

Review Comments
Electrical Recommended Change Order #42
First fifteen plan sheets
{85R1,91R1,93R1,117R1,118R1,119R1,120R1,121R1,122R1,132R1, 133R1,141R1,142R1,154R1,172R1}
Michael Travis

General Comments:

- ❖ **Instead of a single blanket change description with RFI reference the description should only contain the title of the CCO. The present policy is to place the CCO title within the description block of the CCO revision block. The CCO # should be placed in the CCO #/Page Block but leave the page spaces blank - do not place X's in these spaces.**
- ❖ **The contract plan sheets have an engineer stamp by Maxwell Takaki but the CCO Block has the "BY-block" with initials "EL" and "MP" and the "CK-block" with initials "RR". Is the PE Stamp for the complete sheet or for only the changes in the CCO? A note should be placed next to the stamp indicating "for changes only". The present policy is if the engineer of record is not providing the CCO changes then a PE Stamp is required but has a note by the stamp indicating "For Changes Only".**
- ❖ **Do not fill up a page leaving no space for additional CCO work of future stamps to be place on the sheet. Organize the sheet to provide adequate space for future insertions. New details that do not have previous reference from other sheets should be placed on supplemental sheets.**

Plan Sheet CCO Comments:

Sheet 85R1:

NOTE: By placing added details on the sheet reduces area to add any additional information on this sheet in the future if additional changes are required. If new details are added one should consider producing a supplemental sheet for new details.

- ❖ **Added details were placed in this CCO but no sheets in this CCO reference these new details. Need to add the appropriate sheets or remove these details from the CCO.**

Sheet 93R1:

- ❖ **After working with the pole pedestal prototype that was develop to evaluate the routing of the conduit feeds to the light poles Caltrans is requesting to reconsider the response to RFI # 261 with the following exceptions: (1) Provide holes in the pedestal top plate to accommodate 3- 41mm conduit penetrations; (2) Provide three sleeves in the top deck plate in the pole pedestal enclosure; (3) Use flexible metallic conduit to feed from the OBG to the pole mounting area.**

Sheet 117R1:

- ❖ There is a missing clouded area which has deleted junction box, conduit. The other area is clouded. Need to be consistent.
- ❖ After working with the pole pedestal prototype that was develop to evaluate the routing of the conduit feeds to the light poles Caltrans is requesting to reconsider the response to RFI # 261 with the following exceptions: (1) Provide holes in the pedestal top plate to accommodate 3- 41mm conduit penetrations; (2) Provide three sleeves in the top deck plate in the pole pedestal enclosure; (3) Use flexible metallic conduit to feed from the OBG to the pole mounting area.

Sheet 119R1:

- ❖ The branch feed to the barrier rail receptacle has been changed in the CCO but was not clouded and indicated as a change. This changes the conductor feeds from #12's to #10. The conductors feeding this receptacle from the source (Panel board) is #8 conductors.

Sheet 120R1:

- ❖ The branch feed to the barrier rail receptacle has been changed in the CCO. The change is the conductor size from #12 to #10. The conductors feeding this receptacle from the source (Panel board) are #12 and have not been changed in the CCO. The change was not corrected to source. Was the intent to splice #10 conductors to the main feed?

Sheet 132R1:

- ❖ There is an added note #2 on this sheet regarding the barrier rail receptacle but there is no plan view that would indicate this added note. Is this note necessary on this sheet?
- ❖ The plan view has been combined to indicate conduit stub-up plan for both the roadway lighting and the overhead sign. I do not believe that these have similar pole bases and similar base plate openings (200mm for lighting and 150 for sign pole).
- ❖ After working with the pole pedestal prototype that was develop to evaluate the routing of the conduit feeds to the light poles, Caltrans is requesting to reconsider the response to RFI # 261 with the following exceptions: (1) Provide holes in the pedestal top plate to accommodate 3- 41mm conduit penetrations; (2) Provide three sleeves in the top deck plate in the pole pedestal enclosure; (3) Use flexible metallic conduit to feed from the OBG to the pole mounting area.

Sheet 133R1:

- ❖ After working with the pole pedestal prototype that was develop to evaluate the routing of the conduit feeds to the light poles, Caltrans is requesting to reconsider the response to RFI # 261 with the following exceptions: (1) Provide holes in the pedestal top plate to accommodate 3- 41mm conduit penetrations; (2) Provide three sleeves in the top deck plate in the pole pedestal enclosure; (3) Use flexible metallic conduit to feed from the OBG to the pole mounting area.

Sheet 142R1:

- ❖ This sheet has a reference to electrical sheet number E-209. This sheet does not exist and should be changed to sheet E-68.

Sheet 154R1:

- ❖ The cloud should be around all that has been changed. Also the described destination of the feeds should be at the appropriate end of the run.

Sheet 172R1:

- ❖ The section A-A shows Girder center line for "W" westbound but the section cut layout and column numbers are for eastbound structure. Also there is no north arrow on the plan sheet. Need to correct this on the contract plan.

The comments in this document do not constitute a complete review. Since there is no completed Yellow sheet documents set by PB I have to go through all the RFI's that pertain and determine that they have been captured in this CCO document. I am still trying to go through and perform a more comprehensive review but do to time I am sending these review plan sheet. I will be sending the next installment ASAP.