

4554500 STRUCTURES FOUNDATIONS  
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Neil Monkman  
239-462-7371  
[neil.monkman@wrightg.com](mailto:neil.monkman@wrightg.com)

Comment: (10-3-13)

After a review of the proposed change I would like to say that I believe that this is an excellent improvement to the specification. Previously the 0.25" was not that much of an issue on short piles. However when you get piles that are over 100' the potential increased significantly. Generally this ended up in an RFI for acceptance that most times would be accepted anyway. This will cut down on unnecessary paperwork.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Jeffrey Tuell, PE  
DRMP, Inc.

Comment: (10-4-13) I received a copy of the proposed changes to Section 455-45 of the specification, which removes tolerance information related to the noise wall posts from the foundation specification. I agree that the discrepancies should be resolved and that the information should not be duplicated, however I would submit that section 455 might be a better location for post tolerances rather than section 534, because the post typically must be erected concurrently with the pile construction and is therefore intimately related to the tolerances being checked during pile construction. To avoid confusion by doubling the locations to which the contractor and inspector must refer in the specs, I recommend leaving the post tolerance information in section 455 (correcting or revising as needed), and remove it from section 534. A cross-reference in section 534 to section 455 for "pile and post tolerances" may be advisable.

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*

Peter Wagoner  
[pwagoner@capfla.com](mailto:pwagoner@capfla.com)

Comment: (10-11-13) Shouldn't article 455-45 also include tolerances for plumbness and deviation from batter slope. Shouldn't the minimum out of tolerance for the butt elevation be less than the minimum embedment into the pile cap?

Response:

\*\*\*\*\*