

Job Stamp
04-0120F4
04-SF-80-13.2/13.9

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Gary Pursell's

Resident Engineer
(Field)
DAILY REPORT

Report No. 45. GP-41

Date: Week of March 12,
2007

SFOBB East-Span
Seismic Retrofit
Project (SAS)

Monday, March 12, 2007

Dentist appointment in Redding at 7:30 am, then after travel arrived at Pier 7 at noon. Did not attend the morning "Champions" meeting.

At the SAS staff meeting in pm provided an overview of the fabrication shop in China. Also, Kallin Tea provided a presentation on the overview of environment permits and obligations.

Tuesday, March 13, 2007

Attended SAS Risk Management meeting in the morning, hosted by Rob Kobal, to update the risk register. Met informally with Mike Flowers and Brian Petersen and discussed the impasse at reaching an agreement with Macalloy, and the local tax issue with regard to the City of SF ordinances, 1) 1½ % payroll tax and 2) Paid Sick Leave program. Mike would like to discuss with a CT attorney prior to pursuing with there own counsel.

Wednesday, March 14, 2007

At core team meeting this morning, Ron Crockett indicated ABF would attempt, through schedule updates, to show working drawings are on the critical path. The baseline schedule has not been accepted and is long overdue from the ABF. The critical path as identified at the weekly scheduling meeting has for some time been the Shear Leg Barge Crane.

Ron expressed concern on how the provisions for State Owned Float would be applied and, in particular, with reference to the 7 additional day provisions related to multiple submittals. He asked how he should provide submittals. In response, I indicated it was up to ABF to determine how to provide submittals. Ron then threatened to submit extra large packages, presumably to make it difficult for the State to review within the contract timelines and avoid the possibility of state owned float being accrued. This is inconsistent with the contractor's past direction to provide smaller submittals, to expedite approval. It also appears the contractor would have to consciously delay providing some submittals in order to build up a "jumbo" submittal. This would be inconsistent with the accelerated working drawing provisions, and contrary to ABF's planned approach as submitted to-date.

Steve Hulsebus and I meet with the US Coast Guard along with ABF reps, Ron Crocket and Scott Tudor. Coast Guard attendees included Carl Hausner and Dave ?. The meeting was called for 1) CT to obtain clarification on USCG requirements for bridge lighting, fog horns, and bells and 2) for ABF to obtain clarification on several of the standard conditions contained in the USCG's recent approval of a request to reduced vertical clearance submitted by ABF. After considerable discussion on various, inconsistent, lighting, fog horn, and bell requirements and plans, it was concluded we should revisit and update the lighting, fog horn and bell plans for the entire bridge. Steve Hulsebus will submit a request along with a schematic of the new bridge showing vertical clearances and soundings to the USCG. In response, the USCG will provide updated lighting, fog horn, and bell requirements. Two conditions will be addressed; 1) the "stand alone" new bridge and 2) transition conditions during construction when the existing bridge and new bridges are in place. In general, the USCG did not want duplicate lighting/fog horns/bells on the new and old bridge. They felt one set of warning devices, either on the existing or new bridge, would be adequate. When ABF's temporary tower system is in place, USCG requirements call for an alternative "main" channel to be identified with green lighting between Skyway piers E3 and E4. USCG requirements are fairly clear during the transition period when the temporary tower system is in place. However, there will likely be

REC'D 07 APR 11 1000580

changes to the requirements for the "stand alone" new bridge, i.e., more or less lights, fog horns, and bells, which we'll have to implement by CCO. ABF was able to obtain satisfactory clarification to the several questions they had regarding standard conditions on their approval to reduce vertical clearance.

Participated in East Span electrical coordination meeting where options were explored on bringing together the electrical systems between the various contracts, i.e., additional contract focused on electrical or incorporate into existing contracts. A number of electrical items were deleted from the Skyway contractor.

Thursday, March 15, 2007

Attended CCO Status update in pm, followed by focus meeting on PMIV extra work charges and CCO plan.

Friday, March 16, 2007

Prepared response to Submittal 57.
Sent proposed correspondence to DRB members via email Mike Flowers and Steve Buschmeyer. The correspondence will present compensation package revisions and kick off the initial DRB meeting.