

30100



00011126

RMRS MEMO

DATE: January 17, 1997

TO: C. L. Guthrie, Project Management, Building T130F, X7419

FROM: D. L. Hoyt, Engineering, Building 130, X6742

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE KAISER-HILL MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT OF THE NEW
SANITARY LANDFILL - DLH-003-97

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to transmit to you a response to the assessment referenced above. The response has been prepared as requested by Paul Bengel on January 13, 1997.

DISCUSSION

The attached response has been prepared for your transmittal to Gary Coles.

RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

Please call me with any questions.

DLH

Attachment:
As stated.

cc:

- W. J. McAndrew
- D. R. Mittlestadt
- R. L. Ryken
- A. R. Smith
- DLH files

ADMIN RECCRD

IA-A-000548

Y 5

January 17, 1997

Gary W. Coles
Kaiser-Hill

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE KAISER-HILL MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT OF THE NEW
SANITARY LANDFILL

PURPOSE

The purpose of this letter is to provide a formal response to the assessment referenced above. RMRS has been made aware of the management assessment conducted in October 1996 although this assessment was never transmitted to RMRS by Kaiser-Hill. Nevertheless, the RMRS landfill team has reviewed and conclusions of the assessment, and initiated corrective actions where necessary.

DISCUSSION

The following responses addresses each area of concern listed in the cover letter:

- 1) Concern: "The Engineering Change Request (ECR) log does not reflect status or disposition the ECR's."

Response: The purpose of the ECR log is to list the ECR's prepared, summarize the subject, and document the issue date. This log serves its purpose for the landfill project, and there is no ECR status or disposition to track. Dorthea Hoyt, the RMRS Project Engineer, contacted Tom Danielson in December 1996 and asked for a clarification of his concern. Tom Danielson informed her that this statement was intended to be made in reference to the Nonconformance Report (NCR) Log, and the reference to the Engineering Change Request Log was an error.

A current NCR log is attached to this response. The NCR log reflects the status and the disposition of each NCR.

- 2) Concern: "The Contract Technical Representative (CTR) has been assigned to another project and is not familiar with the technical problems of the project."

Response: RMRS acknowledges this problem. The CTR for the Park Construction Subcontract will be changed to the Project Manager, Don Mittlestadt, who is thoroughly familiar with all issues on the New Sanitary Landfill project.

- 3) Concern: "Told that some items were not being documented for unspecified reasons".

Response: It is difficult to respond to this concern without knowing what items were not being documented. The RMRS project team is fully aware of the importance of proper documentation. An extensive effort is made to ensure that all information that is pertinent to the contract between RMRS and Park is documented either through correspondence from the RMRS Subcontract Administrator to Park, through Requests for Information (RFI's), transmitted on Engineering Change Requests (ECR's) and Construction Field Changes (CFC's), or documented on Nonconformance Reports (NCR's).

The following responses address each topic in the assessment:

Project Records Management.

1) Comment: "Couldn't find files for H1, H2, H5, H10".

Response: Due to the extensive number of files and documents on this project, the project team has divided responsibility for maintaining different records. The location of the files listed in the response to Comment 2 below.

2) Comment: "Construction Coordinator did not know where all "H" files are located. Coordinator not keeping files current".

Response: As stated above, the "H" files for the New Sanitary Landfill are extensive, and are being maintained jointly by the project team. The location of all the H files is provided below:

- **H1, Weekly Inspection Reports/Daily Log.** These files are maintained by the Project Manager, Don Mittlestadt in Building T130F. In actuality, Park submits a Daily Quality Control (QC) Report which documents their daily construction progress, daily test results and inspections, project delays, and health and safety issues. These Daily QC Reports also included a separate, detailed "Field Monitoring Summary" prepared by their landfill QC specialist, Golder Construction Services.

In addition to the Park Daily QC reports, Dorthea Hoyt, the Project Engineer, maintains a complete file of Daily Quality Assurance (QA) Reports in Building 130. These reports are prepared by Merrick and Woodward-Clyde.

- **H2, Nonconformance Reports.** These files are currently maintained by the Project Engineer, in Building 130.
- **H3, Maintenance Change Order Log.** There are no Maintenance Change Orders on the project.
- **H4, Construction Change Orders.** The Construction Field Changes (CFC's) and Subcontract Modifications are maintained by the Subcontractor Administrator, Roger Ryken, in Building T130F.
- **H5, Test Reports/Inspection Checklists.** These files are attached to Park's Daily QC Reports and therefore maintained by the Project Manager in Building T130F.
- **H6, Beneficial Occupancy, Final Acceptance.** Beneficial Occupancy and Final Acceptance files do not exist at this time, since the project is currently in the final construction phases (completion of punch list items). When complete, these files will be maintained by the Project Manager and/or the Construction Manager.
- **H7, Construction Submittals.** These files are maintained by the Project Engineer. These is a set in Building 130 and in Building T130F.
- **H8, Payroll Records/Pay Estimates.** Certified Payroll documentation is submitted by Park directly to Ron Slaughter of Kaiser-Hill Relations in Building 116. Pay requests (invoices) are maintained by the Subcontractor Administrator in Building T130F.
- **H9, Contractor Evaluation.** These records do not yet exist. The evaluation of Park Construction will be completed at the end of the project. These files will be

maintained by the Project Manager and/or the Subcontractor Administrator.

- **H10, Project Acceptance and Transfer (PA&T).** As with the H6 files, there is no documentation of PA&T at this time since the project is currently in the final construction phases (completion of punch list items). When complete, these files will be maintained by the Project Manager and/or the Construction Manager.

3) Comment: "Files not being kept in central location. Files not kept up-to-date. Daily Construction Status reports not being kept up-to-date".

Response: As stated before, the files for the New Sanitary Landfill are not kept in one central location due to the large volume of documentation on this project. There is simply not sufficient room in any one location for all of the project files (files A - H). For that reason, the files are maintained by the team member who oversees the applicable task.

The files in each of the locations listed above are current and up-to-date.

Construction Management has reviewed their records, and is now maintaining an up-to-date file of Daily Construction Status reports.

Nonconforming Conditions.

4) Comment: "Observed approximately 17 NCR's that are open and over one (1) year old. Need to resolve these and others that are open. Total of 59."

Response: RMRS continues to work with Park to resolve the outstanding NCR's. Over 68% of the NCR's on this project are closed. An updated NCR log is attached for information. All NCR's will be resolved prior to Project Acceptance and Transfer.

Work Assignment Conformance (Davis Bacon Act Coverage).

5) Comment: "Met with Ron Slaughter who audits the Sub-Contractor for RMRS. He seems to be doing a notable job in his interface with the Contractors and his file keeping".

Response: Noted.

Submittal Management.

6) Comment: "Submittal log is being maintained by Sub-Contractor (Park) and not by Construction Management (COEM 408 3.1 and 3.2). Submittal log indicates Sub. closed but can't be found in RMRS file. Status of some submittals is in error. Some submittals are open for over one (1) year".

Response: The submittal log has been maintained by Park Construction throughout this project. While this may not be a typical practice, RMRS is not aware of any procedure conflict this arrangement, and this system has worked relatively well. Since this project is near completion, it does not make sense to change responsibility for the submittal log at this time.

The submittal files in Building 130 and in Building T130F are periodically checked against the submittal log to identify and recover missing submittals. Submittals are used regularly to verify construction, in the development of ECR's, in the development of responses to RFI's, and in the preparation of the acceptance testing procedures.

The status of the submittals will be compared to the submittal log and any discrepancies will be resolved with Park.

The use of the term "open" is misleading and it usually used by Park on submittals that have been returned to them, "Not Reviewed" because they were incomplete. Whenever there is a start and finish dated in the final two columns of the submittal log, it demonstrates that a submittal was provided to RMRS and was returned either as approved or with another action for Park (approved as noted, not approved, revise and resubmit, or not reviewed).

7) Comment: "Could not explain log or answer questions about outstanding submittals".

Response: It is not clear who was interviewed in regard to this question. The Project Engineer would be able to provide more detailed information on submittals, however she was not interviewed in this assessment.

Component check-Out and Systems Operations Testing.

8) Comment: "Documents for C.C. is being kept by QA/QC Sub-Contractor".

Response: As stated before, documentation of testing is submitted by Park on their Daily QC Reports. These reports are maintained by the Project Manager. The Quality Assurance Subcontractor for this project, Merrick and Woodward-Clyde, also maintain these documents and will use them in the development of final Quality Assurance reports for the project. The same testing documentation will be used to document completion of component checkout for the project.

9) Comment: "Al Smith noted that SO procedures have not been delivered by engineering contractor".

Response: Draft SO test procedures were submitted in Title II (June 1994), and again in September 1996. These test procedures are being finalized, and are being enhanced to add component checkout testing required by the contract.

10) Comment: "Don said that some SO Procedures have been delivered by not reviewed".

Response: Refer to the response to Comment 9 above.

Close-Out.

No comments.

5/5