

Bauske, Shelly A.

From: Fahn, Patrick J.
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Tom.Lehar@chsinc.com
Cc: Jim Jacobs; Bauske, Shelly A.
Subject: requests for variance for two scales at CHS Grain Elevator, Calvin, ND
Attachments: Patrick Fahn.vcf; example certification.pdf

Concerning the requests for variance for two scales at CHS Grain Elevator, Calvin, ND
Scale 1 located just east of the recently constructed grain bin towards the north side of the site.
Scale 2 located southeast of the recently constructed grain bin and adjacent to the east side of an existing building near the south end of the site.

The October 29, 2013 Geotechnical Evaluation Report prepared by Braun Intertec Corporation for the Calvin scale locations recommends that unsuitable materials below the mat foundation locations be removed to a minimum depth of 7-1/2 feet from the planned finished grade surrounding the scale and that the excavations be filled with sand having less than 5 percent of the particles by weight passing a #200 sieve and are able to be compacted by standard equipment. The report recommends that the granular fill be spread in 6 to 10 inch thick loose lifts, depending on the type of compactor used.

The report states that a main concern is a "bathtub" condition at the sites due to the excavation and, just as important as proper backfill, is proper drainage of the backfill by establishing and maintaining surficial drainage by sloping perimeter grades down and away from the structure at a minimum slope of 2 to 5 percent. Other options included sealing the surface with pavements, slabs, or low permeability clays, or, installing a permanent drainage system at the bottom of the granular backfill.

The November 7, 2013 Field Density Test Report prepared by Midwest Testing Laboratories, Inc. states that the excavations extended to a depth of approximately 8 feet below the surrounding grade. Midwest Testing states that they typically recommend a minimum of one compaction be performed for each 2500 square feet at vertical increments of no more than 2 feet. When Midwest Testing arrived on November 6 to perform compaction tests of the engineered fill, the excavations had been backfilled up to the ground surface, concrete had been placed for one of the mat foundations, and the other mat foundation was formed and reinforcing steel had been placed. Since the concrete and formwork was in place, Midwest Testing was unable to test at elevations other than at the final grade or directly below the foundation areas. Midwest Testing states that test pits or dynamic cone penetrometer testing could be used to further evaluate compaction levels at other elevations. Compaction tests in the mat foundation areas indicated compaction levels ranging from 98 to 99.5 percent of the Standard Proctor maximum density at the final grade of directly below the foundation areas. In general, engineered fill compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the Standard Proctor maximum density would be suitable for support of foundations with bearing pressures of 1500 pounds per square foot or less. Therefore, it appears load bearing of the final or surface lift would exceed the minimum required 1500 pounds per square foot. However, we do not know if the other backfill lifts were the same thickness as the final lift and whether the other lifts were compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the Standard Proctor maximum density.

One way to resolve the concern is for Mr. Lehar to certify that, for both scale locations, all backfill lifts were spread in in the same thickness as the final, to-the-surface-level lift and certify that all lifts were compacted the same as the final lift. This will give the Commission some comfort that the compaction of all lifts meets or exceeds 95 percent of the Standard Proctor maximum density and thus meets or exceeds bearing pressures of 1500 pounds per square foot. The other way to resolve the concern is to test as Midwest Testing suggests using test pits or dynamic cone penetrometer testing to evaluate compaction levels at other elevations.

9 WM-13-808 Filed: 11/15/2013 Pages: 4
Email Requesting Additional Information

Public Service Commission
Patrick Fahn

Mr. Lehar should also certify that proper drainage of backfill has been established and will be maintained in one of the ways recommended by the Geotechnical Evaluation Report. I have attached a sample certification to this email.

Patrick Fahn

Director
Compliance and Competitive Markets

North Dakota Public Service Commission
600 E Boulevard Ave, Dept. 408
Bismarck ND 58505-0480
(701) 328-4077 Work
(701) 328-2410 Fax
pfahn@nd.gov

This transmission, email and any files transmitted with it, may be: (1) subject to the Attorney-Client Privilege, (2) an attorney work product, or (3) strictly confidential under federal or state law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you may not use, disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you have received this transmission in error, notify the sender (only) and delete the message. This message may also be subject to disclosure under the North Dakota Open Records Laws.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Vantage Pipeline US LP
Natural Gas Liquids Pipeline
Williams and Divide Counties

CASE NO. PU-11-109

**CERTIFICATION OF APPLICANT
PURSUANT TO NORTH DAKOTA CENTURY CODE
§ 49-22-16.3(1)**

The undersigned, Terry Killackey, being the Chief Executive Officer of Vantage Pipeline US LP ("Vantage"), having the authority to act on behalf of and bind Vantage, does hereby certify under oath:

1. That pursuant to Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, dated June 20, 2012, the Public Service Commission granted to Vantage Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 137, and Route Permit Certificate No. 148 for the construction of approximately 79.80 miles of 10-inch pipeline in Williams and Divide Counties, North Dakota, for the transportation of natural gas liquids.
2. That construction on the pipeline has commenced.
3. That Vantage has determined that two minor adjustments to the route, all being within the designated corridor, are necessary. Attached are exhibits depicting these minor route changes.
4. That construction activities will not affect any known exclusion or avoidance area within the designated corridor.

