

Job Stamp
04-0120F4
SFOBB SAS

Const. Calendar Day No. 490
Project Work Day No. 700
Date **04/18/2008**
Shift Hours Start 0630 Stop 15:00
Inspector Shift 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM

Assistant Structures Representative **CONTRACTOR – ABFJV**

EQUIPMENT AND/OR LABOR:			HOURS - ITEM NO.								IDLE OR DOWN	REMARKS	
Equip. #	NO. MEN	DESCRIPTION (Of Equipment or Labor)	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		Name	Contractor
	1	Pile driver – Foreman	8								Leo Vega	ABF	
	2	Pile Driver – Journeyman	8								Ed Mendoza		
	3	Pile Driver – Journeyman	8								Paul Ekstrom		
	4	Pile Driver – Journeyman	8								Richard Yambao		
	5	Pile Driver – Journeyman	8								Henry Wheat		
	6	Operator	8								Tim Campbell		
	7	Oiler	8								Mel Thompson		
4100	1	Crane	8								Manitowac		

- At Pier E2, where ABF attempted to install sandjacks and ran into problems drilling holes on the first day of this operation. One big problem was the holes that were overdrilled, and the other was the hitting of rebars. The latter problem was rectified by drilling holes to a depth of 4" instead of the 6" required by the falsework plan. Upon the discovery of this infraction by ABF, Aaron approached M. MacDanold and told him about the finding. For the detail of this conversation, please refer to A. Prchlik's diary as I was on the footing looking on when Aaron made Mark aware of this problem. Subsequently, when I asked Aaron about this interaction, he told me that mark called himself the Engineer of record and in his opinion the 4" embedment is adequate. Aaron told him that he needs to submit a revised falsework plan showing that a 4" embedment on these Hilti bolts is acceptable. At the time of our departure, there were 4 sand jacks that ABF was attempting to set. Please refer to M. Modanlou's or A. Prchlik's diaries for the name of the workers who were at Pier E2 today.
- ABF crew continued work at Birth 7 setting up walkways & railings;
- I spent the rest of day updating the survey binder, providing attachments(documentation) for my diaries, updating my reports, and reading diaries written by Massoud & Aaron over the last three weeks.
- At the close of the day (around 16:00) I had a conversation with Ron Matin in regards to the ABF-SUB665R0. Ron told me that he was not in the loop on all the conversations that took place in regards to this submittal. I told him that it was a direct order from Gil for me to draft a letter and reject SUB 665R0. The SUB was not in adherence to Sectin 10-1.23, "survey" of the Special Provisions, and defidcient on two accounts: it lacked a stamp by a licensed land surveyor and the datum information was not called out in the submittal. I told Ron that I had called Dave Adams & told him about this matter and he had told me that he would give us the information. Based on a converastion with Gil, I asked him whether or not he wants CT to write a letter rejecting the Revision "0" version before they submit R1 or would they just revised the submittal and send it to our office. This option

REC'D 08 MAY 31 #004957

was offered to them by Gil. Dave Adams consulted James Davidson and told me that they opt for the latter option.

Ron told me that he had approved the submittal for he did not know that any of these conversations had taken place. Furthermore, he said that writing letters is his task and that he should be informed on all the decisions made on submittals. I told him that I was operating under a directive by Gil and did not know that he was to be informed. A response to a submittal needs to be made before a revised one issued, he added.

I told him that when I spoke to Dave Adams and asked him if he were going to indicate the appropriate revision number, he recanted J. Davidson's account that since a rejection letter has not been issued by CT, ABF does not need to reflect the new revision number on the submittal.

Inspector:



Saman Soheili

Trans Engineer (D)/Asst. Struct. Rep