



CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION REPORT

Project: Cooley Lab

Date: November 29, 2011

Weather: Partly sunny, 44°

Present: Dan Hogan,

REPORT No. : 1

Job Progress:

1. Roof structural steel was in place.
2. The process of removing the topping slab was underway. Spoils were stockpiled and removal of the material was in progress. The weight of the stockpiles should be monitored and managed by the contractor in order to avoid overloading the existing structure. As identified in the General Notes, construction live load is to be limited to 20 psf. Considering that concrete rubble typically occupies a volume approximately equal to the in-place volume, areas where the stockpile depth exceeds twice the original topping thickness may result in an overload of the structure.
3. Removal of the CMU backing at the brick parapet was partially complete. The northwest corner was down to just brick and other areas varied in completeness of demolition.
4. GFRP reinforcing of the concrete was in place.
5. Concrete reinforcing was progressing at the east and west stairs. Work was complete to varying degrees. Some concrete had been cast, mostly on the east stair. Steel reinforcing mat was partially complete in both stairwells. Some areas appeared ready for formwork, while others were semi-complete. Some studs and form ties had been drilled in and grouted with adhesive. The concrete surfaces had been roughened.
6. Steel stud partition walls were mostly in place.
7. Sub-grade work was underway in the basement.
8. The excavation for the elevator pit appeared complete. Helical piers were in and the sides of the excavation had been "shot-creted". One portion of the Cooley foundation had been undermined and was supported by two helical piers with brackets. It appeared that the pier shafts were out-of-plumb. The pier mfr should be consulted to verify the as installed capacity considering the out-of-plumb condition and the unsupported length of the shafts. Grade was being shot for the elevator pit walls. Piers had been left "proud" of the bottom of the excavation to receive future walls.

Observations:

1. Structural steel placement, at the roof, appeared to be in conformance with the intent of the drawings. It appeared, however, that the rod bracing had not yet been fully tensioned.
2. Although spacing of the rebar within the mats varied, the number of bars in the areas viewed appeared to meet the intent of the drawings.

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel E. Hogan", is written over a horizontal line.

Daniel E. Hogan P.E.

Aegis Engineering Incorporated