

32/86

1 of  
8/10/81  
J. Kane

# Comment on Dr. Peck's Deposition Transcript of Aug. 7, 1981

Pg. 3395, line 18

\* Removal & replacement option would have allowed achievement of the compaction criteria. Dr. Peck questions whether removal & replacement is a SUPERIOR action because it leads to an inferior result. "You might say 'removal & replacement' satisfies the letter of the law but not the intent as well."

pg. 3463, line 23

Zamarin redirect question - Dr. Peck, in your opinion, are the engineering principles associated with surcharging any different when you are dealing with a completed or partially completed structure than if you are dealing with any other type of a structure or system

pg. 3464, line 22

Zamarin - Did you have any difficulty in interpreting the results of the piezometers (because of effect of surcharging & raising cooling pond)

Answer - No - It introduced an additional consideration but no difficulty

---

## Questions of Wm. Paton in Redirect

Pg. 3475, line 1

Is the rate of settlement since <sup>September</sup> Dec. 1980 consistent with the estimated rate of consolidation that is predicted on the basis of the surcharge program

Answer, line 19 "I think it's consistent with both (J. Kane's addition: rate & amount of settlement) in the sense that it is less than both

Pg 3476, line 1

Dr. Peck doesn't know if surcharging weakened the structure or not, w/ respect to condition prior to surcharging.

Dr. Peck's judgement would be that it has NOT SIGNIFICANTLY impaired the ability of the structure to function