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# CMB Meeting Minutes \#103 

DATE:
MEETING DATE:
LOCATION:
TIME:
ATTENDEES:

COPIES TO:

December 11, 2012
November 28, 2012

821 Howard St, Main Conference Room

3:00 PM
J Funghi (JF), A. Hoe (AH), R. Edwards (RE), Richard Redmond (RR, M. Benson (MB), E. Stassevitch (ES), S. Wilson (SW), M. Hembd (MH), M. Acosta (MA), K. Barnhart (KB), L. Zurinaga (LZ), B. Lebovitz (BL)

Attendees: S. Farhangi (SF), J. Park (JP), A. Wong (AW), R. Nguyen (RN), M. Latch (ML), B. Ward (BW), Q. Chin (QC), C. Campillo (CC), J. Wang (JW), C. Morganson (CM), A. Read (AR), M. Lee (ML), D. Kuehn (DK)

File No. M544.1.5.0890
Project No. M544.1, Contract No. 149 Task 1-8.02
Final Design
Configuration Management Board Meeting \# 103-Rev. No. 0

RECORD OF MEETING (Italicized text indicates status update of open items)

$\left.$| ITEM \# | DISCUssion | ACTION BY <br> DUE DATE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{3 -}$ | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of, COR 33 Ret Shaft - 20" Water <br> Line Conflict - Contract drawings depict 20" water line being installed further east to the <br> Muni (MRY) electrical duct bank instead of to the side as depicted on the contractor |  |
| drawings to be installed to the side. Due to the proximity of MRY duck bank the |  |  |
| Contractor must excavate and shore a larger hole in order to demolish the concrete |  |  |
| around the duct bank to allow for 18" for welding all around the pipe. Based on the |  |  |
| information presented the CMB found some merit for additional labor and material costs |  |  |
| but were unable to clearly establish what element of work constituted the change as |  |  |
| presented in the COR. RE will proceed with scoping the work to better define and |  |  |
| quantify the change. 11/21: COR revisited due to confusion from some members |  |  |
| resulting from last week's discussion. 11/28 Status: This item was not discussed at this |  |  |
| week's meeting. |  |  |$\quad \right\rvert\,$


| ITEM \# | DISCUSSION | ACTION BY DUE DATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | with the exception of Trend \#5. The RE reported that PG\&E contends Trend \#05 could possibly be a MTA engineering error due to the fact that their information was not properly depicted on the As-Built drawing submitted to the Contractor. CMB suggested the RE get PG\&E involved immediately in the proposal evaluation submitted by the Contractor if the work involved is at the request of the Utilities. This item will be brought back to the CMB once the RE has met with PG\&E and has agreed upon a negotiated cost for the work. |  |
| 2- | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of, COR 006 MOS - PG\&E live electrical delays - To complete the Launch box guide walls, PG\&E Vault \#2975 and utilities connected were required to be abandoned prior to excavation, the Contract documents indicated these utilities were abandoned. PG\&E Inspector found live electrical \& fiber optic lines during an inspection inside PG\&E vault \#2975. <br> De-energization of the PG\&E line and the SFDT cutover were not completed until a month and a half after discovery. The Contractor is claiming they experienced inefficiencies but haven't quantified what the inefficiencies were. The CMB agreed with partial merit for work associated with guide wall excavation and inefficiencies due to the live PG\&E utilities. The CMB recommended the Construction Manager/RE track this issue under CN1251 PG\&E Form B work. |  |
| 3- | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of, COR 013 - MOS - SL conduit from PG\&E vault @ north headwall - Permanent power was installed to an existing street light on $4^{\text {th }}$ Street. PG\&E de-energized vault \#1494 to accommodate 1252 construction and existing street light located at the NW sided of the north headwall at Moscone Station (dwg UD-402 Rev. 0 and UT-402 Rev 0) lost its power. After inspection from PG\&E vault \#1622 on Clementina it was discovered that it is not available as a permanent power source. SFMTA requested that the Contractor install conduit from PG\&E vault \#1493 to the street light for permanent power. The work was not show on the contract drawings. The CMB agreed with merit for work associated with installing conduit for permanent power, but the work has not yet been performed and other possibilities may exist. Suggestion that the COR be forwarded to the Design team for their review prior to making final determination of work to be performed. |  |
| 4- | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of, COR 015 - LB - Pre-Excavation for Slurry Walls - During construction of slurry wall west of the tunnel launch box Contractor uncovered an existing 8" vitrified clay pipe (VCP) sewer main encased in concrete extending 9'-11'below the top of guide wall or street surface. The contractor drawings show it as abandoned and to be removed, also incorrectly show it to be approximately 4'-5' below the street surface. The sewer line encased in concrete was a differing site condition. Additional costs were incurred to remove the concrete and additional slurry was required to fill the over-excavated wall. The CMB agreed with merit of a differing site condition for work associated with removal of the concrete encased sewer line. |  |
| 5- | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of the occurrence of wood pile within slurry diaphragm wall - COR 032 - (SW) Panel W29, COR 034 (SW) Panel W28, COR 042 - (SW) Panel W25, and COR 043 - (SW) Panel W30. The Contractor discovered wood piles within slurry wall panels at the TMB Launch Box, which caused the slurry walls to deviate from the designed excavation limits. The contract document does not show the presence of wood piles within the footprint of SW panels. To correct the issue the panels were backfilled with lean concrete and re-excavated. The Contractor is claiming the presence of the wood pile caused a four day (4) delay to the SW work. A TIA associated with these COR's has not been determined as yet. The CMB agreed with merit for work associated with the differing site condition for SW panels. |  |
| 6- | 1252 - Sarah Wilson presented Evaluation of Merit of COR 63-48 inch Pipe at UMS Headwall South - During excavation of UMS headwall south, the Contractor encountered a 48-inch pipe not shown on the contract drawing. The location of |  |

## central(T)subway

| ITEM \# | DISCUSSION | ACTION BY <br> DUE DATE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | the unforeseen pipe impacted construction of the head wall work. This <br> discovery constitutes a differing site conditions. The RE evaluated the <br> conditions outlined in spec sec. 3.O4 Unforeseen or Differing Conditions. The <br> CMB agreed with merit of the COR providing direction to the RE to issue a <br> change order directing the Contractor to investigate the pipe and provide <br> recommendation for removal or partial removal of the pipe. |  |

## ACTION ITEMS

| ITEM <br> $\#$ | MTG <br> DATE | MTG <br> ACTION <br> DATE | DESCRIPTION | BIC | DUE <br> DATE | STATUS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | $08 / 08 / 12$ | $08 / 29 / 12$ | $1252-$ FCC $1252-02$ UMS Headwalls | M. Benson | $10 / 10 / 12$ | Open |
| 1 | $11 / 07 / 12$ | $11 / 07 / 12$ | $1300-$ WP $1254-$ SF Planning Request | R. Edwards | $11 / 28 / 12$ | Open |
| 3 | $11 / 14 / 12$ | $11 / 14 / 12$ | $1252-$ COR $033-$ Retrieval Shaft $-20^{\prime \prime}$ Water <br> Line | S. Wilson | $11 / 21 / 12$ | Open |
| 1 | $11 / 28 / 12$ | $11 / 28 / 12$ | $251-$ Negotiated cost for additional work <br> Related to PG \&E Facilities Trends $\# 05,46,51$, <br> $55,61,63,66,69 \& 79$ | M. Acosta | $12 / 05 / 12$ | Open |

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm
These meeting minutes have been prepared by B. Ward and reviewed by, E. Stassevitch and are the preparer's interpretation of discussions that took place. If the reader's interpretation differs, please contact the author in writing within four (4) days of receipt of these minutes.

Signed:

[initials of preparer \& reviewer] Date: $\qquad$ [Date review completed]
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Project No. M544.1, Contract No. CS-149

# Meeting Agenda 

Program/Construction Management
Configuration Management Board (CMB) Meeting No. 103
November 28, 2012
3:00pm - 5:00pm
Central Subway Project Office
821 Howard St. $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Main Conference Room

Attendees:

| Mark Benson | Albert Hoe |  | Matt Lee |  | Beverly Ward |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ross Edwards |  | Jim Kelly |  | Roger Nguyen |  | Arthur Wong |
| Shahnam Farhangi |  | David Kuehn |  | Joon Park |  | Luis Zurinaga |
| John Funghi |  | Mark Latch |  | Richard Redmond |  |  |
| John Haley |  | Brad Lebovitz |  | Eric Stassevitch |  |  |

1. $\mathbf{1 2 5 0}$ - Nothing to Report
2. 1251 - Trends $5,46,51,55,61,63,66,69$ and 79
3. 1252 -

- COR 006-MOS - PG\&E live electrical delays - Merit
- COR 015 - LB - Preexcavation for Slurry Walls - Merit
- COR 017 - MOS - Standby Time @ south headwall due to live TS lines - Merit
- DSC XXX - 42 " Pipe at UMS Headwall South

4. 1253 (UMS) - Nothing to Report
5. 1254 (CTS) - Nothing to Report
6. $\mathbf{1 2 5 5}$ (MOS) - Nothing to Report
7. 1256 (STS) - Nothing to Report
8. Trend/Change Log - Review Current update
9. Other Business -
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## Donmecting peaple, Connecting communities.

# Meeting Attendance Sheet 

## Project No. M544.1, Contract No. 149

Program/Construction Management
Configuration Management Board Meeting No. 103
November 28, 2012
3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Central Subway Project Office
821 Howard, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Main Conference Room
Deliver Meeting Attendance Sheet with original signatures/initials to Document Control.

| NAME | AFFILIATION | PHONE | E-MAIL (for minutes) | INITIALS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please enter initials if your name is listed below. <br> Please enter name, affiliation, phone number and email address if your name is not listed below. |  |  |  |  |
| Benson, Mark | CSP | (415) 701-4295 | Mark.Benson@sfmta.com | MCB |
| Dombrowski, Charles | Hill/PCC | (415) 701-5272 | Charles.Dombrowski@sfmta.com |  |
| Edwards, Ross | CSP | (415) 701-5296 | Ross.Edwards@sfmta.com | y/j |
| Farhangi, Shahnam | SFMTA | (415) 554-0721 | Shahnam.Farhangi@sfmta.com |  |
| Funghi, John | SFMTA | (415) 701-4299 | John.Funghi@sfimta.com |  |
| Haley, John | SFMTA |  | John.Haley@sfmta.com |  |
| Hoe, Albert | SFMTA | (415) 701-4289 | Albert.Hoe@sfmta.com | 107 |
| Kelly, Jim | SFMTA |  | Jim.Kelly@sfmta.com |  |
| Kuehn, David | STVIPMOC | (510) 464-8053 | David.kuehn@stvinc.com |  |
| Latch, Mark | CSP | (415) 701-5294 | Mark.Latch@sfmta.com |  |
| Lebovitz, Brad | STVIPMOC | (510) 464-8052 | Bradley.lebovitz@stvinc.com |  |
| Lee, Matt | SFCTA | (415) 522-4813 | matt@sfcta.org |  |
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## Connecting people. Connecting communities.

## TREND NUMBERS 5, 46, 51, 55, 61, 63, 66, 69 AND 79

## SFMTA Contract No. 1251 <br> UNION SQUARE/MARKET STREET STATION UTILITIES RELOCATION

Contractor: Synergy Project Management Inc. 30 Grant Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94108

## SUPPLEMENTAL CHANGE ANALYSIS (FOR CMB APPROVAL)

## SCOPE OF WORK:

Trend 05: Additional work to work around and shift existing PG\&E conduits on Geary Blvd. at 2 locations (east and west of Stockton Street) during installation of AWSS.

Trend 46: Additional cost for enlarging PG\&E Vault No. 584 on O'Farrell east of Stockton.
Trend 51: Intercept existing PG\&E ductbank and terminate into Vault No. 5464 at Market/Ellis.
Trend 55: Install Swiveloc lids on 7EA PG\&E vaults.
Trend 61: Excavate for PG\&E service cut-over at 177 Stillman.
Trend 63: Excavation and restoration for PG\&E gas tie-in and kill holes (Part II).
Trend 66: Intercept PG\&E conduits at Vault No. 573 at Geary east of Stockton.
Trend 69: Removal of abandoned PG\&E gas valve (8EA) and installation of anodes.
Trend 79: Additional work related to the installation of PG\&E Vault Nos. 467, 571, 573, 586 and 594 (including joint trench leading to these vaults).

## REASON FOR CHANGE:

Trend 05: Contract Plans AW-501.1, 501.2, 501.4 and 501.5 show the existing AWSS to be replaced in place. However, existing PG\&E conduits were found to be on top of and parallel to the existing AWSS (whereas Contract Plans JT-308 and 309 showed the existing electrical and AWSS to be in separate trenches). See attached sketch.

Trend 46: The 2 existing PG\&E ductbanks that were supposed to be intercepted by vault 584 were further apart than shown on Contract Plans. It was therefore necessary to enlarge Vault No. 584 to capture the 2 ductbanks.

Trend 51: PG\&E requested that the Contractor reroute an existing ductbank running north out of Manhole 1803 at 4th/Pioneer Place into Manhole 5464 at Market/Ellis.

Trend 55: PG\&E requested that the SFMTA add these lids for safety reasons.
Trend 61: PG\&E requested that the Contractor excavate for service cut-over at 177 Stillman Street.
Trend 63: PG\&E originally intended to self-perform the excavation and restoration work at all gas tie-in/kill holes. However, due to a lack of available crews, PG\&E instructed that the Contractor to finish excavation and restoration work for the last remaining tie-in/kill holes.

Trend 66: During installation of intercept Vault No. 573, PG\&E had incorrectly identified the conduits to be intercepted. This error was discovered during cut-over process by PG\&E.

Trend 69: PG\&E instructed that the Contractor remove all abandoned gas valves (8EA)
Trend 79: Unforeseen conditions were encountered during installation of select PG\&E vaults including joint trenches leading to these vaults.

## COST SUMMARY TABLE:

| Trend <br> Number: | Description of Additional <br> Work Performed: | Contractor's <br> Cost Proposal | Forecasted <br> Cost: | Trended <br> Amount |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 05 | AWSS/PG\&E Conflict on <br> Geary Blvd. | $\$ 250,605.02$ | $\$ 136,416.15$ | $\$ 127,892.53$ |
| 46 | PG\&E Vault No. 584 <br> Enlargement | $\$ 115,660.47$ | $\$ 67,949.78$ | $\$ 60,053.76$ |
| 51 | Rerouting of Existing PG\&E <br> Ductbank at Vault No. 5464 | $\$ 33,531.01$ | $\$ 24,951.91$ | $\$ 15,000.00$ |
| 55 | Installation of Swiveloc Vault <br> Lids | $\$ 29,254.85$ | $\$ 29,254.85$ | $\$ 29,254.85$ |
| 61 | Excavation for Cut-Over at <br> 177 Stillman | $\$ 15,000.00$ | $\$ 7,672.67$ | $\$ 15,000.00$ |
| 63 | Excavation and Restoration <br> for Gas Kill/Tie-In Holes <br> (Part II) | $\$ 88,539.87$ | $\$ 59,522.73$ | $\$ 40,000.00$ |
| 66 | Intercept Conduits at Vault <br> No. 573 | $\$ 7,269.84$ | $\$ 6,948.72$ | $\$ 15,000.00$ |
| 69 | Removal of Abandoned Gas <br> Valves | $\$ 1,308.46$ | $\$ 1,048.14$ | $\$ 15,000.00$ |
| 79 | Unforeseen Conditions <br> Encountered During Vault <br> Installation | $\$ 120,872.36$ | $\$ 47,933.42$ | $\$ 50,000.00$ |
| TOTAL | $\$ 662,041.88$ | $\$ 381,698.37$ | $\$ 367,201.14$ |  |

## COST ANALYSIS:

Each of the FARs, CORs and/or invoices submitted by the Contractor was thoroughly reviewed by the SFMTA Resident Engineer. After this comprehensive review it was determined that the final compensation value of these items will be $\$ 381,698.37$ as shown in the Cost Summary Table.

Approval of the Contract Modification cost contained herein will allow the Resident Engineer to conduct final negotiations with the Contractor which in turn will facilitate the compilation and execution of a Contract Modification for the work contained herein.

## SCHEDULE ANALYSIS:

This work does not impact the Substantial Completion Date. There is no time adjustment associated with this Contract Modification.

## SUMMARY TABLE FOR TRENDS 5/46/51/55/61/63/66/69/79

Additional Costs Related to PG\&E Facilities
SFMTA Central Subway Contract Number 1251 - Union Square/Market Street Station Utilities Relocation

| Index \# | FA \# | Description | Synergy Requested Amount | SFMTA Current Approved Amount | Forecasted Final Amount | Outstanding Cost Differences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.1 | N/A | PG\&E electrical and AWSS conflict at Geary east and west of Stockton Street | \$250,605.02 | \$136,416.15 | \$136,416.15 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 05 Subtotal |  |  | \$250,605.02 | \$136,416.15 | \$136,416.15 |  |
| 2.1 | N/A | Lump sum cost for PG\&E Vault No. 584 enlargement | \$115,660.47 | \$67,949.78 | \$67,949.78 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 46 Subtotal |  |  | \$115,660.47 | \$67,949.78 | \$67,949.78 |  |
| 3.1 | 3167 | Clean PG\&E vault 7730 \& 5464 on Ellis not shown on contract documents. (Per Tom). | \$905.53 | \$889.50 | \$1,138.95 | \$249.45 |
| 3.2 | 3168 | Clean PG\&E vault 7730 \& 5464 on Ellis not shown on contract documents. (Per Tom). | \$692.60 | \$374.49 | \$623.94 | \$249.45 |
| 3.3 | 3358 | Dig for PGE intercept to PGE vault 5464 on Market/Ellis intersection. | \$6,352.40 | \$5,032.94 | \$5,132.94 | \$100.00 |
| 3.4 | 3362 | Dig for PGE Y-Cast for PGE vault 5464. | \$7,980.39 | \$3,984.08 | \$4,748.13 | \$764.05 |
| 3.5 | 3366 | PGE Y-Cast @ Market \& Stockton PGE vault 5464. | \$7,296.94 | \$3,508.46 | \$3,508.46 | \$0.00 |
| 3.6 | 3369 | Installation of conduits to PGE vault 5464 (located on Markey \& Stockton) + PEC FAR | \$5,806.35 | \$2,920.15 | \$6,321.13 | \$3,400.98 |
| 3.7 | 3379 | Backfill \& pour base on PGE tie-in to vault 5454. | \$4,496.80 | \$2,808.65 | \$3,478.36 | \$669.71 |
| Trend No. 51 Subtotal |  |  | \$33,531.01 | \$19,518.27 | \$24,951.91 |  |
| 4.1 | N/A | Lump sum cost for PG\&E Swiveloc installation | \$29,254.85 | \$29,254.85 | \$29,254.85 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 55 Subtotal |  |  | \$29,254.85 | \$29,254.85 | \$29,254.85 |  |
| 5.1 | 2589 | Excavate for PGE cutover at 4th/Stillman |  | \$4,002.11 | \$4,002.11 | \$0.00 |
| 5.2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4th/Stillman } \\ (1 / 2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Restoration | $\$ 15,000.00$ | \$2,393.66 | \$2,393.66 | \$0.00 |
| 5.3 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 4th/Stillman } \\ (2 / 2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Support for PGE cutover work (2 occassions at 2 hours each) |  | \$1,276.90 | \$1,276.90 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 61 Subtotal |  |  | \$15,000.00 | \$7,672.67 | \$7,672.67 |  |
| 6.1 | 3303 | Dig PG\&E gas connection on O'Farrell (east) | \$4,447.01 | \$3,691.06 | \$3,691.06 | \$0.00 |
| 6.2 | 3305 | Dig for PG\&E gas connection on O'Farrell east and west. | \$7,322.46 | \$5,280.22 | \$5,280.22 | \$0.00 |
| 6.3 | 3311 | Support for PG\&E gas crews on O'Farrell east and west. | \$7,388.19 | \$4,479.23 | \$4,479.23 | \$0.00 |
| 6.4 | 3338 | PG\&E gas tie-in holes at O'Farrell. Excavate holes on O'Farrell west and Stockton west north of O'Farrell | \$3,933.45 | \$2,376.11 | \$2,376.11 | \$0.00 |
| 6.5 | 3339 | PG\&E gas tie-in holes at Stockton at Forever 21 and Armani Exchange | \$7,771.37 | \$4,556.90 | \$4,556.90 | \$0.00 |
| 6.6 | 3343 rev1 | Excavate for PG\&E gas on Stockton south of O'Farrell. Support/dig tie-in connections. Work performed from 7AM - 5:30PM | \$8,584.56 | \$5,948.67 | \$5,948.67 | \$0.00 |
| 6.7 | 3344 | Excavate for PG\&E gas on O'Farrell west. Dig/support gas. | \$5,849.62 | \$3,602.95 | \$3,602.95 | \$0.00 |
| 6.8 | 3347 | Support and dig for PG\&E gas on O'Farrell west | \$4,858.10 | \$1,801.47 | \$1,801.47 | \$0.00 |
| 6.9 | 3348 rev1 | Support PG\&E gas on Stockton south of O'Farrell. Dig tie-in holes | \$8,458.88 | \$5,032.94 | \$5,032.94 | \$0.00 |
| 6.10 | 3356 rev1 | Gas tie in on O'Farrell West test line. | \$579.75 | \$514.22 | \$514.22 | \$0.00 |
| 6.11 | 3389 | O'Farrell East-Backfill of gas tie-in hole. Backfill of manhole not installed per SFMTA deeming it as an unsafe condition. | \$5,048.64 | \$3,530.45 | \$3,530.45 | \$0.00 |
| 6.12 | 3394 | Backfill \& base PGE tie in holes directed by Mike Acosta @ O'Farrell West. | \$2,602.90 | \$2,427.89 | \$2,427.89 | \$0.00 |
| 6.13 | 3419 | Dig PGE gas tie in holes on O'Farrell East and West. | \$5,095.87 | \$4,431.10 | \$4,431.10 | \$0.00 |
| 6.14 | 3420 | Support PGE gas tie in on O'Farrell \& Stockton. Crew size directed by Dave V. of PGE. | \$6,645.95 | \$4,809.16 | \$4,809.16 | \$0.00 |
| 6.15 | 3422 | Redig PGE gas tie ins on O'Farrell. Saw cut both East and West tie-ins. | \$1,030.33 | \$912.10 | \$912.10 | \$0.00 |
| 6.16 | 3428 | Backfill and street base PGE gas tie connections on O'Farrell \& Stockton (South of O'Farrell). East \& West side of O'Farrell. | \$7,473.99 | \$4,772.95 | \$4,772.95 | \$0.00 |
| 6.17 | 3492 | Backfill and base PG\&E kill holes on Stockton | \$1,448.80 | \$1,355.31 | \$1,355.31 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 63 Subtotal |  |  | \$88,539.87 | \$59,522.73 | \$59,522.73 |  |
| 7.1 | 3351 | Locate PGE electrical line for vault 573 on Geary East. | \$1,277.70 | \$927.78 | \$927.78 | \$0.00 |
| 7.2 | 3355 | Core drill a 6 " hole in PGE vault 573 . Remove plates and replace. | \$814.89 | \$744.47 | \$1,367.72 | \$623.25 |
| 7.3 | 3373 | PGE conduit tie-in to 573. Missed conduits. | \$995.29 | \$849.62 | \$849.62 | \$0.00 |
| 7.4 | 3392 | PGE cault 573 preparation for conduit installation. Chipping of vault wall on Geary. | \$1,630.00 | \$1,332.90 | \$1,332.90 | \$0.00 |
| 7.5 | 3468 | Backfill missed conduits into PGE vault 573. | \$699.68 | \$656.59 | \$656.59 | \$0.00 |
| 7.6 | 3469b | Concrete base \& repair parking strip on Geary East for PGE vault 573 lines added. | \$1,852.28 | \$1,814.11 | \$1,814.11 | \$0.00 |
| Trend No. 66 Subtotal |  |  | \$7,269.84 | \$6,325.47 | \$6,948.72 |  |
| 8.1 | 3489 | Demo PG\&E gas valves on Stockton and Ellis. Also patch back valves. | \$1,308.46 | \$1,006.26 | \$1,048.14 | \$41.88 |
| Trend No. 69 Subtotal |  |  | \$1,308.46 | \$1,006.26 | \$1,048.14 |  |
| 9.1 | 2094 | Excavation of PG\&E vault 573 was reduced due to 8" water line not shown on plans. | \$3,136.55 | \$931.11 | \$1,158.77 | \$227.66 |
| 9.2 | 2096 | Loss of production on excavation PG\&E vault 573 due to water line not depicted in vault location. | \$5,653.60 | \$1,294.69 | \$1,294.69 | \$0.00 |
| 9.3 | 2098 | Loss of production on excavation PG\&E vault 573 due to water line not depicted in vault location. | \$5,532.85 | \$1,226.48 | \$1,226.48 | \$0.00 |
| 9.4 | 2099 | Loss of production on excavation PG\&E vault 586 due to old water pipes not depicted in vault location. | \$6,402.61 | \$1,294.69 | \$1,294.69 | \$0.00 |
| 9.5 | 2102 | Lose of production on excavation PGE vault 573 due to water line not depicted in vault location. | \$2,261.96 | \$953.27 | \$953.27 | \$0.00 |
| 9.6 | 2169 | Demolition of concrete not shown on contract drawings at PGE vault 594 on Ellis Street | \$339.55 | \$339.55 | \$339.55 | \$0.00 |
| 9.7 | 2170 | Cutting beams that are not shown on contract drawings at PGE vault 594 on Ellis Street | \$1,785.42 | \$1,670.53 | \$1,670.53 | \$0.00 |


| Index \# | FA\# |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Description } \\ \text { Synergy Requested } \\ \text { Amount }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { SFMTA Current } \\ \text { Approved Amount }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Forecasted Final } \\ \text { Amount }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Outstanding Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Differences |  |  |  |  |  |$\}$




## central (1) subway

## 

SFMTA Contract No. 1252
Contractor: Barnard Impregilo Healy JV (BIH)

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## COR 006

Recommendation: Partial acceplance of Merit for COR 006. Merit shall only include additional costs for guide wall excavation and forming inefficiencies due to the presence of live PG\&E utilities. Merit shall not be granted for costs associated with sewer work, which is part of the contract. The Contractor did not submit a request for time extension for this work.

Facts: In order for the completion of the Launch box guide walls to take place PG\&E Vault \#2975 and the utilities connected to It were required to be abandoned prior to excavation. The contract documents indicated that these utilities were abandoned; however SFMTA was informed on April 5, 2012 that PG\&E Inspector Tom Reimer found live electrical and fiber optic lines when performing an inspection inside PGE Vault \#2975. The de-energization of PG\&E line and the SFDT cutover were not completed until May $23^{\text {rd }}$.

As a result of the PG\&E utilities not being abandoned BIH subcontractor Condon Johnson - Nicholson Construction Company (CJA-NCC) state that they experienced inefficiencies beginning on May $17^{\text {th }}$ and ending on May $24^{\text {th }}, 2012$.

In addition BIH claims that CJA-NCC incurred additional costs as they performed work required to shutoff an active sewer line shown to be abandoned on the contract drawings. However, BIH later acknowledged the fact that this was contract work as was documented in an email sent to SFMTA on November 11 $1^{\text {th }}, 2012$.

Rationale for COR: CJA-NCC planned their work based on the understanding that the PG\&E utilities would be abandoned prior to guide wall construction and thus additional costs were incurred due to the discovery of live utilities.

Justification: CJA-NCC experienced inefficiencies due to the presence of live utilities which were shown to be abandoned within the Launch box construction area. The extent and duration of the inefficiencies requires further evaluation.

By:



## central 1 subway


SFIVTA Contract No. 1262
Contractor: Barnard Impregilo Healy $J V(\mathrm{BIH})$

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## COR 013

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 013, for installing conduit for permanent power to an existing street light on Fourth Street near the north headwall at Moscone Station. The Contractor did not submit a request for time extension for this work.

Facts: When PG\&E de-energized Vault \#1494 to accommodate 1252 construction, an existing street light located on Fourth Street at the north-west side of the north headwall at Moscone Station (shown on Dig. No's. UD-402 Rev. 0 and UT-402 Rev.0), lost power. PG\&E inspected Vault \#1622 on Clementina St. and discovered that it is not available as a power source. A connection must be made to Vault \#1493 for permanent street light power.

Rationale for COR: SFMTA requested that BIH install conduit to connect the street light to permanent power. The work was not shown in the 1252 contract documents.

Justification: SFMTA requested that BIH install conduit to connect the street light to permanent power through PG\&E Vault \#1493. Approximately 20' of $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ diameter GRS conduit was required to be installed from PG\&E Vault \#1493 to the street light. Work required to provide permanent power to the existing street light was not shown in the Contract 1252 documents.

By:


Configuration Management Board Approval

11.28 .2

Date




O CONDUIT NOTES:

| CONDUIT | conduit \# AND SIZE | material | UTILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $6-4^{*}, 4-2^{*}$ | HDPE, GRS | MRY |
| 2 | 4-4", $2-2^{\text {" }}$ | HDPE, GRS | MRY |
| 3 | 1-2 ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | GRS | MRY |
| 4 | $2-2^{\circ}$ | GRS | MRY |
| 5 | $4-2^{\text {n }}$ | HDPE | DPT |
| 6 | 1-1 ${ }^{1 / 2}$ | GRS | SFPUC SL |
| 7 | 4-6" | PVG | PG\&E |
| 8 | $3-5^{\prime \prime}$ | PVC | PG\&E |
| 9 | 2-4 $4^{n}$ | PVC | PGqE |
| 10 | 6-6" | PVC | PGGE |
| 11 | $2-6^{* \prime}$ | PVC | PG8E |
| 12 | 2-3" | PVC | PG\%E |
| 13 | $1-6^{n}$ | PE | PG\&E GAS |
| 14 | $1-2^{\text {b }}$ | PE | PG\&E GAS |
| 15 | $12-4^{\prime \prime}$ | PVC | AIET |
| 16 | $24-4^{\prime \prime}$ | PVC | AT\&T |
| 17 | $1-2^{n}$ | GRS | SFDT |
| 18 | 4-4 ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | PVC | AT\&T |
| 19 | 3-4" | PVC | ATET |
| 20 | 2-4" | PVC̄ | ATET |
| 21 | 1-4" | PVC | AT\&T |
| 22 | 1-3* | PVG | ATET |
| 23 | 2-1 $1 / 2$, QUADL.OCK | PVC | ASB |
| 24 | $1-2^{\prime \prime}, 1-4^{*}$ | PVC | ASB |
| 25 | $2-2{ }^{\text {" }}$ | PVC | COMCAST |
| 26 | $1-4^{n}$ | HDPE | SFDT |
| 27 | 2-1 \%゙, QUAOLOCK | PVG | TPC |
| 28 | $8-4{ }^{\text {n }}$ | PVC | AT\&T |
| 29 | $4-5^{*}$ | PVC | PGXE |
| 30 | 8-4" | PVC | P6\&E |
| 31 | 1-3* | PVC | P6\&E |
| 32 | $1-2^{\text { }}$ | HDPE | DPT |

## $\rangle$ SHEET NOTES:

 owner.
2. STuB conours into exsting pulbox Nault. coorodnate work wit pulbox/valt owne
3. HANAN EXSINTG SERMCE OR PROVDE NIERM SERMCE UMIL NEY SERMCE IS CUT-OVER.

5. STUB NEW GAS UNE TO YTHIN 2 FEE OF DISTING GAS UNE. CONNECTON TO EXISTNG GAS UNES by

PGEE. COORDINATE SCHEDULEE FOR WORK WIH PG\&E.
6. Cap ExITNNG Gas live (gy paia).

SEE TP DRAWNGS FOR MUNI CABBE NSTALATION.
8. $\operatorname{INERCEPP}$ AND COUPLE NEV CONOUT TO EXSTING RISER CONOUT. COOROINAIE SCHEOULE FOR WORK
9. STUE AND CAP CONDUTS FOR FTUURE EXTENION.
10. CONNECT EXSTNG CONOUTI NTO NEW MMNHOLE.
for orignal sigmaures, ser cl-17502, rev. 0


## central (T )subway

## Comneatimg peoria Donmeating commominas:

Contractor: $\quad$ Barnard Impregilo Mealy $J V(\mathrm{~B} \mid \mathrm{H})$

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## $\operatorname{COR} 015$

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 015, for pre-excavation to remove concrete encased sewer line at the west slurry wall of the tunnel launch box. Time impact associated with this COR has not yet been determined.

Facts: During construction of the slurry wall for the west wall of the tunnel launch box, BIH subcontractor, Cordon Johnson - Nicholson Construction Company Joint Venture (CJA-NCC), uncovered an existing $8^{\prime \prime}$ vitrified clay pipe (VCP) sewer main encased in concrete. The concrete encasement was found by the Contractor to extend to a depth of $9^{\prime}-11^{\prime}$ below the top of guide wall or street surface. The $8^{\prime \prime}$ VCP sewer main and concrete encasement was incorrectly shown in the contract drawings to be approximately 4 '-5' below the street surface.

BIH notified SFMTA of the impacts to the slurry wall production due to obstructions in Letter Nos. 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029 and 30 beginning on June $26^{\text {th }}, 2012$ through July $20^{\text {1/, }}, 2012$. SFMTA met with the Contractor on July $12^{\text {th }}, 2012$ to investigate the issue. SFMTA, BIH and CJA-NCC then met on August $6^{\text {lh }}, 2012$ and agreed to a plan to pre-excavate in order to remove the concrete encased sewer line, in advance of the slurry wall construction. Due to the depth of the concrete encasement the excavation could not take place during guide wall construction.

Rationale for COR: The sewer line encased in concrete was a differing site condition. Additional costs were incurred to remove the concrete and place additional slurry (bentonite and water) to fill the resulting over-excavated wall width due to the concrete encasement removal.

Justification: The contract documents show that the concrete encased sewer pipe was at a depth shallower than was found at the Site. For the condition shown in the contract documents, the VCP sewer line could have been broken and removed along with the soil excavation during the Contractor's guide wall construction. Additional equipment and labor were required to remove the concrete and to fill the resulting over-excavated wall width with additional slurry. The work was required to be completed before the Contractor's slurry wall production could continue.


Sarah Wilson
Resident Engineer

Configuration Management Board Approval


Date


## NOTES:

demolsh and remove all abanooned utily facilites, ncluding previously
ABANDONED FACLITES NOT SHOWN ON PLANS, WTHIN LLMTS OF LAUNCH BOX STRUCTURE
AND TO THE LIMTS NNDCAEED, UNLLESS OTHERWIS NOTED.
ACTVE UTLITIES Shall be Malianed until relocation or cut over, unless otherwise
NOTED. COORDNATE DEMOUTION WTH LAUNCH BOX CONSTRUCTION PHASING.
3. PROTECT (E) SEwER.
4. SEE (WD) DrAWNGS For abandonement and remuval of water faciuties.
5. See (aw) drawncs for abanoonment and removal of awss facillites.
6. Protect (E) atex FAclitiles.
7. Protect (E) mont tencl
8. CAP or plug all abandoned facilites, including prevously abanooned faclintes no Shown on plans, at Jet grout or slurry wall limt.

(E) STREET LGGHT POLE. TEMPORARILY REMOVE POLE IF NECESSARY FOR LaUNCH box

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ISsule for bo | 0 |  |  |  |
| $\square$ mic |  | \% | 8 |  |  |


| PB telamon |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 込 |
| $c^{E}$ | ENGINEERRG CONSUTITATS IN | cick R. EDWROS R.ken |


| $(620.2011)$ |  | MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| THIRD STREET LIGHT RAIL PROGRAM PHASE 2 - CENTRAL SUBWAY TUNNELS | 1252 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CL-18032 |  |
| UTLITY DEMOLITION | UD-502 |  |
| FOURTH STREET PORTAL | 85 | 0 |





## central (T )subway

Contractor:
Barnard Impreģilo Healy JV (BIH)

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## COR 032

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 032. Occurrence of a wood pile within slurry diaphragm wall (SW) panel W29 constitutes a differing site corıdition. The time impact associated with this COR has not yet been determined.

Facts: On August $30^{\text {(1) }} 2012$, Bl's subcontractor, Condo Johnson/Nicholson JV (CJANCC), encountered a wood pile within panel W29 at the TBM Launch Box. The wood pile caused the SW to deviate from the designed excavation limits. In order to correct the verticality of the panel excavation, the panel was backfilled with lean concrete and reexcavated. BIH/CJA-NCC is claiming the presence of the wood pile caused 4 working days delay to the SW work.

Rationale for COR: The contract does not indicate the presence of wood piles within the footprint of slurry wall diaphragm wall panel W29. The wood pile has prevented slurry diaphragm wall construction from occurring as originally planned.

Justification: RE has evaluated the conditions outlined in Article 3.04 and found that: conditions differ materially and conditions will cause scope of work to increase.

RE notes that the Differing Site Condition does not include:

1. All that is indicated in or may reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;
2. All that could be seen on Site by diligent observation;
3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.
4. Conditions where the location of a building component is in the proximity where, indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents

By:


Sarah Wilson $\frac{11 / 2 r / 12}{\text { Date }}$ Resident Engineer

Configuration Management Board Approval
$11-28-12$
Date

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## COR 034

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 034. Occurrence of a wood pile within slurry diaphragm wall (SW) panel W28 constitutes a differing site condition. The time impact associated with this COR has not yet been determined.

Facts: On September $10^{\text {th }} 2012$, BlU's subcontractor, Condor Johnson/Nicholson JV (CJA-NCC), encountered a wood pile within panel W28 at the TBM Launch Box. The wood pile caused the SW to deviate from the designed excavation limits. In order to correct the verticality of the panel excavation, the panel was backfilled with lean concrete and re-excavated. BIH/CJA-NCC is claiming the presence of the wood pile caused 4 working days delay to the SW work.

Rationale for COR: The contract does not indicate the presence of wood piles within the footprint of slurry wall diaphragm wall panel $W 28$. The wood pile has prevented slurry diaphragm wall construction from occurring as originally planned.

Justification: RE has evaluated the conditions outlined in Article 3.04 and found that: conditions differ materially and conditions will cause scope of work to increase.

RE notes that the Differing Site Condition does not include:

1. All that is indicated in or may reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;
2. All that could be seen on Site by diligent observation;
3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.
4. Conditions where the location of a building component is in the proximity where indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents

By:


Sarah Wilson
Resident Engineer

Configuration Management Board $\frac{11-28-12}{\text { Date }}$ Approval

## central (T )subway

## Connection people Connecting cammentionas.

SFMTA Contract No. 1252
Contractor: $\quad$ Barnard Impregilo Mealy JV (BIH)

## EVALUATION OF MERIT T

## COR 042

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 042, Occurrence of a wood pile within slurry diaphragm wall (SW) panel W25 constitutes a differing site condition. The time impact associated with this COR has not yet been determined.

Facts: On August $15^{1 \mathrm{li}} 2012$, BIH's subcontractor, Condor Johnson/Nicholson JV (CJANCC), encountered a wood pile within panel W25 at the TBM Launch Box. The wood pile caused the SW to deviate from the designed excavation limits. In order to correct the verticality of the panel excavation, the panel was backfilled with lean concrete and reexcavated. BIH/CJA-NCC is claiming the presence of the wood pile caused 4 working days delay to the SW work.

Rationale for COR: The contract does not indicate the presence of wood piles within the footprint of slurry wall diaphragm wall panel W 25 . The wood pile has prevented slurry diaphragm wall construction from occurring as originally planned.

Justification: RE has evaluated the conditions outlined in Article 3.04 and found that: conditions differ materially and conditions will cause scope of work to increase.

RE notes that the Differing Site Condition does not include:

1. All that is indicated in or may reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;
2. All that could be seen on Site by diligent observation;
3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.
4. Conditions where the location of a building component is in the proximity where indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents

By:


Sayali Wilson Residen-Engineer

Configuration Management Board $11 \cdot 28-12$

Date Approval

## central ${ }^{\text {T }}$ subway

## Connecting people: Connectine communities:

## EVALUATION OF MERIT

## COR 043

Recommendation: Accept justification of Merit for COR 043. Occurrence of a wood pile within slurry diaphragm wall (SW) panel W30 constitutes a differing site condition. The time impact associated with this COR has not yet been determined.

Facts: On August 21 ${ }^{\text {El }}$ 2012, BIH's subcontractor, Condon Johnson/Nicholson JV (CJANCC), encountered a wood pile within panel W30 at the TBM Launch Box. The wood pile caused the SW to deviate from the designed excavation limits. It was determined the most efficient course of action was to proceed with excavating rather than backfilling the panel with lean concrete and re-excavating. BIH/CJA-NCC is claiming the presence of the wood pile caused 4 working days delay to the SW work.

Rationale for COR: The contract does not indicate the presence of wood piles within the footprint of slurry wall diaphragm wall panel W 28 . The wood pile has prevented slurry diaphragm wall construction from occurring as originally planned.

Justification: RE has evaluated the conditions outlined in Article 3.04 and found that: conditions differ materially and conditions will cause scope of work to increase.

RE notes that the Differing Site Condition does not include:

1. All that is indicated in or may reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;
2. All that could be seen on Site by diligent observation;
3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.
4. Conditions where the location of a building component is in the proximity where indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract. Documents or Reference Documents

By:


Confgulation Management Board $11-28-12$ Date Approval

## central(T)subway

Comeotine people Combaring sommunifies.
SFMTA Contract No. 1252
Contractor: Barnard Impregilo Healy JV

## EVALUATION of MERIT

## COR 063

Recommendation: Occurrence of 48 inch pipe at the UMS head wall constitutes a differing site condition. Issue Change Order directing Contractor to investigate 48 inch pipe and provide recommendation for removal or partial removal to allow contract work to be constructed In conformance with contract documents.

Facts: During excavation UMS headwall south, the Contractor encounter a 48 inch pipe not shown on the contract drawing. The location of the unforeseen pipe impacts the construction of the headwall in conformance with the Contract Drawing. Indications are that the same pipe was also encountered at the UMS headwall north while attempting to install instrumentation.

Justification: RE has evaluated the conditions outlined in Article 3.04 and found that: the Material could be hazardous waste; conditions differ materially; and conditions will cause scope of work to increase or decrease.

RE notes that the Differing Site Condition does not include:

1. All that is indicated in or may reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents;
2. All that could be seen on Site by diligent observation;
3. Conditions that are materially similar or characteristically the same as those indicated or described in the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.
4. Conditions where the location of a building component is in the proximity where indicated in or reasonably interpreted from the Contract Documents or Reference Documents.

B3:


Configuration Management Board Approval

Date
$11-28-12$
Date


