



STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**ENGINEER'S DAILY REPORT**

LAN Engineering Consultant

REPORT NO. 517

DATE

*5-16-08*  
May 13, 2008

M *J* W T F S S (DAY)

NORMAL WORK HOUR:

START: 6:00AM STOP: 3:00PM

WEATHER:

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:**

❖ **Pre-Design MEP Coordination Meeting MEP Coordination Meeting with Contractor:**

- Covered all items on ABF itinerary.

❖ **CCO #44 CRM Meeting (Caltrans – PB- ABF - Bleyco) (1000- 1600):**

- Reviewed all RFI's in CCO and CCO sheets.
- Discussed all issues and determined resolution of each issue.
- Attached is a draft of the issues discussed and what needs to be accomplished to issues CCO # 44 to contractor.
- Nick King (PB) indicated that PB will make the appropriate changes to the plan sheets and re-issue the package for processing. The estimated time to make corrections and re-issue the package is approximately 1-2 weeks.

*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**

**Attachments:**

1. CCO #44 CRM Meeting Issues.

SIGNATURE

Work hours 0545-1700 – 8 hours regular

Name

Michael F. Travis

TITLE

Electrical Engineer – LAN Engineering

CCO 44 Review Meeting  
ABF/Bleyco/Caltrans/PB  
May 13, 2008

Subject:

Final review of CCO 44 Package

Attendees:

Michael Travis – Caltrans

Chris Bausone – ABF (Prime Contractor)

Sandy Michelotti \_ Caltrans

Rocky Garcia – PB

Nick King – PB

Anna Lee – Bleyco (Electrical Sub-Contractor)

Max Takaki – PB

The following issues were discussed about the proposed package:

- ABF had concerns about the RFI-CCO Hopper layout. The following is a list of the concerns:
  - The hopper has all the RFI's but does not differentiate between superseded RFI's.
  - There is no identification on what RFI's were included in the first submittal to the contractor with a letter to precede. The Delta 1 indicators on the CCO in most cases would indicate the first submittal in the TYLIN Sheets. Contractor indicated that this first submittal was processed for estimate to all subcontractors. There is no way to separate the first and updated portions of the CCO meaning the estimating could have to be done twice.
- Sheet No. 72R1- Section B has dimensions that are not realistic and need to be changed to match the dimensions on sheet 903S1R1.
- Sheet No. 83R1- Section B has dimensions that are not realistic and need to be changed to match the dimensions on sheet 903S1R1.
- Sheet No. 131R1 – Sheet Note 1 is incorrect and the word "Lighting" needs to be removed from the note. The notes on the plan details indicating "see plan for location" needs to be removed or indicate the exact location. In the "plan-typical pull box and conduit locations" the offset dimensions on top and below need to be changed.
- Sheet No. 132R3, 133R3, 208R3, 209R2 – the handhold access in section A-A is incorrect and should show the contract change.
- Sheet No. 192R2 – There is a call box symbol located close to PP 94 that is not indicated in the schedule. This needs to be removed from the sheet.

- Sheet No. 207R1 – Sheet Note 1 is incorrect and the word “Lighting” needs to be removed from the note. The notes on the plan details indicating “see plan for location” needs to be removed or indicate the exact location. In the “plan-typical pull box and conduit locations” the offset dimensions on top and below need to be changed.
- Sheet 207S2 – The Call box pole is state furnished and should be shaded to indicate this. The call box support is included in the contract.
- Sheet 210R2 – The call box poles need to be corrected to indicate the new change.
- Sheet 352R2 – Need to leave call box 242D in the chart to indicate location.
- Sheet No. 373R1 – Cable Tray 2T25 circuit UP205-8 needs to be corrected.
- Sheet No. 388R1 – The conduit 4221 has circuit UP105-2 still being run but was removed from the contract.
- Sheet 399R2 – Conduit # 5457 has a solid dark line indicating the circuit below might be in another conduit run. This should be corrected.
- Sheet 878R1 – The note 3 indicates “with locktight threads” This needs to be clarified as to what is the intent of the statement. Does it mean to provide thread locking material?