

FROM: DANIEL L. COBB

File: D1250008.D01 - Excavation for Structures and
Pipe-Backfilling
Username: DANIEL L. COBB
UserEmail: RT219CD
UserTel: SUNCOM 881-7719
UserFAX: 386-961-7940
ContactRequested:
Remote Name: 156.75.19.64
Remote User:

Comments:

Soapbox and Semantics time!

1.---Soap Box

I disagree with the position that structure-specific tests are not needed if the structure is compacted in the same operation as the pipe connecting to it. In my opinion, that simply is never the case. I believe the Department would be better served to require that QC tests be conducted around all structures in addition to those conducted along the run of the pipe. The generally tight work areas and the need for extra hand work around the structures often result in casual attention to these areas. It is simply easier to go up & down the pipe run than it is to go around the structure. Although I understand that the use of randomly selected Verification tests should result in a point around the structure having the same chance of being checked as a point along the run of pipe, I simply think better performance from the backfill around structures will result if all structures are tested separately from the pipe runs whether compacted in the "same" operation or not.

Response:

Excellent point. The random nature of selecting test locations should give rise to structure areas being tested periodically. The Department inspector should verify that similar effort is made around the structure, or else take an Independent Verification test.

2.---Semantics

Would the use of the word "each" or "both" be better than the word "either" in the second sentence of the proposed change? I believe the intent is to require that a QC test be taken on the first lift somewhere on each side of the pipe. "Either" seems to imply a choice as in "either one side or the other". Along the lines of my comments above, I would also add a provision for the first lift at the bottom of the structure also be considered a separate lot to be QC tested before adding the next lift.

Response:

This language states that either side is a Lot. The specification requires that each lot be tested (when the frequency is one test per lot). There can be no choice as to which Lot to test.

I think the word "both" should not be used. Together, both sides would make one Lot, thus one test, either left or right. The intent is to have the right side tested and the left side also. The word "each" is appropriate and may be a matter of choice for the Specifications office.

3.---Semantics

I think the use of the word "adjacent" in referring to the OPPOSITE sides of the pipe is confusing. Adjacent seems to imply "next too" or "adjoining" sides. This might be appropriate for the area between multiple pipes, but not to something on the other side of the pipe.

Response:

Agree. The specification will be revised as such.