by the Institution of Engineers, Australia. Where information obtained from this investigation is provided for tendering purposes, it is recommended that all information, including the written report and discussion, be made available. In circumstances where the discussion or comments section is not relevant to the contractual situation, it may be appropriate to prepare a specially edited document. The company would be pleased to assist in this regard and/or to make additional report copies available for contract purposes at a nominal charge.

Copyright in all documents (such as drawings, borehole or test pit logs, reports and specifications) provided by the Company shall remain the property of Jeffery and Katauskas Pty Ltd. Subject to the payment of all fees due, the Client alone shall have a licence to use the documents provided for the sole purpose of completing the project to which they relate. License to use the documents may be revoked without notice if the Client is in breach of any objection to make a payment to us.

REVIEW OF DESIGN

Where major civil or structural developments are proposed or where only a limited investigation has been completed or where the geotechnical conditions/ constraints are quite complex, it is prudent to have a joint design review which involves a senior geotechnical engineer.

SITE INSPECTION

The company will always be pleased to provide engineering inspection services for geotechnical aspects of work to which this report is related.

Requirements could range from:

- i) a site visit to confirm that conditions exposed are no worse than those interpreted, to
- ii) a visit to assist the contractor or other site personnel in identifying various soil/rock types such as appropriate footing or pier founding depths, or
- iii) full time engineering presence on site.



GRAPHIC LOG SYMBOLS FOR SOILS AND ROCKS

SOIL		ROCK		DEFECTS AND INCLUSIONS	
	FILL		CONGLOMERATE		CLAY SEAM
	TOPSOIL		SANDSTONE		SHEARED OR CRUSHED SEAM
	CLAY (CL, CH)		SHALE		BRECCIATED OR SHATTERED SEAM/ZONE
	SILT (ML, MH)		SILTSTONE, MUDSTONE, CLAYSTONE		IRONSTONE GRAVEL
	SAND (SP, SW)		LIMESTONE		ORGANIC MATERIAL
	GRAVEL (GP, GW)		PHYLLITE, SCHIST		
	SANDY CLAY (CL, CH)		TUFF		CONCRETE
	SILTY CLAY (CL, CH)		GRANITE, GABBRO		BITUMINOUS CONCRETE, COAL
	CLAYEY SAND (SC)		DOLERITE, DIORITE		COLLUVIUM
	SILTY SAND (SM)		BASALT, ANDESITE		
	GRAVELLY CLAY (CL, CH)		QUARTZITE		
	CLAYEY GRAVEL (GC)				
	SANDY SILT (ML)				
	PEAT AND ORGANIC SOILS				



Identification Procedures larger than 75 μm and basing fractions on estimated weights)				Group Symbols a	Typical Names	Information Required for Describing Soils	Laboratory Classification Criteria	
(little or no fines)	Wide range in grain size and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes			GW	Well graded gravels, gravel- sand mixtures, little or no fines	Give typical name; indicate ap- proximate percentages of sand and gravel; maximum size; angularity, surface condition, and hardness of the coarse grains; local or geologic name and other pertinent descriptive information; and symbols in parentheses	$C_U = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} \text{ Greater than 4}$ $C_C = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}} \text{ Between 1 and 3}$	
	Predominantly one size or a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing			GP	Poorly graded gravels, gravel- sand mixtures, little or no fines		Not meeting all gradation requirements for GW	
(appreciable amount of fines)	Nonplastic fines (for identification pro- cedures see ML below)			GM	Silty gravels, poorly graded gravel-sand-silt mixtures	For undisturbed soils add informa- tion on stratification, degree of compactness, cementation, moisture conditions and drainage characteristics	Atterberg limits below "A" line, or PI less than 4	
	Plastic fines (for identification procedures, see CL below)			GC	Clayey gravels, poorly graded gravel-sand-clay mixtures		Atterberg limits above "A" line, with PI greater than 7	
(little or no fines)	Wide range in grain sizes and substantial amounts of all intermediate particle sizes			SW	Well graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines	Example: Silty sand, gravelly; about 20% hard, angular gravel par- ticles 12 mm maximum size; rounded and subangular sand grains coarse to fine, about 15% non-plastic fines with low dry strength; well com- pacted and moist in place; alluvial sand; (SM)	$C_U = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} \text{ Greater than 6}$ $C_C = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}} \text{ Between 1 and 3}$	
	Predominantly one size or a range of sizes with some intermediate sizes missing			SP	Poorly graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines		Not meeting all gradation requirements for SW	
(appreciable amount of fines)	Nonplastic fines (for identification pro- cedures, see ML below)			SM	Silty sands, poorly graded sand- silt mixtures		Atterberg limits below "A" line or PI less than 5	
	Plastic fines (for identification procedures, see CL below)			SC	Clayey sands, poorly graded sand-clay mixtures		Atterberg limits below "A" line with PI greater than 7	
cedures on Fraction Smaller than 380 μm Sieve Size								
	Dry Strength (crushing character- istics)	Dilatancy (reaction to shaking)	Toughness (consistency near plastic limit)					
	None to slight	Quick to slow	None	ML	Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands with slight plasticity	Give typical name; indicate degree and character of plasticity, amount and maximum size of coarse grains; colour in wet condition, odour if any, local or geologic name, and other per- tinent descriptive information, and symbol in parentheses		
	Medium to high	None to very slow	Medium	CL	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays			
	Slight to medium	Slow	Slight	OL	Organic silts and organic silt- clays of low plasticity	For undisturbed soils add in- formation on structure, stratifica- tion, consistency in undisturbed and remoulded states, moisture and drainage conditions		
	Slight to medium	Slow to none	Slight to medium	MH	Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts			
	High to very high	None	High	CH	Inorganic clays of high plas- ticity, fat clays	Example: Clayey silt, brown; slightly plastic; small percentage of fine sand; numerous vertical root holes; firm and dry in place; loess; (ML)		
	Medium to high	None to very slow	Slight to medium	OH	Organic clays of medium to high plasticity			
	Readily identified by colour, odour, spongy feel and frequently by fibrous texture			Pt	Peat and other highly organic soils			

Use grain size curve in identifying the fractions as given under field identification


Plasticity index

Liquid limit

Plasticity chart
for laboratory classification of fine grained soils

Use grain size curve in identifying the fractions as given under field identification

Determine percentages of gravel and sand from grain size curve
Depending on percentage of fines (fraction smaller than 75 μm sieve size) coarse grained soils are classified as follows:
Less than 5% GW, GP, SW, SP
More than 12% GM, GC, SM, SC
Borderline cases requiring use of dual symbols



- Note: 1 Soils possessing characteristics of two groups are designated by combinations of group symbols (eg. GW-GC, well graded gravel-sand mixture with clay fines).
2 Soils with liquid limits of the order of 35 to 50 may be visually classified as being of medium plasticity.



LOG SYMBOLS

LOG COLUMN	SYMBOL	DEFINITION
Groundwater Record		Standing water level. Time delay following completion of drilling may be shown.
		Extent of borehole collapse shortly after drilling.
		Groundwater seepage into borehole or excavation noted during drilling or excavation.
Samples	ES	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for environmental analysis.
	U50	Undisturbed 50mm diameter tube sample taken over depth indicated.
	DB	Bulk disturbed sample taken over depth indicated.
	DS	Small disturbed bag sample taken over depth indicated.
	ASB	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for asbestos screening.
	ASS	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for acid sulfate soil analysis.
	SAL	Soil sample taken over depth indicated, for salinity analysis.
Field Tests	N = 17 4, 7, 10	Standard Penetration Test (SPT) performed between depths indicated by lines. Individual figures show blows per 150mm penetration. 'R' as noted below.
	N _c = 5 7 3R	Solid Cone Penetration Test (SCPT) performed between depths indicated by lines. Individual figures show blows per 150mm penetration for 60 degree solid cone driven by SPT hammer. 'R' refers to apparent hammer refusal within the corresponding 150mm depth increment.
	VNS = 25	Vane shear reading in kPa of Undrained Shear Strength.
	PID = 100	Photoionisation detector reading in ppm (Soil sample headspace test).
Moisture Condition (Cohesive Soils) (Cohesionless Soils)	MC>PL	Moisture content estimated to be greater than plastic limit.
	MC≈PL	Moisture content estimated to be approximately equal to plastic limit.
	MC<PL	Moisture content estimated to be less than plastic limit.
	D	DRY – Runs freely through fingers.
	M	MOIST – Does not run freely but no free water visible on soil surface.
	W	WET – Free water visible on soil surface.
Strength (Consistency) Cohesive Soils	VS	VERY SOFT – Unconfined compressive strength less than 25kPa
	S	SOFT – Unconfined compressive strength 25-50kPa
	F	FIRM – Unconfined compressive strength 50-100kPa
	St	STIFF – Unconfined compressive strength 100-200kPa
	VSt	VERY STIFF – Unconfined compressive strength 200-400kPa
	H	HARD – Unconfined compressive strength greater than 400kPa
	()	Bracketed symbol indicates estimated consistency based on tactile examination or other tests.
Density Index/ Relative Density (Cohesionless Soils)		Density Index (I_p) Range (%) SPT 'N' Value Range (Blows/300mm)
	VL	Very Loose <15 0-4
	L	Loose 15-35 4-10
	MD	Medium Dense 35-65 10-30
	D	Dense 65-85 30-50
	VD	Very Dense >85 >50
	()	Bracketed symbol indicates estimated density based on ease of drilling or other tests.
Hand Penetrometer Readings	300 250	Numbers indicate individual test results in kPa on representative undisturbed material unless noted otherwise.
Remarks	'V' bit	Hardened steel 'V' shaped bit.
	'TC' bit	Tungsten carbide wing bit.
		Penetration of auger string in mm under static load of rig applied by drill head hydraulics without rotation of augers.



LOG SYMBOLS continued

ROCK MATERIAL WEATHERING CLASSIFICATION

TERM	SYMBOL	DEFINITION
Residual Soil	RS	Soil developed on extremely weathered rock; the mass structure and substance fabric are no longer evident; there is a large change in volume but the soil has not been significantly transported.
Extremely weathered rock	XW	Rock is weathered to such an extent that it has "soil" properties, ie it either disintegrates or can be remoulded, in water.
Distinctly weathered rock	DW	Rock strength usually changed by weathering. The rock may be highly discoloured, usually by ironstaining. Porosity may be increased by leaching, or may be decreased due to deposition of weathering products in pores.
Slightly weathered rock	SW	Rock is slightly discoloured but shows little or no change of strength from fresh rock.
Fresh rock	FR	Rock shows no sign of decomposition or staining.

ROCK STRENGTH

Rock strength is defined by the Point Load Strength Index (Is 50) and refers to the strength of the rock substance in the direction normal to the bedding. The test procedure is described by the International Journal of Rock Mechanics, Mining, Science and Geomechanics. Abstract Volume 22, No 2, 1985.

TERM	SYMBOL	Is (50) MPa	FIELD GUIDE
Extremely Low: -----	EL -----	0.03	Easily remoulded by hand to a material with soil properties.
Very Low: -----	VL -----	0.1	May be crumbled in the hand. Sandstone is "sugary" and friable.
Low: -----	L -----	0.3	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm dia. may be broken by hand and easily scored with a knife. Sharp edges of core may be friable and break during handling.
Medium Strength: -----	M -----	1	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm dia. can be broken by hand with difficulty. Readily scored with knife.
High: -----	H -----	3	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm dia. core cannot be broken by hand, can be slightly scratched or scored with knife; rock rings under hammer.
Very High: -----	VH -----	10	A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm dia. may be broken with hand-held pick after more than one blow. Cannot be scratched with pen knife; rock rings under hammer.
Extremely High:	EH		A piece of core 150mm long x 50mm dia. is very difficult to break with hand-held hammer. Rings when struck with a hammer.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN DEFECT DESCRIPTION

ABBREVIATION	DESCRIPTION	NOTES
Be	Bedding Plane Parting	Defect orientations measured relative to the normal to the long core axis (ie relative to horizontal for vertical holes)
CS	Clay Seam	
J	Joint	
P	Planar	
Un	Undulating	
S	Smooth	
R	Rough	
IS	Ironstained	
XWS	Extremely Weathered Seam	
Cr	Crushed Seam	
60t	Thickness of defect in millimetres	



Borehole No.
101
1 / 2

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~652.4 m
Date: 22/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING						652			CL	FILL: Silty sand, fine to medium grained, dark brown, trace of root fibres. GRAVELLY CLAY: medium plasticity, light brown, fine to coarse grained ferruginous gravel.	M MC<PL	H		GRASS COVER RESIDUAL
					N = 26 10,13,13		1						>600 >600 >600	
						651			CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown, with fine grained ferruginous gravel.	MC>PL		560 590 >600	
					N = 12 6,5,7		2							
						650				SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained gravel, light brown, with ferruginous and clay seams.	XW - DW	EL - VL		VERY LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
							3			as above, but brown.	DW	L		
						649								
							4							
						648				REFER TO CORED BOREHOLE LOG				
							5							
						647								
							6							
						646								

CORED BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Core Size:** NMLC **R.L. Surface:** ~652.4 m
Date: 22/8/17 **Inclination:** VERTICAL **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Bearing:** N/A **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Water Loss/Level	Barrel Lift	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	CORE DESCRIPTION Rock Type, grain characteristics, colour, structure, minor components.	Weathering	Strength	POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX $I_p(50)$	DEFECT DETAILS	
									DEFECT SPACING (mm)	DESCRIPTION Type, inclination, thickness, planarity, roughness, coating.
								EL-0.03 VL-0.1 L-0.3 M-1 H-3 VH-10 EH	500 300 100 50 30 10	Specific General
					START CORING AT 4.33m					
		648			SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained gravel, light brown.	SW	L			(4.36m) XWS, 0°, 8 mm.t (4.43m) HEALED JOINT, 60°, P (4.47m) J, 50°, P, R (4.51m) J, 70°, P, S, IS (4.54m) J, 30°, P, R (4.57m) J, 30°, P, R (4.59m) FRAGMENTED ZONE, 0°, 40 mm.t (4.68m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (4.70m) J, 80°, P, S, IS (4.81m) Be, 0°, P, S (5.00m) J, 20°, P, S (5.02m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (5.09m) XWS, 10°, 5 mm.t (5.19m) J, 40 - 60°, Un, R (5.24m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (5.31m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (5.32m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (5.38m) J, 40°, P, R, IS (5.41m) J, 0°, P, R (5.45m) J, 50°, P, R (5.50m) J, 50°, P, R (5.60m) J, 60°, P, R (5.70m) J, 40°, P, S (5.80m) J, 40°, P, S (5.81m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (5.87m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (5.90m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (5.95m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (6.04m) J, 80°, P, R (6.07m) J, 50°, P, S, IS (6.11m) J, 70°, P, S, IS (6.26m) J, 40°, P, S (6.30m) Be, 0°, P, S (6.46m) J, 60°, P, S (6.65m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (6.71m) Jx2, 60°, P, R, IS (6.84m) CS, 0°, 2 mm.t (6.95m) J, 60°, P, S (7.09m) J, 50°, P, R (7.15m) J, 30°, P, R, IS (7.21m) J, 20°, P, R, IS (7.28m) J, 80°, P, R, IS (7.40m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (7.43m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (7.50m) J, 60°, P, R, IS (7.62m) XWS, 0° (7.74m) J, 30°, P, R, IS (7.80m) J, 80°, P, S, IS (7.92m) J, 70°, P, S, IS (8.11m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (8.28m) J, 80°, P, S, IS (8.42m) J, 80°, P, S, IS (8.50m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (8.57m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (8.82m) J, 70°, P, S, IS
			5							
		647								
			6							
		646								
			7				M			
		645								
			8							
		644								
			9							
		643								
			10							
		642								
					END OF BOREHOLE AT 8.92 m					

JK Geotechnics

Job No. 30116V2

BH101

START CORING AT 4.33m

4

5

6

7

8

C1 16

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~651.1 m
Date: 22/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING						651				FILL: Silty clay, medium plasticity, dark brown, trace of roots.	MC>PL			GRASS COVER
					N = 8 6,5,3					FILL: Silty sand, fine to coarse grained, with fine to medium grained igneous gravel, trace of clay and brick fragments.	M			APPEARS MODERATELY COMPACTED
						650	1				D			
					N=SPT 7/ 50mm REFUSAL									HIGH 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
						649	2		CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown.	MC>PL	(Vst - H)		RESIDUAL
					N > 9 14,9/ 50mm REFUSAL	648	3			SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, light brown and orange brown, with silty clay seams and low strength seams.	XW	EL		VERY LOW RESISTANCE
											XW - DW	EL - VL		
						647	4							
						646	5			SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, brown, with ferruginous bands.	DW	L - M		LOW RESISTANCE
														HIGH RESISTANCE
						645	6			REFER TO CORED BOREHOLE LOG				

CORED BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Core Size:** NMLC **R.L. Surface:** ~651.1 m
Date: 22/8/17 **Inclination:** VERTICAL **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Bearing:** N/A **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Water Loss/Level	Barrel Lift	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	CORE DESCRIPTION Rock Type, grain characteristics, colour, structure, minor components.	Weathering	Strength	POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX $I_p(50)$	DEFECT DETAILS	
									DEFECT SPACING (mm)	DESCRIPTION Type, inclination, thickness, planarity, roughness, coating.
		646						EL-0.03 VL-0.1 L-0.3 M-1 H-3 VH-10 EH	500 300 100 50 30 10	Specific General
					START CORING AT 5.85m					
		645	6		CORE LOSS 1.25m					
		644	7							
	100% RETURN	643	8		SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, brown and light brown, with iron indurated bands.	DW	M			(7.16m) J, 40°, P, S (7.22m) J, 40°, P, S (7.30m) J, 40°, P, S (7.35m) J, 50°, P, S (7.40m) J, 90°, P, S (7.47m) XWS, 0°, 10 mm.t (7.58m) XWS, 0°, 10 mm.t (7.65m) J, 90°, P, R (7.70m) XWS, 0°, 8 mm.t (7.72m) J, 40°, P, S (7.76m) J, 0-40°, Un, R, IS (7.83m) J, 90°, P, S (7.90m) J, 60°, P, R (7.93m) XWS, 0°, 10 mm.t (8.00m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (8.07m) FRAGMENTED ZONE, 0°, 50 mm.t (8.10m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (8.23m) Be, 0°, P, R (8.30m) J, 30°, P, S (8.37m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (8.40m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (8.45m) XWS, 0°, 10 mm.t (8.49m) CS, 0°, 3 mm.t (8.58m) J, 60°, P, S, IS (8.65m) J, 40°, P, R, IS (8.69m) XWS, 0°, 20 mm.t (8.73m) J, 30°, P, R, IS (8.81m) XWS, 0°, 10 mm.t
		642	9		END OF BOREHOLE AT 8.82 m					
		641	10							
		640	11							

JK Geotechnics

Job No. 20116V2 BH102 START CORING AT 5.85m

5

6

CORE LOSS: 1.30m

7

8

EOBH 8.83m

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~655.5 m
Date: 23/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING										FILL: Silty clay, medium plasticity, dark brown, trace of roots.	MC~PL			
					N = 32 9,16,16	655	1		CL	GRAVELLY CLAY: medium plasticity, light grey, fine to coarse grained ferruginous gravel.	MC<PL	H		TOO FRIABLE FOR HP TESTING
					N = 20 6,9,11	654	2		CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown.	MC~PL		>600 >600 >600	
						653				SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, light brown and light grey.	XW	EL		VERY LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
							3			as above, but light brown and orange brown.	XW - DW	EL - VL		
						652	4							
						651	5							
						650								
											DW	L		LOW RESISTANCE
						649	6			REFER TO CORED BOREHOLE LOG				

CORED BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Core Size:** NMLC **R.L. Surface:** ~655.5 m
Date: 23/8/17 **Inclination:** VERTICAL **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Bearing:** N/A **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Water Loss/Level	Barrel Lift	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	CORE DESCRIPTION Rock Type, grain characteristics, colour, structure, minor components.	Weathering	Strength	POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX $I_p(50)$	DEFECT DETAILS	
									DEFECT SPACING (mm)	DESCRIPTION Type, inclination, thickness, planarity, roughness, coating.
								EL-0.03 VL-0.1 L-0.3 M-1 H-3 VH-10 EH	500 300 100 50 30 10	Specific General
		650			START CORING AT 5.92m					
100% RETURN		649	6		SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, orange brown.	DW	L			(6.02m) J, 90°, P, R, IS (6.10m) Be, 0°, P, R (6.17m) Be, 0°, P, R, IS (6.27m) Be, 0°, P, R, IS (6.43m) Be, 0°, P, R, IS (6.50m) J, 60°, P, R (6.61m) J, 80°, P, R, IS (6.76m) J, 30°, P, R, IS
		648	7		CLAYSTONE: light grey.	XW - DW	EL - VL			(7.33m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (7.42m) J, 70°, P, S (7.47m) J, 20°, P, S (7.49m) Be, 0°, P, S (7.54m) J, 60°, P, S (7.61m) J, 30°, P, S, IS (7.66m) J, 90°, P, R (7.71m) XWS, 0°, 5 mm.t
80% RETURN					CORE LOSS 0.07m	DW	M - H			
			8		CLAYSTONE: light grey.					
					CORE LOSS 0.84m					
		647								(8.50m) NOTE: DEFECTS NOT INDIVIDUALLY DESCRIBED BETWEEN 7.81 AND 9.33m ARE GENERALLY JOINTS, 40-90°. P, S, IS CAUSING FRACTURING OF CORE
			9		CLAYSTONE: light brown.	DW	H			
		646			END OF BOREHOLE AT 9.33 m	XW	EL			
			10							
		645								
			11							
		644								

JK_LIB_CURRENT - V8.00.GLB Log J & K CORED BOREHOLE - MASTER 30116V2 GOULBURN.GPJ <DrawingFile> 22/09/2017 15:22 Produced by gINT Professional. Developed by Dagei

JK Geotechnics

Job No 30116V

BH103

START CORING AT 5.92m

5

6

7

CL
0.07m

8

CORE LOSS: 0.84m

9

EOBH AT 9.33m

29

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~653.1 m
Date: 23/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING						653				CONCRETE: 110mm.t				
									CL	FILL: Sand, fine to coarse grained, yellow brown.	M			POSSIBLY FILL
					N=SPT 5/ 20mm REFUSAL					GRAVELLY CLAY: medium plasticity, brown, trace of fine to medium grained mudstone gravel. CLAYSTONE: light brown.	DW	M - H		MODERATE 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
						652	1							
						651	2							
						650	3			REFER TO CORED BOREHOLE LOG				
						649	4							
						648	5							
						647	6							

CORED BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Core Size:** NMLC **R.L. Surface:** ~653.1 m
Date: 23/8/17 **Inclination:** VERTICAL **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Bearing:** N/A **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Water Loss/Level Barrel Lift	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	CORE DESCRIPTION Rock Type, grain characteristics, colour, structure, minor components.	Weathering	Strength	POINT LOAD STRENGTH INDEX I _s (50)	DEFECT DETAILS	
								DEFECT SPACING (mm)	DESCRIPTION Type, inclination, thickness, planarity, roughness, coating.
	651			START CORING AT 2.83m					
100% RETURN	650	3		CLAYSTONE: light brown.	SW	H			(2.84m) J, 30°, P, S, CLAY COATED (2.90m) J, 50°, P, S, IS (3.08m) J, 60°, P, S, CLAY COATED (3.10m) J, 10°, P, S, IS (3.15m) J, 80°, P, S (3.19m) CS, 0°, 30 mm.t (3.24m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (3.43m) J, 30°, P, S, IS (3.73m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (3.75m) J, 30°, P, S, IS (3.92m) J, 80°, P, S (3.97m) J, 40°, P, S (4.01m) J, 40°, P, S (4.04m) J, 40°, P, S, IS (4.12m) J, 90°, P, S, IS (4.20m) J, 10°, P, S, CLAY COATED (4.23m) J, 80°, P, S (4.28m) J, 90°, P, S, CLAY COATED (4.32m) FRAGMENTED ZONE, 0°, 50 mm.t (4.42m) J, 60°, CLAY COATED (4.46m) Be, 0°, P, R (4.53m) J, 20°, P, R (4.68m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (5.02m) J, 90°, P, S (5.09m) J, 30°, P, S (5.13m) J, 20°, P, S (5.23m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (5.43m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (5.49m) Be, 0°, P, S, IS (5.57m) J, 60°, P, S (5.68m) Be, 0°, P, R, IS (5.75m) J, 40°, P, S (5.84m) J, 30°, P, S, IS (6.06m) J, 70°, P, R, IS (6.09m) J, 30°, P, R, IS (6.15m) Be, 0°, P, R, IS (6.19m) J, 80°, P, S, IS (6.31m) J, 30°, P, R (6.46m) J, 20°, P, S, IS (6.54m) Be, 0°, P, R (6.70m) XWS, 0°, 3 mm.t (6.75m) Jx2, 80°, P, S
	649	4							
	648	5		as above, but with sandstone, fine grained, dark brown, cross bedded at 30°. CLAYSTONE: light brown.					
	647	6							
				END OF BOREHOLE AT 6.81 m					
	646	7							
	645	8							

JK Geotechnics

JOB No. 30116V2 BH104 START CORING AT 2.83m

2

3

4

5

6

EOBH 6.81m

EOBH

2



Borehole No.
105
1 / 1

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~656.4 m
Date: 24/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING						656			CH	ASPHALT SEAL SPRAY: 3mm.t over FILL: Silty clay, low plasticity, brown, with fine grained sand, trace of fine to medium grained igneous gravel.	MC<PL			
					N = 6 3,3,3		1			SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, dark brown.	MC>PL	VSt	380 450 460	RESIDUAL
						655				as above, but light brown.		H		
					N = 26 4,8,18		2			SANDSTONE: tuffaceous, fine to coarse grained, light brown, with ferruginous inclusions.	XW	EL	410 480	
						654				as above, but with low strength bands.	XW - DW	EL - VL		VERY LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
							3				DW	VL		
						653				END OF BOREHOLE AT 3.00 m				
							4							
						652								
							5							
						651								
							6							
						650								



Borehole No.
106
1 / 1

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~657 m
Date: 24/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION									CH	FILL: Gravelly sand, fine to coarse grained, yellow brown, fine to coarse grained igneous gravel. SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown mottled red brown.	M MC~PL	H		RESIDUAL
						656	1			CLAYSTONE: light brown and light grey.	XW - DW DW	EL - VL M	>600 >600 >600	
						655	2					H		MODERATE TO HIGH 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
						654	3			END OF BOREHOLE AT 2.40 m				'TC' BIT REFUSAL
						653	4							
						652	5							
						651	6							



Borehole No.
107
1 / 1

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~657.6 m
Date: 24/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION & AFTER 5 HRS										TOPSOIL: Silt, low plasticity, brown.	MC<PL			GRASS COVER
									GC	CLAYEY GRAVEL: fine to coarse grained, ferruginous gravel, silty clay, low plasticity, light brown.	D	MD - D		RESIDUAL
					N > 15 7,15/ 150mm REFUSAL	657	1							
									CL	GRAVELLY CLAY: medium to high plasticity, light brown, fine to coarse grained mudstone gravel, trace of medium to coarse grained quartz gravel.	MC<PL	H	>600 >600	
					N = 21 5,9,12	656	2			CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE: light brown and light grey.	DW	L		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
						655	3							
						654	4							
						653	5			SILTSTONE: light grey.				
						652								
						651	6			END OF BOREHOLE AT 6.00 m				

BOREHOLE LOG

Client: HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE
Project: PROPOSED HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT
Location: 130 GOLDSMITH STREET, GOULBURN, NSW

Job No.: 30116V2 **Method:** SPIRAL AUGER **R.L. Surface:** ~657.9 m
Date: 24/8/17 **Datum:** AHD
Plant Type: JK205 **Logged/Checked By:** A.B./F.V.

Groundwater Record	SAMPLES				Field Tests	RL (m AHD)	Depth (m)	Graphic Log	Unified Classification	DESCRIPTION	Moisture Condition/ Weathering	Strength/ Rel Density	Hand Penetrometer Readings (kPa)	Remarks
	ES	U50	DB	DS										
DRY ON COMPLETION OF AUGERING										ASPHALT SEAL SPRAY: 5mm.t over FILL: Gravelly sand, fine to coarse grained, light brown, with fine grained igneous gravel, trace of ash and slag.	M			
					N = 5 1,2,3	657	1		CL	SILTY CLAY: low plasticity, brown, with fine grained ferruginous gravel.	MC<PL	St	120	POSSIBLY FILL ?
									CH	SILTY CLAY: high plasticity, light brown.	MC>PL	VSt		RESIDUAL
					N = 7 3,3,4	656	2						300 310 270	
						655	3			CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE: light brown and light grey.	DW	L H		LOW 'TC' BIT RESISTANCE
										END OF BOREHOLE AT 3.00 m				
						654	4							
						653	5							
						652	6							
						651								