

MS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA	Job Stamp	7-day Const. Calendar	Day No. 1015
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	SFOBB SAS	Project Work Day No.	Day No. 1225
Form HC-10A (Rev. 6/80)	04-0120F4	Date	9/23/2009

Weather: Overcast and cool (AM)
Partly Cloudy and warm (PM)

Inspectors Hours	Start	0630	Stop	1530
Shift Hours	Start	0700	Stop	1530

ASSISTANT STRUCTURE REP.
JASON WILCOX

CONTRACTOR – American Bridge - Fluor JV

HOURS - ITEM NO. 8													
EQUIPMENT AND/OR LABOR:			REGULAR	OVERTIME	DOUBLE TIME	NIGHT PAY					IDLE OR DOWN	REMARKS	
Equip. #	NO. MEN	DESCRIPTION (Of Equipment or Labor) American Bridge											
												Name	Contractor

Description of Operation:
Erect Temporary Truss and Towers: Assemble E12/13/14 at Pier 7 Test Anchor Rods at E2

FIELD WORK:

I observed the testing of the West bents on the North side of E2 throughout the morning today. They started on the South one around 0800 hrs and finished by 1030 hrs. One of the rods failed under the prescribed testing set forth by the designers, Klohn Crippen Berger. The workers placed a jack around the rods, placed a plate containing a hole through it for the rod on top, then had another plate stick out to push against the dial gauge used to track elongation. See photo.



RECT H31 NOV-04 #011373



The failed rod, pictured above, happened on the North side of the column cluster of rods. The other three rods were brought up to 5,550 psi, which associates with the 1000kN required by the designer, then held at that pressure for ten minutes, while the elongation/relaxation is observed and tracked. The maximum change set forth is 0.04 inches, and all three were less than 0.04 inches. They were accepted by the Contractor, for now.

The same testing happened on the North rod cluster, W-Line, West bent. Here, there was one failure as well, but it was the Eastern most rod. This was brought up to 5,550 psi, and failed immediately. The rod was removed and samples were taken of the epoxy. There appeared to be portions of the epoxy that did not set, experiencing characteristics of gel and still unset after three or four days. Some of the other areas showed signs of disintegration. Upon first seeing this, it appeared as though either the epoxy is bad, the mixing was not adequate, or the setting time was inadequate. The Contractor is going to take the results and contact me later in the week.

Since RFCO 070 came in stating that there was an error on page 431 of 1204 in the contract plans stating that the elevation of the top of E2 was 3.2 meter, I measured the distance down from the 4 meter mark on both the North and South columns of E2. At multiple locations around both columns, the distance down ranged between 80 cm and 82 cm. This shows that, according to the 4 meter line placed there by ABF, that the top of concrete at the base of the columns is at 3.2 meters. This coincides with page 431 of 1204 in the plans. It also says in the plans that there is a slope that goes from 3.2 meters at the base of the columns down to 3.0 meters at the edge of the top of concrete, negating the approval of a CCO.

OFFICE WORK:

- Diary work
- 0800 meeting with Gil to discuss the three items listed below
- Reviewed Submittal 691R10 – Temp Tower Foundations Tower H
- Reviewed Submittal 1350 – Temp Works Erection Plan – FS E17 to FS E20
- Reviewed ABF-CAL-LTR-001233 regarding RFCO No. 070, Pier E2 Top of Footing Elevation
- Worked on the Home Storage Permit as required by Division of Equipment

CONVERSATIONS:

OVERTIME: No overtime accrued today.

Inspector: Jason Wilcox

Transportation Engineer (D)/Asst. Structure Rep.

September 23, 2009
Page 2 of 2