QUALITY CONTROL CHECKLISTS FOR FOUNDATION INSPECTION OF RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER LOW-RISE BUILDINGS

by The Structural Committee

of

The Foundation Performance Association

www.foundationperformance.org

Houston, Texas

Document # FPA-SC-10-0

ISSUE HISTORY

Rev#	Date	Description	Subcommittee Chair	Subcommittee Members
Α	02 Oct 01	For Subcommittee Comments	Jack Spivey	Ron Kelm
В	19 Sep 02	For Subcommittee Comments		Jon Monteith
С	14 Oct 02	For Subcommittee Comments		Michael Skoller
D	26 Nov 02	For Subcommittee Comments		Terry Taylor
Е	10 Dec 02	For Subcommittee Comments		Mari Mes
F	24 Jan 03	For Subcommittee Comments		Mike Palmer
G	06 Mar 03	For Subcommittee Comments		Lowell Brumley
Н	28 Apr 03	Issued for Committee Comments		George Wozny
I	10 Jul 03	For FPA Peer Review		Dan Jaggers Toshi Nobe
0	09 Oct 03	FPA Web Site Publishing		108111 NODE

PREFACE

The following documents are the results of two years of work completed in the late nineteen nineties by the Inspections Subcommittee of the Foundation Performance Committee. Jack Spivey chaired this committee and his fellow members were:

MR. MICHAEL SKOLLER P.E.

MR. JOE EDWARDS

MR. LOWELL BRUMLEY P.E.

MR. DEAN EICHELBERGER

Meetings took place on a monthly basis and were attended by many interested parties. Special recognition should be given to Mr. Jim Dutton of Du-West Foundation Repair and Mr. Dan Jaggers of Olshan Foundation Repair. Their assistance with the foundation repair sections was invaluable. The topics for discussion have followed a general outline, which was established at the onset of the meetings. It was determined that our basic intent would be to establish a set of standards and procedures for the inspection of foundation construction and foundation repairs. These standards were to be incorporated into an inspection document, which would be thorough in its scope, but also easy to use. It was established early on in our discussions that the best form for our purposes would be a simple checklist, which would fully cover the subject of the inspection. It was also determined that keeping the checklist to one page would afford the most user-friendly instrument for our purposes. Once these parameters were established the subjects of the inspections were taken in the following order:

FOUNDATION MAKE-UP -- POST TENSION STRESSING POST TENSION FOUNDATION MAKE-UP -- CONVENTIONAL/REBAR CONCRETE PLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION PIERS REPAIR PIERS SEGMENTED REPAIR PILES

These topics were judged to represent the major types of foundation construction and foundation repairs found in the Houston area. They are certainly not inclusive of every inspection situation or construction method in use, but they do offer a basic set of standards for the majority of inspections that would be encountered in typical residential construction.

They are also designed to be used by anyone who has some knowledge of foundation construction. It was our intention that they would serve field inspectors, builders, builders' superintendents, municipal inspectors, or anyone with an interest in quality foundations.

The first order of business worked on by the subcommittee was to establish a heading format for each inspection. This portion of the form is meant to establish a context for the inspection. The basics of the site such as, the builder, subdivision, address, lot and block, are all set out at the top of the form. The next section is meant to establish the parameters that will govern the rest of the inspection. The most important of these, deals with the plans. No inspection should be undertaken without a set of plans, which should include the name of the engineer, the date of the plans and the detail sheet. Other pertinent details of the site that are covered in this section are the date, the time, the weather, and whether there is a detached garage.

The above guidelines were followed on each form, with the following variations dictated by the context of the inspection:

- For the Concrete Placement Form there is specific reference to the Foundation Make-Up Form, and the items in need of repair.
- In the Stress Form, there is an added reference to the cable count, the concrete placement date, and the post tension construction company.
- On the Construction Piers Form, there is a reference to the Geotechnical Engineer, and on the Repair Piers and Segmented Repair Piles Forms, there is reference to the design documentation and the municipal permit.

Once the context is established in the heading, the form moves on to sections relating to different aspects of each inspection. In general, these sections are documented by simply checking the item to show that it has been correctly completed. The checkmark (\checkmark) serves to show that the item has been considered and complies with the plans, whereas an x (X) denotes that the item does not comply with the plans. In some sections, direct questions are asked that should be answered. Finally, the lower sections of the forms generally have reference to a drawing of the slab, the piers or piles, or the foundation being repaired. The drawings further document the conditions specific to the site and the foundation and allow the inspector to orient the data being described in the conclusion of the inspection.

Each of these forms represents an attempt to document the events related to a specific foundation project or a specific foundation repair. It should be remembered that all the answers and data reported are typically the only documentation of what actually happened during this phase of construction. For this reason, every item is pertinent and should be given careful consideration during the inspection. Though many of the items listed are fairly common knowledge to the typical inspector or builder, it is the sequencing and nuances of certain questions and items listed, which are the greatest advantage of using the forms. The committee felt that all major items such as beam size, tendon counts, plan dates, etc., were adequately covered in each form.

It should be noted that the Repair Piers and Segmented Repair Piles Forms contain information that is not found in any established sources or specifications. This is particularly true of the Segmented Repair Piles Form. It was generally agreed that these items are rarely inspected by an independent inspector.

This document is made freely available to the public through the Foundation Performance Association at www.foundationperformance.org so engineers, architects, inspectors, contractors, and other professionals involved in the quality control of foundations systems for residential and low-rise buildings may have access to the information. To ensure the document remains as current as possible, it will be periodically updated under the same document number but with new revision numbers. Please direct suggestions for improvement to the current chair of the structural committee.

The Foundation Performance Association and its members make no warranty regarding the accuracy of the information contained herein and will not be liable for any damages, including consequential damages, resulting from the use of this document.

QC Checklists

- 1. POST-TENSION SYSTEM FOUNDATION MAKE-UP
- 2. CONCRETE PLACEMENT
- 3. POST-TENSION SYSTEM STRESSING
- 4. CONVENTIONAL (REBAR) FOUNDATION MAKE-UP
- 5. CONSTRUCTION (BUILDERS) PIERS
- 6. REPAIR PIERS
- 7. SEGMENTED REPAIR PILES

CLIENT_____ QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY_____

QC Checklist #1 - POST-1	ENSION SYS	TEM FOUNDAT	TION MAKE-UP
Builder	Subdivision		DateTime
Site Address	_LotBlk	_Sec	Plan site specific Yes ☐ No ☐
Plan #:Cable Count	Design Engineer	Sı	uperintendent
Plan provided at site Yes ☐ No ☐	Weather	Plan Date	Detail Sheet Date
Concrete Contractor	_Detached Garage Yo	es 🗌 No 🗌	Permit #:
	Check (🗸) If Items	Comply With The Plans Comply With The Plans	
SITE Substitution I at a Cothern		FORMS	ADDITIONAL REVIEWS
Subdivision Lot Other		Forms secure Floats installed	Date Time
Fill on site Yes \(\subseteq \text{No } \subseteq		Proper clearance at f	loats
Lot Description Fill on site Yes No Compaction verified by Geotechnical English	gineer:	Garage front closed	1040
Yes No D Will foundation make up drain: Yes N	ate	_ •	
Trees removed			
Are trees within 20' of foundation Yes	No		
CLAD		TENDONS	
Thickness (in) Measured: Screeds Stringline Describe Pad Material		Count: L to R	F to B Garage
Measured: Screeds Stringline	Other	TotalVariance	to BGarage Explain on siteRebar
Describe Pad Material Level and Firm Yes No		Number of tendons left	on site Rebar Other
Level and Firm Tes No		No tendons spaced of	Other over 6'-0" strings f plastic not over 1" or taped ight
BEAMS		20D nails used at cas	stings
Design Depth:(in) Exterior Actual Depth:(in)(in) Design Width:(in)(in) Actual Width:(in)(in) Average depth into undisturbed soil Clean of soil & debris	_ Interior(in)	Live ends stripped of	f plastic not over 1" or taped
Design Width: (in)	(III)(III)	All intersections tied	ignt I
Actual Width:(in)(in) _	(in)(in)	All tendons supported Dead ends have 3/4"	ed at intersections
Average depth into undisturbed soil	(in)	Dead ends have 3/4"	clearance to forms
Clean of soil & debris Water in beams Yes No Avera Will water drain Yes No Plumbing obstructions accommodated	ige Denth (in)	All S Hooks crimped	l secured by #3 stakes or rebar concrete bricks
Will water drain Yes No	.ge(m)	Ample chairs all tied	secured by #3 stakes or rebar concrete bricks
Plumbing obstructions accommodated		Tendon grid secured f	or concrete placement Yes 🗌 No 🗌
Pier tops clean			
POLYETHYLENE SHEETING ☐ 6-mil.Lapped and Taped ☐ Seated in	bottom of beams	secured at sides Mas	stic/tape applied at plumbing
REINFORCING STEEL			
SLAB SECTION WWF: (Mesh)Size Roll	Sheet	OR □#3 @	(in) on center both ways
WWF: (Mesh)Size Roll All WWF (mesh) seams lapped No rebar or WWF (mesh) tou	ed 6"	#3 Lapped pe	(in.) on center both ways r plans All edges 2" from forms
No rebar or WWF (mesh) tou	ching forms		0
BEAM SECTION			
Rebar: grade Clearances per plan: S	ides 🔲 Bottom 🔲 To	ор 🗌	
Splices lapped per plan	d ands		
Typical Rebar/Exterior Beams	d ciius Ci	ontinuous	
BEAM SECTION Rebar: grade Clearances per plan: S Splices lapped per plan Corner rebar installed at corners & dea Typical Rebar/Exterior Beams Typical Rebar/Interior Beams Corner bars installed at dead ends Yes Bay Windows or Porches Rebar Extra Rebar Added	CO	ontinuous	
Corner bars installed at dead ends Yes Bay Windows or Porches	No L		
Extra Rebar Added	11 Stirups _		
Diagonal Rebar at Re-entrant Corners	No. of Corners		
Nose Bars @ Cons Anchor bolts on site Yes No Diam	truction Joints	(in)	
Other FastenersNo Diam	eter(III) Leng	ui (III)	
Is foundation ready		Yes No No	
			Sketch
CHANGES NEEDED:			
		0	• 6
Quality Controller's Signature		Superintendent	's Signature

CLIENT_____

QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY_

QC Checklist #2 - CONCRETE PLACEMENT	
Builder Subdivision Site Address Lot Blk Sec Design Engineer Superintendent Copy of Foundation Makeup Report Provided Yes No Date of Copy Concrete Contractor Detached Garage Yes No	Plan #:Cable Count
Check (✔) If Items Comply With T (X) If Items Do Not Comply With T	he Plans The Plans
Subdivision Lot Other	Forms secure Date Time Floats installed Proper clearance at floats Garage closed in
WEATHER Weather conditions START: FIN	NICH.
Will temperature rise above 40° F for five hours Forty-eight hour forecast: HIGH TEMPERATURE:	LOW TEMPERATURE:
Mix: psi	RIDE—APPLIES TO POST TENSION SLAB
Anchor bolts on site Yes No Diameter (in) Length time Cother Fasteners Describe provisions for curing ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:	о) S кетсн

CLIENT	QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY	
QC Checklist #3 - POST-	TENSION STRESSING	
Builder Site Address Plan #:Cable Count_ Plan provided at site Yes \(\to \) No \(\to \) Concrete Placement Date Post Tension Company	Lot Blk Sec Pland Design Engineer Super Weather Plan Date Detail Stress Date Partia	an site specific Yes No No Sintendent I Sheet Date I Stress Date t #:
	Check (✓) If Items Comply With The Plans (X) If Items Do Not Comply With The Plans	
Are there any cracks in the surface of	the slab Yes No Describe	_ ADDITIONAL REVIEWS Time
Are the wedges placed in a vertical po Is there evidence of gripper marks on	S Yes No No Chees No No No Chees lab Yes No No Chees lab Yes No No Chees lab Yes No No Chees lab No Chees lab No Chees lab No Chees No Chees No Chees No Chees No Chees No Chees lab	now location on sketch below)
William (ii) 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	Maximum Theoretical Minimum 70 80 90 100 110 120	
Tendon Length (ft) Out	t-to-Out of Concrete	
USE CHART IF ELONGATIONS ARE NOT TENDON LENGTH IN FEET BY 0.08 T ELONGATION IN INCHES FOR LE	TO CALCULATE APPROXIMATE	
	Sketo	СН

Draw a simple sketch of the foundation configuration noting all tendon locations and their elongation measurements. Also note any problems which you have observed, particularly blowouts at corners or the garage entry and cracks.

FOLLOWING STRESS VERIFICATION☐ Are the tendon ends cut inside the poor

Are	tne	tenaon	enas	cut	ınsıae	tne	роскет	iormer

☐ After stressing are the nails cut☐ Are the tendon ends grouted with a non-shrink grout

CLIENT_____

QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY_

QC Checklist #4-CONVE	NTIONAL	(REBA	AR) FOUNDAT	TON MAKE-UP
Builder	Subdivision	•	Sec	DateTime
Site Address_	Lot	_Blk	Sec	Plan site specific Yes ☐ No ☐
Plan #:Design Engineer Plan provided at site Yes ☐ No ☐			Superintender	nt
Plan provided at site Yes ☐ No ☐	Weather		_Plan Date	Detail Sheet Date
Concrete Placement Date	_Detached Ga	rage Yes [] No □	Permit #
	Check (✔) If (X) If Items L	Items Con Do Not Con	pply With The Plans uply With The Plans	
SITE Subdivision Lot Other Lot Description Fill on site Yes No Compaction verified by Geotechnical En Yes No D Will make up drain: Yes No Trees removed Are trees within 20' of foundation Yes	gineer: ate	_	Forms secure Floats installed Proper clearance at flo Garage front closed	<u> </u>
SLAB Thickness (in) Measured: Screeds Stringline Describe Pad Material Level and Firm Yes No	Other	_ [Actual Depth: Design Width: Actual Width: Average depth into ur	(in) Exterior
☐ 6-mil.Lapped and Taped ☐ Seated in secured at	sides Mast	ic/tape app	lied at plumbing	
Number of piers Are pier tops REINFORCING STEEL Grade of Steel	s clean of debri	s res r	10	
BEAM SECTIONS Exterior Beams: Steel size Num Interior Beams: Steel size Num Extra Beam depth Yes No Addin Proper Clearance: Bottom (in) Section Continuity: Splices lapped per plan Yes Rebar clean of mud and excessive rust Yes Void Boxes in bottom of beam Yes No No No No No No No	aber top aber top tional steel requestides No Company Compan	Bottom Bottom United In Dorner bars in	Stirrup sizeStirrup sizeStirrup size (in) Support S nstalled YesNo Condition	Spacing (in) Spacing (in) system
SLAB REINFORCING Mesh: Size Roll Shee All mesh seams lapped 6" No rebar or mesh touching for Void Boxes Yes No Height (i	orms n) Poly coverin	OR	#3 @ #3 Lapped per plans es Yes □ No □	(in.) on center both ways All edges 2" from the forms
ADDITIONAL REINFORCING Diagonals: Size Fireplace pads: Size of steel Bay windows: Size of steel Other projections: Construction joints: Anchor bolts on site Yes No Diam Other Fasteners	Number i Placemen Placemen Control jo	in slab it oints n) Length	(in)	
IS THE FOUNDATION READY FOR CONCR CHANGES NEEDED:	ETE PLACEMEN			Sкетсн

CLIENT_____ QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY____

QC Che	cklist #5	- CONST	RUCT	TON (B	UILDE	R'S) PIE	RS	
Builder_ Site Address			_Subdivis _Lot	sion _Blk	_Sec		Date Plan	Time
Builder			S Plan Dat Concrete FORM NOT	uperintende te Contracto APPLICAB	ent Detail S r LE FOR SI	heet DateC	Geotechnica Geotech PIERS)	nical Report #
			Check (v	/) If Items	Comply W	Vith The Plans Vith The Plans	,	
SITE Subdivision Fill on site Y Compaction Trees remov Are trees with	Lot Oth Yes \(\sum \colon \co	er otechnical Eng Location:	Exp	lain			ADDITIO	DNAL REVIEWS Time
PIERS Name of drill Can drill equ	ling company: ipment access ing apparatus: r of piers:	all pier locatio	ons Yes [d	No 🗌				Other:
	Bell	Pier	PIER SI No.		Stirrup	s		
(in)	Dia. (in)(in)(in)(in)(in)(in)	(ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)		Size	Piers	Spacing		Sketch Typical Pier Showing Depth
Boring logs	from Geotechn aring strata:	ical report on	site Yes □	No□	`	ing tool required	d)	
Pocket Penet		g taken from a	uger cutti	ng Yes 🗀	No 🗆	TSF N	lote location	ons below
REINFORCIN		noie res iv	о 🗌 Бер	uı <u> </u>	_ Action .	i aken		
Rebar grade_ Does rebar e	xtend above pi	er top Yes 🔲 1			ove	(in) Slee	ved Yes □] No Describe
Concrete cor Was pump tr Specified str Was concrete	npany: ruck used Youngth of concre e placed on the ne of completion	es No tes:	ruck numl _ psi he pier dri –	ers:				
	ER HOLES READ EEDED:	Y FOR CONCR	ETE PLACI	EMENT Yes	□ No □		s	Sкетсн
Quality C	ontroller's S	Signature			Sup	erintenden	t's Signa	ture

CLIENT_____ QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY_____

QC Checklist #6	- REPAII	R PIERS	3					
OwnerSite AddressPlan #:Design E	ngineer_	_LotF Supe	31k erintender	_Sec nt	_ 	Plan eotechnica	Time site specific al Engineer	Yes No
Plan provided at site Yes Weather at site] No 🗌	Permit #			Geote	echnical R	eport #	
SITE Subdivision Lot Oth Soils Report on site Yes Test hole drilled to what de Underground plumbing tes Site obstructions to drilling Trees removed Yes No	ner Bearing pth No No No, Describe: Location_	(X) If Items Explain ng Soils at wl (ft) Water li	n hat depth Bearing sines under	oils at	th The Plans th The Plans (ft) (ft) ss \[\] No \[\]	ADDITIO	ONAL REVIEWSTime	
VINDERPINNING Name of repair contractor: Method of repair: Total number of piers:	Interior _	Exterio PIER SIZE	r E S	-				
	Pier Depth (ft)		Size	Piers				
(in) (in) (in) (in) (in) (in) (in) (in)	(ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)				(in) (in) (in)		Sketch Typ	ical Pier
Describe the manner of me	asuring the bel	l sizes:	(1	Bell checkin	g tool required)	Showing 1	Depth
Describe bearing strata:	ng Yes □ No □ hole Ves □ N	Denth	TSF "	Note local	tions below			
REINFORCING Rebar per plans Yes ☐ No Rebar grade	П	o		riction ru	iken <u></u>			
HELICAL PIERS Test hole depth Helix Size	(ft	Bearing Bracket	Data Style			P	ier Log Onsite haft Diameter	Yes 🗌 No 🗌
CONCRETE Will concrete truck be able Concrete company: Specified strength of concr Was concrete placed on the Projected time of completic If not, explain: ESTIMATED MAXIMUM	to access site ete: pse same day as to no f concrete p	Yes \(\sum \) No [Truck numb si Slump as o he pier was b placement \(\sum \)	Ders:delivered selled Yes	Was pum	p truck used Bi Wat	Yes ☐ Natch Time er added Y	No 🏻	
Sкетсн								
ARE THE PIER HOLES REAL CHANGES NEEDED:			_					
Quality Controller's	Signature			Supe	rintendent	's Signa	ture	

CLIENT_____ QUALITY CONTROL COMPANY____

		– SEGME						
Builder			Subdivision			DateDatePlan sGeotechnica	Tim	ie
Site Addres	S	P	_LotB	lkSec_		Plans	site specific	Yes □ No □
Plan #:	Design i	Engineer	Super	Intendent	ail Sheet Dat	Geotechnica	i Engineer	
Weather at	site		Permit #	Dca	ili Sileet Dai	eGeotechnica	l Report #	
							- F	
			Check (✓) If (X) If Items I					
SITE			. , ,	•	•	ADDITIO	NAL REVIEWS	
Subdivision	LotOtl	her te Yes ☐ No ☐	Explain Explain	s at what dan	th	Date	Time	
Test hole dr	rilled to what d	lepth	ft) I	Bearing soils	at	_(ft)		
Undergroun	nd plumbing tes	epth st Yes No g, Describe:] Water lin	ies under slab	Yes □ N	o 🗌		
rees remov	ved rest tho	Location				_		
Were builde	er's piers prese	ent Yes 🗌 No 🗀]			_		
UNDERPIN	NING							
Name of rep Piling system	pair contractor: m:	:						
Total numb	er of piles:	Interior	Exterior					
			F	IELD OBSE	RVATIONS	3		
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)		
		(11)	(D)	(0)	(D)	Distance From		Observed
D.II		G	37 1 0	D	DII 6	Top of Slab	Total Depth	Measuremen
Pile Round	Size Square	Segment Length	Number of Segments		Pile Cap	To Top of Pile Cap	From Top of Slab	of Lift at Refusal
Itounu	Square	_				тис Сир	OI SIUD	at Iterusur
(d)	(in)	(in)					(ft)	(in)
(d) (d)	(in)	(in)					(ft) (ft)	(in)
(d)	(in)	(in)					(ft)	(in)
(d)	(in)	(in)				DEDELL	(ft)	(in)
Total numb	er of nilings ob	served driven t	(A X B) + ($(C \times D) + E$	= IUIAL Inimum five	is recommended)		
Was pile log	g available at tl	he site Yes N	√o Expl	ain				
Were the pi	les shimmed in	nmediately upo	n completion	of being drive	en Yes 🔲 N	o 🗌		
If no, explains	In . can horizontal	I Ves □ No □	If no evolain					
Were the pi	les driven with	out interruption	i Yes No □	If no, expla	ain			
Were builde	ers piers detach	ned prior to jack	ting Yes 🔲 N	o 🗆				
What is the	shims determin	ned to be tight Yerlock	Yes ∐ No ∐					
Were interior	or piles installe	ed Yes No	If so, were tu	innels used I	Describe			
Was dewate	ering system us	sed and maintain	ned in excavat	ing and tunne	els Yes 🔲 N	О		
Describe ma	aterials used in	backfilling tun	nels	tar intrusion				
Was jetting	required to ins	stall piles Yes	No∏Expla	in				
ESTĬMATE	ED MAXIMUN	M LÍFT	INCHES	: TO BE MU	JD PUMPEI	Yes No No		
			Draw a sketc	h of the structur	e indicating the	pile placement		
	_							
CHANGES N	NEEDED:							<u>.</u>
	7 4 11 9	Signature		-	Cum owin to	ndent's Signat	1110	