

0050105 CONTROL OF THE WORK
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Charles Boyd
414-4275

Comment: (1-13-11)

This is the one where we recommended that the designee must be a PE. It's a little bit screwy the way it is written now. Maybe he meant to say:

If the erection plans for multiple locations are sufficiently similar, as determined by the Engineer, the Specialty Engineer may assign, as his designee, **another** Specialty Engineer to inspect the erected elements; however, the Specialty Engineer and the designee **Specialty Engineer** must both inspect the first erection location.

Response: Another revised version has been approved by Clay McGonagill, Robert Robertson and Dave Sadler and should address any of Mr. Boyd's concerns.

Roger Martin
813-376-1771
rcmartin@pcl.com

Comments: (3-29-11)

1. You assume that "affecting traveling Public safety" only means cars. In the 3rd paragraph it states "opening of the roadway below the structure". What if it crosses a railroad or a navigable channel and maybe it's not over but adjacent. These were not proposed changes but might be worth considering.

Response: Agree: will change.

2. You assume that a specialty engineer who performs calculations and details truly understands what he is looking at in the field, i.e. welds, proper bolted connections, actual insitu soil conditions etc. It seems that what we're trying to achieve here is insuring that we have a competent person in charge of each of these areas. The meeting should be with "a" specialty engineer(s) and let the engineers determine who is best qualified. This also applies to the field inspection, this should be "a" specialty engineer and not "the" specialty engineer - they might be the same or they might be different.

Response: Agree: will change.

3. In previous discussions with FDOT, even they felt that their inspectors could be qualified to inspection falsework installation and no argument here. If a Specialty Engineer is going to be in charge and responsible, let him/her determine who is qualified to do an inspection on his behalf rather than mandate. I assume what we're trying to achieve is to have the most qualified individuals perform the work under a person in responsible charge.

Response: Agree: will change.

4. It requires that the Specialty Engineer submit his packet to the Engineer 4 weeks prior to the start of erection. There is no indication that the packet will be reviewed, commented on and/or approved by any other entity, i.e. EOR, CEI, 3rd party agency (Railroad, Expressway Authority, Port, etc.) or FDOT. However, this is often not the case and a review process starts with turnaround time and re-submittals and the other parties do not adhere to the time frame allocated by spec. to the contractor. Also, these parties that are reviewing are not familiar with temporary construction loadings, which causes delays that were not contemplated in the contract specifications. The question is “who is ultimately responsible”?

Response: The ultimate responsibility is the Department’s (Office of Construction, District Structures Design or State Structures Design); however, rarely do we disagree with the EOR’s recommendation and the EOR is the primary reviewer.
