Missy Hollis
414-4182
Melissa.Hollis@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (11-8-17, Internal)
David/Amy,
I don't think we have captured the decision from our meeting/teleconference. I thought I understood that the spec needed to indicate something along the lines of:

"If the Contractor fails to perform the Thermal Integrity Testing, then CSL testing will be required with no separate payment."

The sentence currently added to 455-23.10 does not capture this intent. "When CSL testing is requested by the Engineer, the quantity of CSL tests to be paid for will be the number of drilled shafts accepted based on CSL tests."
If this sentence is intended to address additional testing requested by the Engineer, it should fall under the current guidance of "if there is a problem, the Contractor must resolve it; if the testing reveals no problem, the testing is paid as unforeseen work"

Per the discussion, the CSL testing pay item would become obsolete with the implementation of the Thermal Integrity pay item.

Has this decision changed?

Response: Language will be updated prior to Industry Review as follows:

Change made.

****

JC Miseroy

813-367-9635
jc.miseroy@gcinc.com

Comments: (12-4-17)

1. 455-17.6.1.2 - Why do we need to retain the water from the CSL tubes in an insulated container for later replacement? Why not have an option to replace with potable water? This seems to be an opportunity for unnecessary issues.

Response: The reason for this requirement is to avoid an abrupt drop in temperature that may create debonding in the steel tubes and create issues for future CSL testing.
No change made.

2. 455-18 - Method Shafts. This sub-article states that the Method Shafts should be the same diameter and maximum depths as production drilled shafts. Previously, Method Shafts were required for the largest diameter and deepest shaft for the project, with at least one on water and land if applicable. Does this proposed specification now anticipate a Method Shaft for every diameter of shaft? Will additional shafts be required for the same diameter shafts on the water? It seems to me it is much more important to verify construction methods for each type of shaft construction (temporary vs. permanent casings), different installation equipment and land vs. water based shafts than to perform a Method Shaft for a 42" plus a 48" diameter shaft.

Response: This proposed specification does not intend to require a method shaft for every diameter. The intent is to specify one for water and one for land (for the largest diameters) when these conditions occur in the project. This is clear in the second paragraph "…When there are shafts both on land and in water, successfully construct a method shaft for each condition. When there is more than one size of drilled shaft, perform a method shaft for the largest diameter for each condition..."
No change made.

****