ADSC Members Comment

Hi Mike,

I read your article in the April 2016 Foundation Drilling magazine. I am happy to notice the development of the "CDSE." In particular, I like to refer to your second paragraph:

"Collectively we should continue to strive to find balance, from design parameters and acceptance criteria, to delivery methods and constructability allowance and constrains, **to the development and deployment of tooling, machinery and product.**"

The continuous **development of better tooling, machinery and materials** will, without doubt, lead to an even better end product.

As providers, not only with machinery and materials, but also special systems, the direction most of our ADSC members was and always will be, improving and producing better products.

I would like to refer to the latest drilled shaft test at the University of Oregon, sponsored by the ADSC, conducted by Professor Armin Stuedlein, introducing high strength bars as a replacement of lower strength bars in connection with hollow re-bars as entry pipes for Cross Hole Sonic Logging, CSL. The result of this test may show a large improvement in the quality and in the non-destructive testing of drilled shafts.

I can see that the CDSE will in the future make this kind of Information available to our industry.

Kind Regards,

Horst K. Aschenbroich, *Dipl.Ing.*
CEO,President, Con-Tech System, Ltd.

***

Mike,

I really appreciated getting to know you better through the PileBuck profile interview. You told your story well–quite movingly, actually. Lance was right to twist your arm!

Now we need to get Lance to tell his personal story. It can make a difference in how the Association views the leadership–it increases understanding and trust.

Good job, Mike!

Jim Melcher, President
Tri-State Drilling

ADSC Member Provides Clarification

ADSC members GRL Engineers, Inc. and Pile Dynamics, Inc. provided copy for their article in Equipment Innovations of the February/March issue of ***Foundation Drilling****. They would like to clarify values that were shown in the article. (Editor)*

Editor, Sherry Epperson
Foundation Drilling Magazine

Dear Ms. Epperson,

The authors of the article SQUID which appeared in the *Equipment Innovations* department, of your February/March 2016 issue, page 52, would like to alert your readers to incorrect values on Table 1 shown on page 54.

As a result of a typo on our part in the area of the penetrometers, incorrect pressure values were obtained. The amended table appears to the right, as does the amended graph. Note that the shape of the pressure versus penetration curves has not changed – the correction only affects the horizontal scale (pressure).

Even though the actual pressures were higher than reported in the article, its conclusion remains unchanged: the SQUID did not push the penetrometers sufficiently deep into the bearing layer (rock) since the bottom of the shaft had not been completely cleaned at the time of the test.

Sincerely,

Danny Belardo, GRL Engineers, Inc.
and Gina Beim, Pile Dynamics Inc.

Table 1: Summary of Results.

	Tower NorthEast	Tower SouthWest	Tower Center 1
Max Force applied to the SQUID - kips	9	8	12
Max Cone 1 pressure - ksf	243.7	141.4	531.8
Max Cone 2 pressure - ksf	162.1	297.6	173.8
Max Cone 3 pressure - ksf	457.2	315.1	480.5
Max Displacement - inch	5.6	5.3	5.5