

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 #: xx.25A**QUALITY ASSURANCE -- NON-CONFORMANCE RESOLUTION****Location:** Monnig Industries--Glasgow, Missouri**Report No:** NCS-000103**Prime Contractor:** American Bridge/Fluor Enterprises, a JV**Date:** 08-Oct-2008**Submitting Contractor:** Dyson Corp. & Subs**NCR #:** DYSN-0004**Type of problem:**

Welding	Concrete	Other	
Welding	Curing	Procedural	Bridge No: 34-0006
Joint fit-up	Coating	Other	Component:
Procedural	Procedural	Description:	

Date the Non-Conformance Report was written: 05-Sep-2008**Description of Non-Conformance:**

ABF procured ASTM A 354 BD anchor rod assemblies too late to allow normal release procedures. As a result, QA sampling and shipment occurred simultaneously, and A 354 Grade BD anchor rods and A 563 hex nuts for the E2 Shear Key were shipped to the jobsite without QA testing results or METS release. Time was constrained because these components were ordered on a schedule that led to completion of fabrication only several days before anticipated installation.

In addition, documentation was either missing or incomplete.

Contractor's proposal to correct the problem:

Contractor states that the Department is responsible for schedule difficulties, citing response times for ABF-RFI-1233. Contractor to provide documentation once it is complete.

Corrective action taken:

None taken for lateness; however, METS review of Department response times for ABF-RFI-1233 does not bear out ABF's assertions. ABF aggregate time lapse between completion of Department reviews and ABF follow-up revisions total almost 3 months, including a 63-day lapse between Department return of R01 (4/11/08) and ABF submission of R02 (6/13/08). During the June-July period, ABF submitted R02 through R05, with three one-day and one four-day deadlines; in aggregate, the Department was only one (1) day late during this period, compared to the 17 days of lapses between Department responses and follow-on ABF RFIs. ABF's version of events was refuted in discussions between METS, Construction, and ABF.

ABF provided complete COC packages for all material several weeks following delivery of the components to the job site.

Did corrective action require Engineer's approval?

QUALITY ASSURANCE -- NON-CONFORMANCE RESOLUTION

(Continued Page 2 of 2)

If so, name of Engineer providing approval:	Yes No	
	Brian Boal	Date:
Is Engineer's approval attached?	Yes No	

Comments:

This report is for the purpose of determining conformance with the contract documents and is not for the purpose of making repair or fit for purpose recommendations. Should you require recommendations concerning repairs or remedial efforts please contact Venkatesh Iyer, (858) 967-6363, who represents the Office of Structural Materials for your project.

Inspected By:	Petrina,Markian	Quality Assurance Inspector
Reviewed By:	Iyer,Venkatesh	QA Reviewer
