Checklist – CAC067M
PSC Pile driving (excludes supply of piles) - MRTS65

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contractor** |  | **Date** |  | **Review No.** |  |
| **Contract No.** |  | **Project No.** |  | **Project Name** |  |

| Reference | Requirements | Addressed | Comments / Observations |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clause 4.2Hold Point 1 | Has the Contractor submitted to the Administrator documented procedures for all construction processes in accordance with the quality system requirements of the Contract, including pile driving, preboring, splicing (if required) and shall include an RPEQ certified design of the crane pad, or alternatively a statement confirming no need for a crane pad in specific locations? |  |  |
| Clause 5.1Milestone | Has the Contractor submitted transport details for piles over 21 m (if required) (14 days)? |  |  |
| Clause 5.1Hold Point 2 | Approval of handling details. |  |  |
| Clause 5.1Milestone | Has the Contractor submitted their delivery schedule for piles under 21 m (7 days)? |  |  |
| Clause 5.3.1Hold Point 3 | Have all required inspections been undertaken and has approval to transport been given? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1Milestone | Has the Contractor submitted all the QA documentation? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1Hold Point 4 | Did the Administrator approve the procedures prior to commencement of pile driving? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1Hold Point 5 | Did the Administrator inspect and approve the piles prior to driving? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1 | Were any defects observed which may affect the piles behaviour during driving? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1Hold Point 6 | Was the Administrator or his delegate present for the pile driving? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1 | Was PM undertaken for at least the last 10 blows on each pile? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1 | Was HSDT testing undertaken as required in the contract documents, if not were nonconformances issued? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1 | Was HSDT testing undertaken on all raked piles? |  |  |
| Clause 7.1Hold Point 7 | Did the pile driving equipment stay on Site until the Administrator approved its removal? |  |  |
| Clause 7.2 | Were test piles driven at the locations shown in the drawings? |  |  |
| Clause 7.2 | If test piles were incorporated into the permanent structure did the Administrator approve this? |  |  |
| Clause 7.2 | Were all test piles monitored for at least the last 10 blows by a PM device? |  |  |
| Clause 7.3 | Were changes to founding levels required, if so, did the Administrator with the agreement of the Designer, notify the Contractor of such changes, in writing, at the earliest possible time? |  |  |
| Clause 7.4 | Have the piles been driven so that the lateral displacement of the pile head from its correct position is no more than 75 mm? |  |  |
| Clause 7.4 | Is the deviation from the specified rake less than 20 mm per m? If not what approved, was a nonconformance raised and changes were made to accommodate the deviation? |  |  |
| Clause 7.5.2 | Piles shall be driven by using hammer equivalent to the type nominated in Clause 1 of Annexure MRTS65.1 or an approved alternative in accordance with Clause 7.5.2. |  |  |
| Clause 7.5.2 | The ratio of the mass of the hammer to the mass of the pile shall not be less than that given in Table 7.5.2. |  |  |
| Clause 7.5.2 | Did the drop of the hammer, or of the ram, exceed 2 m? If so, were nonconformances issued? |  |  |
| Clause 7.5.3 | Where the Contractor uses an alternative hammer did it comply with the requirements of Table 6.5.3? |  |  |
| Clause 7.6 | Did the helmet meet the requirements of Clause 6.6? |  |  |
| Clause 7.7 | Were the piles driven from a fixed rigid frame? |  |  |
| Clause 7.7 | Were flying leaders used, if so, was the system approved by both the Administrator and Director SCM? |  |  |
| Clause 7.7 | Was the force of the hammer blow directed along the long axis of the pile? |  |  |
| Clause 7.7 | Were any piles rejected due to splits or cracks or due to being out of tolerance? If so, which piles were nonconformance reports issued? |  |  |
| Clause 7.7 | Were piles ever driven with a set of greater than 25 mm per blow? |  |  |
| Clause 7.9 | Has a pile driving log been kept, and maintained? |  |  |
| Clause 7.9 | Has a Hiley analysis been undertaken on each pile to confirm the capacity? Does the capacity exceed that specified in Annexure MRTS65.1? |  |  |
| Clause 7.9 | Has the required set for the actual hammer used been met for each pile? |  |  |
| Clause 7.9Hold Point 8 | Could all the piles be driven to at least below minimum penetration, if not did piling cease and how was this resolved? |  |  |
| Clause 7.12.3 | Were any restrikes required? If so, what piles and what was the outcome for each such pile? |  |  |
| Clause 7.13 | Were followers used? If so, on which piles? |  |  |
| Clause 8Witness Point | Who witnessed the stripping of the pile head? |  |  |
| Clause 9 | Were any piles spliced? |  |  |
| Clause 9.2 | If spliced, were the dowel bars within tolerance, if not was a nonconformance issued? |  |  |
| Clause 9.3 | If spliced, were pile sleeves manufactured by a Transport and Main Roads approved Fabricator? |  |  |
| Clause 9.5Clause 9.7 | If spliced, was each batch of epoxy tested for conformance? And was conformance achieved? |  |  |
| Clause 9.7.2 | Was the equipment for testing the epoxy in calibration? |  |  |
| Clause 11 | Were there any supplementary requirements in regard to MRTS65, if so, were these met? |  |  |

*Delete below section if not required*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Audited by: |  |  |  |
| Name |  | Signature |  | Date |  |