

MEMORANDUM

November 9th, 2018

TO: ACEC-INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee Members

FROM: Bobby Chandler, Clark Dietz, Inc.

RE: Minutes from the November 9th, ACEC-INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee Meeting.

The following were in attendance:

Andrew Fitzgerald, INDOT
Randy Strain, INDOT
Nate Pfeiffer, INDOT
Stephanie Moore, INDOT
Adam Post, INDOT
Jennifer Hart, INDOT
Jeremy Hunter, INDOT
Maricer Gonzales, INDOT

Bill Dittrich, INDOT
John Lukac, BLN
Jonathan Olson, BF&S
Michael Vereb, Lochmueller Group
Bobby Chandler, Clark Dietz
Matt Lee, United Consulting
Brett Longnecker, USI Consultants

Item #1 - Load Rating

- Deadline for getting all bridges in BRADIN is Oct 2019.
- For FHWA, requirement is to have legal load data into BRADIN even if it is in spreadsheet format.
- To satisfy FHWA, the bridges need to be load rated for legal loads. Needs to be in BIAS.
- Follow Memo 18-01. Use the spreadsheet template and instructions in Memo 18-01.
- BF&S noted they are having problems getting values from BIAS to update from BRADIN values.
- The data values are not in synch between BIAS and BRADIN but is being corrected and synched.
- BRADIN controls the load rating values, BIAS will receive the data from BRADIN. BRADIN will have the authoritative source for the load ratings.
- We have noticed we are load posting a few more bridges for the EV Load Ratings
 - o FHWA has softened some of the requirements for running the EV Load Ratings in Bridge Inspection Memo 18-04.
- The MAD Tab has limited options for the Load Rating drop-down asking if the load rating needs to be updated
 - o Only options are Yes, Create Critical Finding and No. Recommend another option for Yes - Update Load Rating
- It was noted the Oct 2019 date may be a problem for a few counties based on the compliance month.
 - o About seven counties have inspections due between June and October
 - o Some counties had load ratings pushed to the 2019 contracts due to limited funds in 2017.
 - o INDOT will look at the counties that may conflict with the Oct 2019 deadline and present them to FHWA to see how to proceed. A suggestion was made to adjust the compliance month temporarily to accommodate the load rating upload.
- Most of the bridges have been rated for Legal loads. But timber bridges cannot be rated in BRR so spreadsheets are used. The spreadsheets do not have the EV loads just the H and HS vehicles.

- For engineering judgement from the state guys, the guys are out looking and getting plans for the bridges to use in the engineering judgement for legal loads.
- Michael has a border bridge in Lake Co and asked about the load rating of the border bridges. Andrew said the lead state is supposed to rate the bridge and provide the results to the Indiana consultant. INDOT has visited all the corresponding border bridge counties along the Illinois and Kentucky state lines. MOAs have been completed for several of the counties with Illinois.
 - o The other challenge will be the legal loads used. The FHWA legal loads are the same for every state, but each state has their own set of additional legal loads per state code. We will need to add a note in BRADIN noting the legal loads that have been provided from the lead state.
 - o The main issue is to have the border bridges posted with the same loads on both sides of the bridge and to have the fed tape data match for the same bridge from each state.

Item #2 - Compliance Month

- o This is discussion only. The intent is not to make changes yet.
- o There have been several considerations:
 - o 100 bridge limit per month
 - o Quarterly
 - o Add a couple of weeks on each end
- o INDOT would like to have Consultants work with county officials of their respective contracts who willing to adjust their compliance month. INDOT would like consultants and counties to present a plan for INDOT to review. The plans can vary and be individually based per the consultant and county collaboration. INDOT will decide if the plan is approved or not.
- o INDOT would like to eventually end the contracts 2 months earlier, so the next consultant can be in place and be able to start the office work prior to the inspection compliance month.
- o INDOT expects the bridges should be inspected with engineering judgement in regard to weather. If weather is not conducive do not inspect. If there is snow on the ground but the deck is clear, then if engineering judgement dictates it is good to inspect, then ok to inspect.
- o The changes discussed should be done gradually. INDOT does not want to overwhelm the system, INDOT personnel or the consultants.
 - o Hamilton, Allen, Marion have over 300 bridges.
 - o 12 other counties with over 200 bridges.
- o FHWA has been understanding in regard to moving counties up in compliance. Funding will be a different issue.
- o Revisions to the schedule of bridges is to help with quality and safety of the inspectors.
- o Several attendees agree not shuffling too much at once. We need to incorporate the 100-bridge limit per month by moving the compliance months earlier and balance the months with counties willing to adjust their compliance months. Then, balance the years out.
- o A memo needs to be presented to explain moving compliance months around, but we need to balance moving with the contracts that exist.
- o The process is expected to take an extended period of time. 8 years was discussed as an anticipated minimum period.
- o It was noted it could be possible to move compliance months within the current contract. But the first step is understanding how much time will be needed to amend the current contract. A county with 115 county bridges will

probably not be changed. The larger counties may have a higher possibility of moving compliance months.

- o INDOT noted most of the changes will not come out with the current contract but will be seen in the next round of contracts.
- o Andrew will be presenting the memo at the county bridge conferences, road school, design conference over the next two years to make the counties aware of the need to move compliance months, especially for the southern counties.

Item #3 - How to handle permanently closed bridges

- o Bill said inspection of closed bridges need to mainly be safety inspections using the routine inspection information. If it is permanently closed, the bridge does not need a special inspection, an underwater or fracture critical inspections
- o Andy said he will draft a memo and would like to present it at the next meeting.
- o INDOT will provide a template for closed bridges to be signed by the locals to include with the bridge file.
- o FHWA considers bridges permanently closed if they have been closed for 5 years.
- o Once the county signs off, then the bridge will be archived in BIAS
- o The memo can be used for the state bridges also.
- o We should not to make any bridge a 0 especially if it is under construction. Better to leave report intact and code a G or K
- o No document from the county will require a "safety inspection"
- o Bridge closed to vehicles but left open to pedestrian.
 - o If we do a safety inspection with it being in bad shape, then we are taking on the liability of future problems.
 - o Pedestrian bridges are not required to be inspected.
 - o If a county wants a pedestrian bridge inspected, then the inspectors need to talk to the county officials about condition.

Item #4 - Critical Findings Online Course

- o This will be going online today (November 9, 2018)
- o Every current Team Leader will be required to take it within 90 days of November 9, 2018.
- o New Team Leaders will need to take the course within 90 days of gaining Team Leader status
- o The course is not intended to be overwhelming.
- o Information presented in the course can be printed and kept for personal use.
- o INDOT has the ability to track who has taken it and not taken it.
- o INDOT suggests those thinking about becoming a Team Leader should take it and it will be counted towards their Team Leader status once they are made a Team Leader.

Item #5 - Additional courses coming up

- o INDOT is open to other course offerings.
- o A Photos course showing what needs to be looked at and what should be shown in photos. This will probably be required to take
- o An Extended Frequencies course is also being considered. It will help guide inspectors in the process of making requests for extended frequency bridges. This course will probably not be a required course.

- o Could the clients take these courses? Yes, courses are not intended to be full day things. The courses are intended to help provide understanding to those taking the courses.
- o INDOT is open to other course offerings.
- o Jonathan suggested a course on load rating.
 - o Andy suggests pushing that to Jeremy's group.
- o Nate suggested a course on commonly miscoded items such as Guardrails.
 - o From the county side, we agree a guardrail coding course would be beneficial, especially when w beam is used as bridge railing.
- o A course on Fracture critical inspection reporting was suggested
- o A railroad flatcar course created by Professor Rob Connor through his S-BRITE center was suggested.

Item #6 - BIAS Update

- o INDOT is aware of the disconnect between BIAS and BRADIN
- o Biggest concern item 41
 - o BIAS has it coded as a B, but the history shows a P.
 - o Be aware when posting bridges, make sure BIAS is set correctly to what it needs to be set
- o MAD Tabs
 - o Two additional fields will be incorporated
 - Terminal joints and slopewalls. Feel free to fill out for county if you want.
 - A field for hydraulic information is also being developed.
- o Summary reports
 - o Are working now
- o Scheduler
 - o Still not working. No word from Bentley when it will be fixed.
 - o Item 91, 92, 93 dates
 - Make sure they are correct and being used instead of

Item #7 - Border Bridges

- o INDOT has met with all the counties on Illinois and Indiana side
 - o Still have several MOAs to develop.
 - o FHWA wants the fed tape to be consistent from both states.
 - o The intent is to have the lead county provide the information to the subordinate county.
 - o INDOT still needs to coordinate with Ohio side.
 - o INDOT has to meet with Kentucky, but those bridges are state owned rather than local bridges.
 - o Consistent bridge numbers are one issue that still needs to be resolved.
 - o Another issue is the fed data is collected but some of the fields from the different states do not match.

Item #8 - Extended frequencies

- o Extended frequency request process is up and running.
- o The process has been presented at the county bridge conference and is online.
- o Once the online training is done, it will reflect the presentation from the county bridge conference.
- o Jonathan has a concern. The current process is a registered PE is to look at the good bridges under the extended frequency process which leaves an EIT to look at the bad bridges.

- o INDOT agrees the PE needs to look at the extended frequency bridges at least for the first inspection. After that, any Team Leader can inspect the extended frequency bridges, even the non PEs.
- o In the current contract, we are to treat them as 2 year inspected bridges. If in the second phase the bridge is not inspected, then note the bridge was not inspected because it is on the extended frequency list.
- o Can the extended frequency evaluations be done in Phase 2 through a supplement? The bridge would be inspected in phase 2, but then in the next contract the consultant would know which bridges are extended frequency bridges.
- o There have been a few county bridges listed on the extended frequency and the state has approx. 20 bridges. The BIAS system was down for awhile for the county approval, so the ones previously submitted needed to be pulled back to have the report submitted.

Item #9 - LPA Status and discussion

- o Review Final Reports - Do consultants get feedback from INDOT once the reports are submitted?
 - o No we have not received any feedback for a few years now.
 - o We submit the transmittal letter to show what we submitted to the counties
 - o Randy and Andy noted County summary is not required to be submitted to INDOT.
 - o Open door policy only means the county report must be available if asked. The information does not have to be on demand. The information can be accessed electronically.
 - o INDOT will discuss internally and with LPAs to see if we need to upload the county reports to ERMS. If the current contract has language requiring an ERMS submittal, then we need to follow the contract. The language may be removed in future contracts.
- o Invoicing
 - o Update address on county vouchers
 - o Invoices are submitted to Counties monthly
 - Under a normal contract, there may be gaps when invoices are submitted.
 - o End of Phase Summary
 - Do a summary from BIAS showing how many routines, underwater, fracture critical bridges looked at in the month. Also, include the load ratings done, office work done, etc. through a spreadsheet.
 - Stephanie will create a query to run which will show the information she wants to see.
 - o NTP
 - Stephanie would like to give a heads up to the consultant the PO is good and processing. And then, we can start the office work. She is looking to get this going by March.
 - o Jonathan asked if Stephanie can send out an example of her preferred invoice format so we can standardize and make it easier for her to review. Stephanie will send out an example.

Item #10 - Training Update

- o Bridge Inspection workshop
 - o Bridge Inspection Workshop is scheduled for February 13, 2019
 - o Some of the topics on the list
 - LPA Administration

Minutes from the November 9th
ACEC-INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee Meeting

- Hydraulics - Scour Screening
- Safety during inspections
- Have Rob talk about either Flatcar or fracture critical
- Inspecting Flatcar bridges
 - What to look for
 - What is fracture critical
 - Focus more on the inspection rather than the load rating
- Fracture Critical in relation the FHWA requirements

Item #11 - Other discussions

- o Next meeting February 22nd at the Indianapolis Subdistrict
- o Hold meeting after Bridge Inspection workshop to discuss feedback of conference.