STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ENGINEER'S DAILY REPORT

LAN Engineering Consultant 5-6-08

REPORT NO. 504 {7-day}

DATE April 30, 2008

M T W T F S S (DAY)

NORMAL WORK HOUR: START: 7:00AM STOP: 3:30PM

WEATHER: CLEAR/SUNNY

LOCATION :

Construction Field Office : 333 Burma Road, Oakland 94607

Working Drawing Campus Office : 375 Burma Road, Oakland 94607

04-SF-80-13.2/13.9
Contract No. 04-0120F4
{SAS Superstructure}

Caltrans Supervisor:
Gary Lai
Senior Bridge Engineer

Office Work:

- **Safety Stand-Down Meeting (0800-1000).**
  - Went to the safety stand down meeting in the Mission Bay Office (Make-up).
- **CCO # 44 – Review.**
  - Reviewed the CCO package with Sandy Michelotti and Sam Patel.
  - Review comments will be placed on the PB & TY LIN package.
- **CCO # 42 - Review and Comments (CRM Meeting on Tuesday).**
  - Drafted the comments and issues covered in the meeting and sent out.
  - Discussed some of the issues with Chris (ABF) (see email attachment).
- **MEP Shop Drawing Work.**
  - New priority submittal list sent out by John Lyons.
  - Worked on Master Penetration Lists.

Any questions or comments you can reach me at (916) 919-7158. My E-Mail address is Mike.Travis@LANEngineering.com or Michael_Travis@dot.ca.gov

END OF REPORT Work hours 0535-1900 – 10 hours regular

Attachments:

1. CCO #42 Meeting Issues.
2. CCO #42 email

SIGNATURE

Name: Michael F. Travis

TITLE: Electrical Engineer – LAN Engineering

Mike Travis

From: Chris Bausone [cbausone@abfjv.com] **Sent:** Wed 4/30/2008 2:01 PM
To: Mike Travis; 'King, Nick'
Cc: 'Bill Shedd'; 'Saeed Shahmirzai'; 'Takaki, Maxwell'; 'Gary J Lai'
Subject: RE: CCO 42
Attachments:

It seems like an acceptable response if I understand correctly. You want us to ignore the need for splice boxes while estimating CCO 42 because you want them priced with CCO 70?

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Travis [mailto:Mike.Travis@lanengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2008 12:52 PM
To: cbausone@abfjv.com; King, Nick
Cc: Bill Shedd; Saeed Shahmirzai; Takaki, Maxwell; Gary J Lai
Subject: RE: CCO 42

Chris,

The transition routing of the tower cable tray to conduit is being addressed in CCO #70 because of the relocation of the service panels at elevation 89 to inside the tower structure.
The rerouting of the circuit wiring from the power sources are be modified in the tower.
The branch routing of the conduits are being shown with boxes being shown at the cable tray interface.
CCO # 42 is covering the cope opening in the diaphragm plate and the cable tray installation transition through the tower.

The comments by Anna was noted in the meeting yesterday and I hope this is an acceptable response.

Mike Travis

From: Chris Bausone [mailto:cbausone@abfjv.com]
Sent: Wed 4/30/2008 11:40 AM
To: 'King, Nick'; Mike Travis
Cc: 'Bill Shedd'; 'Saeed Shahmirzai'; 'Takaki, Maxwell'
Subject: FW: CCO 42

Please consider Anna's request for the refinement of CCO 42, dealing with the need for splice boxes throughout the tower for conductor type transitions between trays and conduits.

From: Anna Lee [mailto:alee@bleyco.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2008 11:28 AM
To: cbausone@abfjv.com
Subject: CCO 42

Chris,

CCO 42 includes the conduit change to cable tray in the tower, but the picture is not complete. Single conductors are used in conduit runs, and multi-conductor cable are used in cable trays. Since splices are not allowed in the cable trays, provisions have to be made for boxes mounted to C1, C2 stiffeners. Can you get them to call out the size of the box, as well as show us how they want them mounted on the stiffeners, etc.?

Anna

--
This message has been scanned for viruses
and dangerous content by MailScanner. <http://www.mailscanner.info/>
--
This message has been scanned for viruses
and dangerous content by MailScanner. <http://www.mailscanner.info/>

--
This message has been scanned for viruses
and dangerous content by MailScanner.

--
This message has been scanned for viruses
and dangerous content by MailScanner.

CCO 42 Review Meeting
ABF/Bleyco/Caltrans/PB
April 29, 2008

Subject:

Review of CCO 42 Package

Attendees:

Michael Travis – Caltrans
Sandy Michelotti _ Caltrans
Nick King – PB
Max Takaki – PB
Chris Bausone – ABF (Prime Contractor)
Rocky Garcia – PB
Anna Lee – Bleyco (Electrical Sub-Contractor)

The following issues were discussed about the proposed package:

- Sheet No. 117R1 – It was agreed to place a type 9 (PB-LTG) next to the roadway light pole on the south side of the westbound roadway at Bent W2. No pull box is shown on the plans.
- Sheet No. 122R1, 123R1, 153R1, 193R1 and 195R1 - The splice point and routing of the circuit for the Roadway light Pole was brought up for Poles 1032-2 and 2032-2. Poles are feed from the barrier rail. Routing not clearly indicated.
- Sheet No. 132R2 – The insulated ground bushing at end of conduit in the pole pedestal was brought up about how this was to be accomplished. Also the note #5 references both the detail 3 for the light pipe and the sleeves for the pole pedestal. This needs to be modified to be clearer for the two different types of locations. In addition, the pole pedestal dropout, section A-A, should be modified per RFI 565R3 details.
- Sheet No. 133R2 - The pole pedestal dropout, section B-B, should be modified per RFI 565R3 details.
- Sheet No. 141R1 – The pier 1 tower light schedule (roadway level) need to be verified that for RFI's in this change order.
- Sheet No. 142R1 – There is a conflict in the pull box schedules for the pull box "PB-2K". The two boxes are different size and type.
- Sheet No. 149R1, 123R1 and 124R1 – PB-2A JB not in one-line. Routing of circuits need to be verified in conduit/cable tray schedules.
- Sheet 188R1 - Need to add a type 9 (PB-LTG) in concrete barrier for roadway light pole 2031-1. Need to add location of the emergency ramp between PP 14-16 and reference the detail on sheet 210S1 detail #2. Need to remove Note 6 and add a note to cover the Belvedere area electrical equipment to be supplied and turned over to Caltrans. Note to read: "Bike path electrical components west of PP 9 furnished by contractor, installed by others".

- Sheet 190R1 – Need to add location of emergency ramp between PP 46-48 and reference the detail #2 on sheet 210S1.
- Sheet 191R1 - Need to add location of emergency ramp between PP 46-48 and reference the detail #2 on sheet 210S1.
- Sheet 192R1 - Need to add location of emergency ramp between PP 46-48 and reference the detail #2 on sheet 210S1.
- Sheet No. 208R2 – The insulated ground bushing at end of conduit in the pole pedestal was brought up about how this was to be secured/ routed. In addition, the pole pedestal dropout, section A-A, should be modified per RFI 565R3 details.
- Sheet No. 209R2 – The insulated ground bushing at end of conduit in the pole pedestal was brought up about how this was to be secured/ routed. In addition, the pole pedestal dropout, section B-B, should be modified per RFI 565R3 details.
- Sheet 210S1 – Detail #3 (ES-6 Detail) is incomplete and needs to be modified. The welding of the bracket to the bridge structure is shop welded. Field welding was requested to be an option. The detail needs to be modified and coordinated with T.Y. Lin. The detail #2 for the emergency access platform needs to be referenced to the locations or sheets.
- Sheet 249R1 – This sheet will be modified to clear the routing of the conduit above the 6.0m elevation as indicated in RFI # 402 R00. The other sheets will be covered in future CCO's.
- Sheet 270R1 – Concern was brought up about the grounding in this sheet. The grounding will be covered in a future CCO.
- Sheet 275S1 – Detail #3 needs to be modified removing cable tray sections as indicated. The cable support and securing details need to be clarified on this sheet.
- Sheet 275S2 – The cable tray schedule has changed and needs to be modified due to the change in Detail #3 on sheet 275S1. Cable tray cable support requirements need to be included in this sheet.
- Tower interior routing issue: We discussed the transit of the cable tray to conduit and the junction boxes needed in the transition from cable to conductors. This was not addressed in CCO #42. The rerouting and transition is being addressed in CCO #70 which covers the service installation in the tower structure at elevation 89. The circuits will be modified within the tower so the details for this interior issue will be addressed in the CCO.
- The circuit routing issue: We discussed that conflicts between some of the conduit schedules, one-line diagrams and plan sheets as to the accrual rerouting of the circuits to the equipment supplied. It was agreed that this will be further investigated and verified. Any errors will be addressed and corrected.