

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

George Russell, Jr

File: 0050014 –Control of the Work
Username: George Russell, Jr
UserEmail: glr.jr@russellengineering.com
UserTel: 954-540-4876
Date: Wednesday, September 28, 2005
Time: 09:16:55 AM

Comments:

Seems a bit redundant. Furthermore, now that the contractor has an "engineer" and the department has an engineer you probably will need to clarify whose engineer your referring to everytime the word engineer is utilized in the specs.

Ghulam Mujtaba:

In Sections 5 and 6, the "Contractor's Engineer of Record" has been mentioned as predominant entity and "Specialty Engineer" as a secondary. For example in 5-1.4.4.1: ".....when applicable, the signature and embossed seal of the Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record". This means that Specialty Engineer should sign it and it is also OK if Contractor's Engineer of Record signs it. It should be changed to read: ".....when applicable, the signature and embossed seal of the Contractor's Engineer of Record or Specialty Engineer".

Mike Bergin:

Section 5 and 6 are not worded as 346, 400 or 455. Sections 346, 400 and 455 say " All calculations and details submitted shall be sealed by the ~~Specialty Engineer~~ Contractor's Engineer of Record."

Section 5 and 6 say "the signature and embossed seal of the Specialty Engineer or Contractor's Engineer of Record." I think the wording should be the same to standardize the documents. We all know that the seal is embossed. Why not indicate the same verbiage for all of the specs?
