

OBSERVATION REPORT

TO:	Jay Hibbard	DATE: 11/9/2017 TIME: 1:00 PM
FIRM:	Monaghan	JOB NO. 16-0117
	100 Commercial St.	PROJECT: Danforth St. 2-Unit
	Portland, ME	LOCATION: Portland, ME
FROM:	Ben Heidebrink	WEATHER: clear TEMP: 50

SI performed an inspection of the wood framing, and observed that a majority of the wood framing had been completed. The completed work generally appeared to be in conformance with the design. Items in need of completion, or alternative methods for construction of miscellaneous items, were discussed on site and are listed as follows:

- At first floor framing, it was noted at grid location H-8, that solid blocking was needed within the floor framing level, between posts above and below. This is typical for similar conditions. Posts above and below should have solid bearing within the framing level, of equal or greater size than the posts specified.
- At first floor framing, full-height blocking was specified above the bearing wall between grid lines D and E, between the LVLs transferring the offset bearing wall load from above, but was not in place. As discussed on site, this may be achieved with (2) 2x10s ripped and stacked to match full height. Fasten to top and bottom of joists, to top of wall plate, and at joint between stacked pieces, w/ minimum (2) 10d toe nails at each location.
- Below second floor framing, a window along line H was observed to have less than the specified number of king studs. It was discussed in the field, that an additional 2x4 king could be added at each side of this opening. This is an acceptable method of correction at other openings where a similar condition may exist.
- Below second floor framing at the exterior wall of the stairs, along line A, the specified posts below a stair header were not in place. This header also did not bear on the post or have a hanger, but was fastened to a single stud. A more solid attachment of blocking and RSS screws with an LS90 clip at the inside corner of the header, was discussed at this location. Similar conditions of incorrect numbers of studs in posts were observed in other areas. Posts should be verified to have the number of studs specified throughout, and have solid bearing of equal size or greater to the foundation wall.
- In general, the stair framing appeared to be in need of completion. Many headers were not connected to walls with hangers, but were supported by adjacent members fastened to wall framing, with the headers screwed into the ends of these. Headers may be supported by these adjacent members, but must be connected with an LS90 clip at a minimum. These adjacent members supporting the headers should be fastened directly to wall framing (2 studs minimum) with (5) RSS screws total (3 in end of header, and at least 2 into face of adjacent member). As discussed in the field, either the specified stud packs, or LVL blocking that directly bears within wall framing, may be used in these locations to achieve the minimum fastening described.
- Some hangers had not yet been installed, particularly at stairs. LSSU hangers or optional LS90 clips were specified at stringers. Per site discussions, a twist strap (Simpson TS12 or equal) may be used as an alternative at each stringer. Installation of all remaining hangers at stairs, landings and other areas should be completed.
- Web stiffeners/packing were specified at all joist bearing over exterior walls and were not in place. As discussed on site, 2x vertical blocking fastened to the joist web is acceptable.
- Structural plans called for gussets at mid-height of all outermost studs between the inner and outer exterior walls. As discussed on site, a 2x fastened to mid-height of each outermost stud can be fastened to the 2x blocking already in place at mid-height of the 2x4 inner wall. Fasten with at least (3) 10d into each in-place stud/block at new 2x gussets (6 10d per gusset).
- Wall top plates at the roof framing level step in various locations. Where the top plates are not lapped, an 18 gauge coil strap (+/- 18" long) should be installed on the face of the plates, or over blocking within studs at adjacent wall, as discussed on site.

In general, the wood framing appears to be in substantial conformance to the design, except as noted above.

As discussed during our inspection, SI is available to either inspect the site again to follow-up on outstanding items, or photographs of finished/ corrected work may be emailed to ben@structuralinteg.com.

COPIES TO: Aaron Jones, PE (SI)

The SIGNED:

NAME: Ben Heidebrink

This site visit is made to observe the progress and quality of the structural portion of the construction work and to determine whether that work was in general conformance to the structural portion of the Contract Documents. S.I. Inc.'s observations are intended to protect the interests of the Owner and the public. S.I. Inc. is not responsible for the Contractor's work, work methods, safety precautions, timeliness of the work nor any other aspect of the construction for which the contractor has responsibility.