

Questions and Corrections 2016-10

4/14/16

[2016-10 Statewide Geotechnical Engineering & Laboratory Testing](#)

CLARIFICATION: The link to the Word document containing the *Summary of Estimated Hours for Engineering Tasks and Production Rates for Laboratory Tests* has been revised and included linked on page 5 of the RFP.

4/27/16

[2016-10 Statewide Structural Steel Shop](#)

QUESTION: In the RFP, [Section VI. Special Instructions](#) indicates that inspection must be an American Welding Society (AWS) Certified Welding Inspector and be a qualified Certified Level 2 Non-Destructive Testing Inspector for magnetic particle and ultrasonic testing. In the past, KYTC has approved inspectors to work on projects that did not have all of those certifications.

- For example, an individual with a CWI was approved to perform weld inspection, however he did not have any NDT certifications. Will it be acceptable to submit Inspectors that do not have the certifications listed in the RFP?
- Can an inspector have a CWI with MT & RT instead of MT & UT? Or any other combination of NDT certs?
- Is it acceptable to use an experienced inspector - that does not have certifications - during the fabrication of non-welded materials such as bearings?

RESPONSE: KYTC has allowed inspectors that have not had all of the requirements in the contract given the specific circumstances. For example, if an inspector was only going to be inspecting coatings and we were going to require more than one inspector on site, we would generally allow someone without NDT certifications. The same would apply in the other sense, if an inspector was not going to inspect coatings then we would not require them to have the coatings certifications. These are reviewed on a case by case basis, but is somewhat common. We really just would not want to get into a situation of having to pay for two inspectors when we may only need one (given the workload) simply because they did not have all of the required certifications. This has not been a problem.

- Yes, these would be reviewed on a case by case basis.
- This would be acceptable as long as we had adequate coverage.
- Yes, but this would be limited and also reviewed case by case.