

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DIVISION OF ENGINEERING SERVICES

Office of Structural Materials

Quality Assurance and Source Inspection



Bay Area Branch
 690 Walnut Ave. St. 150
 Vallejo, CA 94592-1133
 (707) 649-5453
 (707) 649-5493

Contract #: 04-0120F4Cty: SF/ALA Rte: 80 PM: 13.2/13.9File #: 69.yy**DAILY PROJECT JOURNAL****Prime Contractor:** American Bridge/Fluor Enterprises, a JV**Report No:** DPJ-000044**Contractor:** Zhenhua Port Machinery Company, Ltd (ZPMC), Changxing Island **Dated:** 15-Jan-2007**Location:** Changxing Island, Shanghai, China**Submittals(New / Total):****CWR's:** 0 / 0**HSR's:** 0 / 0**NCR's:** 1 / 1

Item	Title	Detail
1	Major component movement	<p>Reviewed RT film for PQR's HP-2006129, HP-2006131, HP-2006116, HP-2006117-2, HP-2006128 and HP-2006133. The IQI's for HP-2006129 and HP-2006131 were 44mm long, indicating that the IQI was put on the source side of the film as required (note these are the PQR test plates QA observed the RT set-up on). The IQI's for the other PQR's were 38mm (the same size as the actual IQI), which indicated that the IQI's had been placed the film side of the plates. QA issued a Non-conformance Report (NCR).</p> <p>QA observed macro-etches of the following PQR's:</p> <p>HP-2006126 - Failed due to lack of penetration HP-2006127 - appears acceptable HP-2006138 - appears acceptable HP-2006139 - appears acceptable</p> <p>QA observed mechanical testing of PQR test plate HP-2006137. The depth of the Charpy-V notch was less than the allowable tolerance, and testing could not be performed. ZPMC will have to make an additional Charpy sample and reset the blade depth on their broaching machine. All other required mechanical tests were performed and appear to comply with the contract requirements.</p>
2	Key conversations	<p>QA spoke with ABF representative Craig Knops and ZPMC personnel and explained how QA could determine that the RT of four plates had been performed with the IQI (Image Quality Indicator) on the film side. QA explained that this was not acceptable by code, and that the RT company had performed the RT correctly while QA was present and then switched their technique after QA left. QA notified Mr. Knops that the State would issue a Non-Conformance Report on the issue. QA also requested to be informed when any RT was to be performed, so that the State has the opportunity to witness the testing.</p>

