

Quality Control and Quality Assurance



Procedures

for the

INDOT and County Bridge Inspections

Presented by:
Michael W. Cox, PE
& Tyler Wolf, PE
Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC



Quality Control Procedures

- Internal review process (District or Consultant)
- Similar to current INDOT/LPA design process (QA Form)
- Focus on at-risk bridges
- Office and field reviews



Quality Control Procedures

- Time added is approximately 2 days per inventory
- Procedures began for INDOT Team Leaders in June 2010
- For Consultants, the QC Procedures will need to be conducted on all Phase I Inspections after September 30, 2010



Quality Control Procedures

- Designate a Quality Control Officer
 - Consultant—Another Team Leader within firm (direct supervisor or a program manager)
 - ➤ INDOT District—District Bridge Engineer
 - Firms w/o active 2nd team leader—shall use another firm
 - > Not the team leader of original inspection team



Quality Control Office Review

- Not practical to thoroughly review all items
- Items to review
 - Inspection performed on time
 - Review noted deficiencies and compare to recommended maintenance and repair
 - Were critical findings properly handled
 - Review load ratings
 - Photos taken for condition ratings of 4 or less
 - Has scour plan of actions been updated



Quality Control Office Review

- Sampling of County-owned bridges
 - ➤ Minimum of 5% or 5 bridges, whichever is greater
 - Maximum of 15
- Sampling of INDOT District bridges
 - > 5 bridges per team leader, per quarter



Quality Control Office Review

- Sampling County-owned bridges
 - Selected structures with structural condition rating of a 4 or less
 - > Selected structures posted 10 tons or less
 - ➤ Minimum of 5% or 5, whichever is greater
 - Maximum of 15
 - Select lowest sufficiency ratings if no low-condition ratings or posted bridges

Example: QC Office Review Form

BRIDGE INSPECTION	MANUAL		Appendix A
PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Con	trol Office Revi	iew Form (Internal)
APPENDIX A QUAL	ITY CONTROL OF	FICE REVIEW FOR	RM (INTERNAL)
(One copy of this sheet shall I	be filled out for each Ir	spection Team Lead	er.) Date:
Company/District:	-		
Quality Control Officer:	P		
QCO Team Leader No.:			
Team Leader:			
Team Leader No.:			
Team Members:			
County/County No.:	r		
List Selected Bridges			
(5% or 5 min) (15 max):			

The Quality Control Office Review shall be performed on selected bridges that meet any of the following

- · A rating of 4 or less for Items 58, 59, · Posted for 10 tons or less 60, or 62
 - . A rating of 3 or less for Item 113A
- · A rating that changed by 2 or more for Items 58, 59, 60, or 62

For bridges inspected by Inspection Consultants, the minimum number of bridges to undergo the Quality Control Office Review shall be the greater of five percent of the total number of bridges, or five

The maximum number of bridges required to undergo the Quality Control Office Review shall be

If the number of bridges which meet the sampling criteria is less than the minimum number listed above, the bridges with the lowest sufficiency ratings shall be selected for the remaining bridges for the Quality Control Office Review. If multiple Inspection Team Leaders are involved in the inspections, all efforts shall be made to review every Inspection Team Leader.

For bridges inspected by state employees, five bridges per Inspection Team Leader, per quarter, shall be reviewed by the Quality Control Officer for the above criteria. In addition, if the Inspection Team Leader is responsible for any Fracture Critical or Special Inspections, one of each shall be sampled for each of these inspection types, per quarter.

June 2010 Page 2-A-2



Example: QC Office Review Form

BRIDG	E INSPECTION MANUAL Appendix A
PART	2: QA/QC Quality Control Office Review Form (Internal)
	Date: Bridge No
Office	Review Form - (One copy of this sheet shall be filled out for each bridge.)
Item #	Items to Review
1	All inspectors qualified
2	Inspection completed within the required frequency
3	Ratings of 4 or less for Items 58, 59, 60, or 62 have been documented
	properly (photos, notes, and sketches)
4	Critical Deficiencies properly handled (Part 1 – Section 7)
5	Load ratings performed and reflect current site conditions (Part 3)
6	Posting policies have been complied with (Part 3)
7	Maintenance and repair items reflective of noted deficiencies
8	"Estimated Year Remaining Life" values consistent with the condition
	ratings
9	Bridge files contain all available data (Part 1 – Section 5)
10	Priority schedule consistent with the bridge usage and deterioration
11	If required, scour Plan of Action developed, on file, and current
	(Part 4 – Section 7)
12	Printed inspection report uses standard format

Provide items reviewed, printed name, and signature in space below.

ltem(s)	Inspection Team Leader	Quality Control Officer



Quality Control Field Review

- Evaluates condition ratings assigned
- Various inventory items
- Adequacy of photo documentation
- Review recommended maintenance and repair recommendations
- Review condition ratings of a 4 or less
- Verify proper postings
- Verify scour documentation and scour plan of action



Quality Control Field Review

- Sampling County-owned bridges
 - Selected structures with structural condition rating of a 4 or less
 - > Selected structures posted 10 tons or less
 - Minimum of 5% or 5, whichever is greater
 - Maximum of 15
 - Select lowest sufficiency ratings if no low-condition ratings or posted bridges



Quality Control Field Review

- Sampling INDOT District bridges
 - > 5 bridges per team leader per quarter
 - Fracture Critical & Special Detail Inspections do not require QC due to special access equipment requirements



BRIDGE INSPECTION	MANUAL	Appendix B
PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Control Field I	Review Form (Internal)
APPENDIX B QUAL	ITY CONTROL FIELD REVIEW F	ORM (INTERNAL)
(One copy of this sheet shall	be filled out for each Inspection Team	Leader.) Date:
Company/District:		
Quality Control Officer:	7	
Team Leader No.:		
Team Leader:		
Team Leader No.:		
Team Members:	-	
County/County No.:		
List Selected Bridges		
(5% or 5 min) (15 max):		

The Quality Control Field Review shall be performed on selected bridges that meet any of the following criteria:

- A rating of 4 or less for Items 58, 59, 60, or 62
- . A rating that changed by two or more for Items 58, 59, 60, or 62
- A rating of 3 or less for Item 113A
- Posted for 10 tons or les

The minimum number of bridges to undergo the Quality Control Field Review shall be the greater of five percent of the total number of bridges inspected, or five bridges.

The maximum number of bridges required to undergo the Quality Control Field Review shall be 15 bridges

If the number of bridges which meet the sampling criteria exceeds 15 bridges, then only 15 bridges are required to be reviewed. If multiple Inspection Team Leaders are involved in the inspections, all efforts shall be made to review every Inspection Team Leader.

For bridges inspected by state employees, five bridges per Inspection Team Leader, per quarter, shall be reviewed by the Quality Control Officer for the above criteria. In addition, if the Inspection Team Leader is responsible for any Fracture Critical or Special Inspections, one of each shall be sampled for each of these inspection types, per quarter.

June 2010 Page 2-B-4



CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY.	8 ST FERRE DAME			THE STATE OF THE S
		1000		JANUAL
~~ 11 11 _1			16 3171 13	// // IX II I // I
		SEC. 1	14 / 13 13	/

Appendix B

Bridge No.

PART 2: QA/QC

Quality Control Field Review Form (Internal)

Date:

	Bute Bridge No
QC#	Items to Review
1	Main structure type correct (43A)
2	"One Lane Bridge" or "Narrow Bridge" (51, 28A, 102, & 41) postings in
	place; if not, is it recommended (41)?
3	Load limit (66B) bridge postings in place (66C & 70); if not, is it
	recommended (41)?
4	Bridge rail and approach coding (36A) acceptable
5	Foundation type acceptable (113B)
6	Maintenance and repair items properly addressed
7	Photos taken of load posting
8	Photos taken of condition ratings of 4 or less for Items 58, 59, 60, or 62
9	Channel profiles or cross-sections taken for all bridges
10	If scour noted, was it adequately documented?
11	If deterioration noted, was it adequately documented?
12	Stream channel alignment problems are noted using sketches



	BE INSPECTION N					ppendix
PART	2: QA/QC	Qualit	y Control F	ield Revie	w Form	(Interna
			D	ate:	_Bridge No	D
			Rati			Concur*
QC#			Prev. Inv.	Curr. Inv.	Yes	No
15	Item 58: Deck					<u> </u>
16	Item 59. Superstructur					
17	Item 60: Substructure	V.				
18	Item 62: Culvert					
19	Item 113A: Scour Criti	ical Bridge				
rovide	items reviewed, printed				y Contro	ol Officer
rovide	items reviewed, printed QC Nos.		gnature in spac on Team Lead		y Contro	ol Officer
rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
'rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
'rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
'rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
°rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
'rovide					y Contro	ol Officer
rovide					y Contro	ol Officer



BRID	GE INSI	PECTION	MANU	JAL								Appendix C
PART	2: QA/	QC								Qu	ality Co	entrol Field Log Form
APPE	NDIX C	QUAL	ITY CON	ITROL	FIELD	LOG F	ORM					
NBI#	County/ District / Toll Road / LA	Bridge #	Item 43A Bridge Type	Item 58 Deck	Item 59 Super	Item 60 Sub.	Item 62 Culv.	Item 113A Scour	Item 66B H Rating	Suff. Rating	Date of Field Rev.	Team Leader Name
Officer (QCO) show	eet the samp uld have valusese should al	ues in the	Date of	Field Re	ito the Q view" field	uality Co d. If addi	ntrol Log tional stru	Form; how actures we	wever, only re added	y bridges r to meet the	eviewed by the Quality Control e minimum number of reviewed
Submi	tted by 0	QCO:(Si	gnature)					_ Date	:			
Printe	d Name:							_ Com	pany/Di	strict: _		
June 20	10											Page 2-C-7



Submission to INDOT—Data Review

- After the internal review is complete—submit to QC Data Officer (Gerald)
- QC data review shall be 30 days maximum
- If errors found—correct and then 30 days reset
- Sampling—100% of data reviewed
- Inspect Tech program should minimize error issues



Submission to INDOT—Report Review

- After the data review is complete—submit to QC Report Officer (Debbie)
- Submission requirements
 - > All summary reports
 - > SIA's for 5 bridges with lowest sufficiency ratings
 - Entire special inspection reports
- Level 1 Review
 - Ensure Federal and State reports are included
 - Ensure individual SIA's utilize appropriate forms
 - Verify inspector meets requirements

Continued...



Submission to INDOT—Report Review

- Level 2 Review (Not INDOT)
 - ➤ All requirements of the Level 1 Review
 - Verify deficiencies are documented with photos
 - Proper recommended actions are stated in reports

Sampling

- ➤ Level 1—100% of reports submitted
- Level 2—5% of reports submitted
- QC Report review shall be 30 days maximum
- If errors found—correct and then 30 days reset
- Inspect Tech will set up majority of up front summary reports



Quality Assurance Procedures

- INDOT or INDOT's designate will be the quality assurance officer
- Ensure adherence to FHWA and INDOT criteria
- Review includes team leader's choice of:
 - > Inspection equipment
 - Information gathering methods
 - Time and frequency of inspection
- Review quality control efforts
- Office and field reviews



- Ensure consistency of data collection
- Ensure QC efforts are equally effective
- Results gathered from QC data and report reviews
- Results provided on quarterly basis to INDOT/FHWA
- If district or county consultant is selected, they will be asked to complete a questionnaire

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

PART 2: QA/QC		Quality As	surance Questionnaire
APPENDIX D QU	JALITY ASSURANCE	QUESTIONN	AIRE
(To be completed by	the District Engineer	or Inspection	Consultant)
Date	Inspection Agency Und	ler Review	District/County/Toll Road/LA
QUALIFICATIONS Refer to Part 1, Section requirements.	2.4 of the Indiana Bridg	ge Inspection Ma	anual for personnel qualification
Quality Control Office	er – Person in charge o	f inspection pr	rogram
Name:			
Team Leader No:			
Registered Professional En	gineer: Yes No	Complex Br	ridge Certified: Yes No
Inspection Team Lead	ders – Personnel that s	sign the inspec	tion reports
Name:			
Team Leader No:			
Registered Professional En	gineer: Yes No	Complex Br	ridge Certified: Yes No
Name:			
Team Leader No:			
Registered Professional En	gineer: Yes No	Complex Br	ridge Certified: Yes No
Name:			
Team Leader No:			
Registered Professional En	gineer: Yes No	Complex Br	ridge Certified: Yes No



BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL PART 2: QA/QC	Appendix D Quality Assurance Questionnaire
Inspection Team Members - Personnel th	at assisted Inspection Team Leaders with
Field Inspections and do not sign inspection r	eports
Date:	
Name:	
On INDOT Inspection Team Member list: Yes	No
Registered Professional Engineer: Yes No	
Experience:	
Training:	
Name:	
On INDOT Inspection Team Member list: Yes	No
Registered Professional Engineer: Yes No	
Experience:	
Training:	
Name:	
On INDOT Inspection Team Member list: Yes	No
Registered Professional Engineer: Yes No	
Experience:	
Training:	
June 2010	Page 2-D-9

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL	Appendix D
PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Assurance Questionnaire
RECORD KEEPING Bridge owners should maintain a complete, accurate jurisdiction. Complete information, in good usable form Such information also provides a record which may be i Bridge File – The bridge file should contain all cumulations.	n, is vital to the effective management of bridges. mportant in legal action.
Location of bridge file:	
Date:	
File accessible to users: Yes No	
Length of time information is kept in the file:	
Comments:	
Planning and Scheduling Number of bridges Inspection Team Leaders responsible	e to inspect (per Inspection Team Leader):
Number of inspections performed in the past calendar y	ear (per Inspection Team Leader):
Load-Posted/Closed Bridges Number of bridges posted or closed:	
Computations or summary on file for load-posted/closed	bridges (provide number):
Computations or summary not on file for load-posted/cle	osed bridges (provide number):
Comments:	
Routine Inspections Number of inspections performed within the recommend	
Number of inspections performed outside of the recommendation	100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100
Number of bridges scheduled for a Routine Inspection a	it less than a 24-month frequency:
Comments:	
June 2010	Page 2-D-10



PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Assurance Questionnaire
Special Inspections	-
	or all of the bridge to be examined in more detail or at a greater
frequency than standard for Routine	Inspections:
Cantilevered Bearings	Bridges Crossing Major Rivers
Cover Plates	Cable-Stayed Bridges
Fatigue Details E and E'	Suspension Bridges
Hinge Connections	Timber-Covered Bridge
Pin or Hinge Connections	Steel Box Girders
Hangers	Movable Bridges
Hoan Details	Bridges With Post-Tensioned Elements
Bridges or Details as Determin	ned by the State Program Manager
Primary Truss Gusset Plates \	With Corrosion and Difficulty Quantifying Section Loss
Fracture Critical Inspections	
Number of bridges requiring a Fractu	re Critical Inspection:
Number of Fracture Critical Inspectio	ns performed within the recommended frequency:
Number of Inspections performed out	ns performed within the recommended frequency: tside of the recommended frequency:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde	tside of the recommended frequency:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges	tside of the recommended frequency:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges:	tside of the recommended frequency:envater Inspection: Bridge No. Inspection Frequency
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require inspections	tside of the recommended frequency:enwater Inspection: Bridge No. Inspection Frequency
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require inspendence Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency ctions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require inspendence Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency citions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues: na scour Plan of Action on file:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require insper Number of Scour Critical bridges with Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency citions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues: na scour Plan of Action on file:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require insper Number of Scour Critical bridges with Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency citions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues: na scour Plan of Action on file:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require insper Number of Scour Critical bridges with Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency citions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues: na scour Plan of Action on file:
Number of Inspections performed out Underwater Inspections Number of bridges requiring an Unde Bridge No. Inspection Frequence Scour Critical Bridges Number of Scour Critical Bridges: Number of bridges that require insper Number of Scour Critical bridges with Number of Scour Critical bridges with	tside of the recommended frequency: envater Inspection: y Bridge No. Inspection Frequency citions at a reduced frequency due to scour issues: na scour Plan of Action on file:



PART 2: QA	N/QC	Quality Assurance Questionnaire
Unknown Foเ	undations	
Review the step	os taken to eliminate unknown for	oundations, classify the scour risk for bridges with
unknown foundat	tions, and provide an appropriate P	Plan of Action:
Movable Brid	ge Inspections	
Number of moval	ble bridges:	
Bridge No.	Inspection Frequency	
7		
	with Bridge Owner	
	with Bridge Owner	ation about each individual bridge.
The bridge file sh	ould contain all cumulative informa	ation about each individual bridge. repairs:
The bridge file sh	ould contain all cumulative informa	
The bridge file sh List inspector's co	ould contain all cumulative informa	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co	nould contain all cumulative information and contacts for emergency closures or	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	nould contain all cumulative information and contacts for emergency closures or	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	could contain all cumulative information and contacts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergency to close a bridge in an emergence.	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	could contain all cumulative information and contacts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergency to close a bridge in an emergence.	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	iould contain all cumulative information and acts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergencity to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	could contain all cumulative information that the contacts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergency to open a bridge;	repairs:
The bridge file sh List inspector's co List who has auth	could contain all cumulative information that the contacts for emergency closures or nority to close a bridge in an emergency to open a bridge;	repairs:



Quality Assurance Office Review

- Consists of reviewing the bridge files
- Two levels of review
 - ➤ Level 1—cursory review of file
 - ➤ Level 2—thorough review of file





Quality Assurance Office Review— Level 1

- Verify bridge plans are available
- Verify load rating calculations are on file
- Verify scour plan of actions are on file
- Verify pertinent correspondence on file
- Verify team leader documentation

Appendix E

Quality Assurance Office Review— Level 1

BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL

PART	2: QA/	QC	Quality Assurance	Office Review - Level I
APPENI	DIX E	QU	ALITY ASSURANCE OFFICE REVI	EW – LEVEL I
Date			District/Consultant Under Review	Bridge Number
RECOR	D KEEF	PING		
Bridge ov	vners sho	ould mair	tain a complete, accurate, and current re	cord of each bridge under their
			nation, in good usable form, is vital to the e	
,				
Such Intol	mation a	iso provid	es a record which may be important in legal	action.
Bridge Fi	le – The b	oridge file	should contain all cumulative information at	out each individual bridge.
Location of	of bridge f	ile:		
File acces	sible to u	sers:	Yes No	
Comment	s:			
	_			
Bridge File	Dooum	ante		
Yes	No	N/A	Documen	
res	NO I	N/A	Bridge design plans, as-builts, and/or re	
H	뉴	┞∺╴	Correspondence	mab pians
H	ᅲ	 	Load rating analysis computations or lo	ad rating summary
H	芇	┞∺	Initial/inventory update inspection repo	
H	H	 	Inspector qualification records	
H	H	 	Routine Inspection performed withi	n 24 months of previous
		-	inspection	in 24 months of previous
			Critical Deficiency documentation curre	nt
$\overline{}$		 	Scour Plan of Action	
			Additional Inspe	ctions
			Damage Inspection reports	
			Special Inspection reports	
			Fracture Critical reports	
			Underwater Inspection reports	
			Border Bridge Inspection reports	
			Other	

June 2010 Page 2-E-13

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Quality Assurance Office Review— Level 1 BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL Appendix E

BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL				Appendix	
PART 2: QA/QC	Qua	•		ice Review	
		1	Date:	Bridge No	
SUMMARY OF LEVEL I REV	VIEW COM	MENTS			
Reviewer's Comments:					
of .					
Reviewer's Confidence Level	Good			Poor	
	5	4 🔲 3	□ 2	□ 1	
Typical Deduction Items:					
-2 If load rating cor					
-2 If scour Plan of	Action is require	red, but curren	t copy is not	on file	
 -3 If Critical Defici since previous ins 		ntation is not o	n file, but a	Critical Deficiend	cy was not
-3 If inspector was	not a certified	Inspection Tea	am Leader at	the time of inspe	ection
-1 If not performed 23 months of previ			nd the notice	to proceed was	given with
(Inspection Team Leader Printed Na	me)	(Inspection	n Team Leader	Signature)	(Date)
(Quality Control Officer Printed Nar	ne)	(Quality C	ontrol Officer S	Signature)	(Date)
(Quality Assurance Officer Printed N	ame)	(Quality Ass	surance Officer	Signature)	(Date)

June 2010 Page 2-E-14



Quality Assurance Office Review— Level 2

- All requirements of Level 1
- Load rating verification (Stage I, II or III)
- Verify documentation of deficiencies for baseline
- Verify special inspections on file



Quality Assurance Office Review— Load Rating Verification

Stage I

- Compare load rating with proper posting
- Verify PE involved in calculations

Stage II

- Review calculations for assumptions
- % deterioration included?
- Rehabilitation made to bridge?

Stage III

- Independent recalculation of load rating
- Tolerance level is 2 tons



Quality Assurance Office Review

Sampling

- > 2 INDOT Districts each year
- > 2 Counties in each district each year
- No County reviewed twice within five years
- > 8 bridge files reviewed for Level I
- 4 bridge files reviewed for Level II
 - At least one bridge—Stage II load rating
 - At least one bridge—Stage III load rating

Example: QA Office Review Form

BRIDG	SE INS	PECTI	ON MANUAL	Appendix F
PART	2: QA	/QC	Quality Assurance C	Office Review - Level II
APPEN	DIX F	QL	JALITY ASSURANCE OFFICE REVI	EW – LEVEL II
Date			Inspection Agency Under Review	Bridge Number
RECOF	RD KEE	PING		
Bridge o	wners sh	ould mai	intain a complete, accurate, and current re	cord of each bridge under their
iurisdictio	n. Comp	lete infor	mation, in good usable form, is vital to the	effective management of bridges.
			des a record which may be important in legal	
			,	
Bridge F	ile – The	bridge file	e should contain all cumulative information at	oout each individual bridge.
Location	of bridge	file:		
File acce	ssible to	users:	Yes No	
Commen	its:			
	-			
Bridge Fi	le Docum	nents		
Yes	No	N/A	Documer	nt
			Available bridge design plans, as-builts,	and/or rehab plans
			Correspondence	
			Load rating analysis computations or lo	,
			Initial/inventory update inspection repor	ts
			Inspector qualification records	
			Routine Inspection performed within 24	months of previous inspection
			Critical Deficiency documentation curre	nt
			Scour Plan of Action	
			Additional Inspe	ections
			Damage Inspection reports	
			Special Inspection reports	
			Fracture Critical reports	
			Underwater Inspection reports	
Ħ			Border Bridge Inspection reports Other	

June 2010 Page 2-F-15

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Example: QA Office Review Form

	Quality Assurance Office Review – Level I
INSPECTION	Date: Bridge No
	ed to determine the physical and functional condition of the bridge
	lependent on proper planning and techniques, adequate equipment, and
the experience and reliability of th	ne personnel performing the inspection.
Planning and Scheduling	
Previous inspection reports availa	able for review: Yes No
Comments:	
Initial Inspections – New a	and Rehabilitated Structures
Previous inspection reports availa	able for review: Yes No NA
Bridge inspection forms updated	to reflect modifications: Yes No NA
Comments:	
Routine Inspections List frequency for Routine Inspec	tion (in months):
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections	us
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damag	us: Yes No NA
List frequency for Routine Inspec ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage:	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availate Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge	Se: Yes No NA Yes No NA Able for review: Yes No NA Abdedated to reflect modifications: Yes No NA Description
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availate Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes	JS DE: Yes NO NA Yes NO NA Able for review: Yes NO NA Dodated to reflect modifications: Yes NO NA Jess NO NA
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes Load limit reduced: Yes	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes Describe how load posting and/or	JS DE: Yes NO NA Yes NO NA Able for review: Yes NO NA Dodated to reflect modifications: Yes NO NA Jess NO NA
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes Load limit reduced: Yes	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes Describe how load posting and/or	
List frequency for Routine Inspect ADDITIONAL INSPECTION Damage Inspections Bridge load posted due to damage Bridge closed due to damage: Previous inspection reports availa Bridge Inspection Report Form up Load Posted/Closed Bridge Bridge re-load rated: Yes Describe how load posting and/or	



Example: QA Office Review Form

PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Assurance Office Review – Level I
	Date: Bridge No
Fracture Critical Inspection List frequency for Fracture Critical	Il Inspection (in months):
Fracture Critical Inspection Plan	of Action adequately documented:
Scour Critical Bridges Describe how Scour Critical Ratio	ng determined (N/A if determined previously and not documented):
☐ Calculated ☐ Visually ☐	Other NA
LOAD RATINGS	
Stage I	and a control of the Van Division of the Control of
01	ary or calculation): Yes No NA
Professional Engineer involved:	
Calculations checked: Yes	□ No □ NA
How was the load rating determine	ned?
☐ Calculation ☐ Deterioration	on Summary Standards Other
Comments:	
Stage II (Complete Stage I Also)
Adequate documentation of assu	mptions: Yes No NA
Deterioration of bridge accounted	for: Yes No NA
Stage III (Complete Stage I & II	Also)
Post-inspection review performed	d on subject bridge: Yes No
Quality Assurance Officer's calcu	alated load rating: H-20 Inv HS-20 Inv HS-20 Oper.
Inspection Agency's load rating:	H-20 Inv HS-20 Inv HS-20 Oper.
Inspection Agency's load rating v	vithin two tons of QAO's load rating: Yes No Difference
Comments:	

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Example: QA Office Review Form

PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Assurance Office F	Review – Level I
	Date: B	Bridge No
FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS		
Each inspection report shall be r	reviewed by the owner for completeness and	recommendations. The
	ould be considered for implementation within the	ne limits established for
public safety, cost effectiveness, a	and fiscal restraints.	
Inspectors inform maintenance per	rsonnel/owner about maintenance/repair needs:	Yes No No
Repair/maintenance recommendat	tions are consistent with deterioration:	Yes No No
Estimated repair costs provided to	owner (N/A for state-owned bridges):	Yes No No NA
Deterioration provided to Load F	Rating Team Leader (Load Rating Team Le	ader may also be the
Inspection Team Leader):		Yes No No
INSPECTED AGENCY COM	MMENTS	
1. Please take this opportu	unity to ask questions or make comments a	bout the State Bridg
Inspection Program.	,	
mopeodorn rogium.		
2 Do the bridge Inspection	Team Members feel they have enough time	/ equipment / training
experience to do their jobs	,	equipment / training
experience to do their jobs	s properly r	

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Example: QA Office Review Form

BRIDGE INSPECTION I PART 2: QA/QC		litv Ass	uran	ce Offic	ce Review	ppendix F - Level I
		,			Bridge No	
SUMMARY OF LEVEL II RE	VIEW COM	IMENTS				
Reviewer's Comments						
Reviewer's Confidence Level	Good				Poor	
terrer s communice zerer		4 🗆	3	□ 2	☐ 1	
Deduction Items:						
-2 If load rating co	mputations or	load rating	summa	ry is not o	n file	
-2 If scour Plan of	Action is requi	ired, but cu	rrent co	py is not o	on file	
 -3 If Critical Defices ince previous inserting 		ntation is n	ot on fi	le, but a (Critical Deficier	ncy was noted
-3 If inspector was	s not a certified	Inspection	Team	Leader at	the time of insp	pection
-1 If not performe 23 months of prev			d (and	the notice	to proceed wa	as given withir
-2 If load rating co	mputations are	e not within	two tor	ns of QAO	value (Stage I	II review only)
(Inspection Team Leader Printed N	ame)	(Inspe	ction Te	am Leader S	Signature)	(Date)
(Quality Control Officer Printed Na	ime)	(Qual	ity Contr	ol Officer S	ignature)	(Date)
(Quality Assurance Officer Printed N	lame)	(Qualit	y Assura	nce Officer	Signature)	(Date)

June 2010 Page 2-F-19



Quality Assurance Peer Field Review

- Ensure proper equipment utilized
- Proper safety measurements utilized
- Coordinate with team leader on schedule and bridge types
- QA officer (QAO) observes team leader
- Evaluation includes time, equipment, safety, access methods and thoroughness
- QAO shall not impede the inspection
- Field performance review form will be completed



Quality Assurance Peer Field Review

- Sampling—Routine Inspections
 - 5 bridges in each district annually
 - > 5 bridges from 12 Counties annually
 - No county reviewed twice within a 4 year cycle
- Sampling—Special Inspections
 - > 1 bridge in each district annually
 - > 1 bridge from 12 Counties annually
 - ➤ No County reviewed twice within a 4 year cycle
- Scoring on peer field review form



Example: Peer Field Review Form

BRIDGE INSPECTION	MANUAL			Appendix G
PART 2: QA/QC		Quality As	surance Pee	r Field Review
APPENDIX G QUAL	ITY ASSURA	NCE PEER FI	ELD REVIEW	
Quality Control Officer:				
Team Leader No.:				
Company/District:	-			
Team Leader:				
Team Leader No.:				
Company/District:	-			
Team Members:				
County:				
County No.:	_			
Bridge No:	-			
NBI No.:				
Road Name:				
Crossing:	-			
Inspection Date:				
Inspection Type:	Routine	Fracture Critical	Underwater	Special
Inspection Start Time:				
Inspection Complete Tim	e:			

June 2010 Page 2-G-20

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Example: Peer Field Review Form

. At	the co	nclusion	s possible of the inc	spection
ow. '	No	N/A	Max Reduc. -15 -10 -20 -10 -10 -5 -10	shall be
]	No	N/A	Max Reduc. -15 -10 -20 -10 -10 -5 -10	
			Reduc15 -10 -20 -10 -10 -5 -20 -20	Score
			Reduc15 -10 -20 -10 -10 -5 -20 -20	Score
			-10 -20 -10 -10 -5 -10	
			-20 -10 -10 -5 -10	
			-10 -10 -5 -10	
			-10 -5 -10	
]			-5 -10	
]	_ 		-10	
]	_		-20	
]				
			40	1
core			-10	
core			Total	

Indiana Bridge Inspection QC/QA Procedures

Page 2-G-22

Example: Peer Field Review Form

June 2010

Fracture Critical/Special Inspection R	eview					
Review each question below and record the so	ore reduction in e	each b	lank be	low. It is	possible	to use a
lower reduction than the maximum possible red	duction listed bel	ow. At	the co	nclusion	of the ins	spection,
add up the reductions and subtract from 100. R	ecord the score	below.	"Yes" a	nd "N/A	" answers	shall be
scored with a zero reduction.						
Performance Review		Yes	No	N/A	Max Reduc.	Score
1. Inspections completed in a thorough man	iner				-15	
2. Bridge cleaned if needed (Part 1 – 4.3.3)					-10	
3. Critical areas inspected					-20	
4. Deficiencies measured					-10	
5. Proper equipment and appropriate salused (Part 1 – 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)	fety measures				-10	
6. 100% hands-on inspection of all members performed (Part 1 – 3.5.2)	nonredundant				-15	
7. Photos taken of deteriorated portions of (Part 4 – 11.6.6)	f the structure				-20	
8. Inspection team has the proper (Part 1 – 2.4)	qualifications				-10	
					Total	
Comments:		Scor	e: 100	_	-	
Cofety Equipment Head/Not Head						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:						

Appendix G



Example: Peer Field Review Form

BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL

PART 2: QA/QC Quality Assurance Peer Field Review							
Underwater Inspection Review							
Review each question below and record the score re	eduction in e	each b	lank be	low. It is	possible	o use	
lower reduction than the maximum possible reduction	on listed bel	ow. At	the co	nclusion	of the ins	pectio	
add up the reductions and subtract from 100. Record	d the score i	below.	"Yes" a	nd "N/A	" answers	shall b	
scored with a zero reduction.							
Performance Review		Yes	No	N/A	Max	Scor	
Safety briefing conducted with emergency in and pre-dive checks	formation			0	Reduc.		
2. Waterline measured to reference point (Part 1 – 3.9.2)	on bridge				-5		
3. All required soundings recorded (Part 1 – 3.9.	2)				-10		
4. Photos taken					-5		
5. All appropriate dive equipment checked and u	sed				-20		
6. Inspection notes recorded					-10		
7. Inspection team has the proper qua (Part 1 – 2.4)	lifications				-20		
					Total		
Safety Equipment Used/Not Used:							
June 2010					Page	2-G-2	
adiid work					rage	2-0-	



Example: Peer Field Review Form

PART 2: QA/Q	C	Quality Assurance Peer Field Revie			
Acceptable Score	es: Any score lower than a	an 80 shall be considered unacceptable.			
Routine Inspection	on Review:				
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □			
Fracture Critical/	Special Inspection R	eview:			
Acceptable	Unacceptable □	N/A □			
Underwater Inspe	ection Review:				
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □			
(Quality Assurance O	fficer Printed Name)	(Quality Assurance Officer Signature) (Dat	e)		

June 2010 Page 2-G-24



Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Field Review

- Ensure consistency of ratings
- Ensures QC efforts are equally effective
- QAO shall inspect without prior knowledge
- Performed within 6 months of team leader's inspection



Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Field Review

Sampling Consideration

- Sufficiency rating
- Bridges needing rehabilitated or replaced
- New structures
- Bridges with critical findings
- Bridges with unusual changes in condition

Sampling—Routine Inspections

- 4 bridges in each district annually
- > 5 bridges from 12 Counties annually
- ➤ No county reviewed twice within 4 years



Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Field Review

- Sampling—Special Inspections
 - > 1 bridge in each District annually
 - > 1 bridge from 12 Counties annually

Scoring provided on QA post-inspection field

review form





BRIDGE INSPECTION	I MANUAL	Appendix F
PART 2: QA/QC	Quality Assurance Post-Inspection	Review Form
APPENDIX H QUAL	ITY ASSURANCE POST-INSPECTION RE	VIEW FORM
Quality Control Officer:		
Team Leader No.:		
Company/District:		
Team Leader:		
Team Leader No.:		
Company/District:		
Team Members:		
County:		
County No.:		
Bridge No:		
NBI No.:		
Road Name:		
Crossing:		
Inspection Date:		
Inspection Type:	☐ Routine ☐ Fracture Critical ☐ Underwater	Special
Inspection Start Time:		
Inspection Complete Tin	ne:	

June 2010 Page 2-H-25



RRIDGE	INSPECTION	IMANIIAI
DRIDGE	INSELCTION	INANUAL

Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

Routine Inspection - Inventory Review - Part 1

Review each question below and record the score reduction in each blank below. At the conclusion of the inspection, add up the reductions and subtract from 100. Record the score below. "Yes" and "N/A" answers shall be scored with a zero reduction.

	Yes	No	N/A	Reduc.	Score
1. Main structure type (43A), main widening type (43C), and approach structure type (44A) correct				-10	
2. Bridge rail and approach coding (36A) acceptable				-10	
3. Required maintenance and repair items properly documented and address deterioration				-10	
4. Load limit (66B) bridge posting in place (66C & 70); if not, is it recommended (41)?				-10	
5. Foundation type acceptable (113B)				-10	
6. "One-Lane Bridge" or "Narrow Bridge" posting in place; if not, is it recommended (51, 28A, 102 & 41)?				-10	
7. Inspection team has the proper qualifications (Part 1 – 2.4)				-20	
				Total	

Score: 100 =	
--------------	--



_								
7	ОП	ACE.	IVIC	DEC	TION	I NAA	NUAL	
		/\7!	11/1/2			VI IVI 🖂	INCIAI	200

Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC

Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

Routine Inspection - Inventory Review - Part 2

Review each question below and record the score reduction in each blank below. At the conclusion of the inspection, add up the reductions and subtract from 100. Record the score below. "Yes" and "N/A" answers shall be scored with a zero reduction.

Measurements	Measurement		w/in ±3"				
	Inspector (Team Leader)	QAO	Yes	No	N/A	Reduc.	Score
1. Max Span Length (48)						-10	
2. Structure Length (50)						-10	
3. Bridge Roadway Width (51)						-10	
4. Vertical Clearance/Deck (53)						-10	
5. Vertical Underclearance (54)						-10	
6. Lateral Clearance (55)						-5	
						Total	

Score:	100-	
	93	



Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC Quality As

Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

Routine Inspection - Condition and Appraisal Review

Condition and Appraisal	Rating	ıs	- 27	w/in ±	1		
	Inspector (Team Leader)	QAO	Yes	No	N/A	Reduc.	Score
Item 58: Deck						-10	
Item 59: Superstructure						-10	
Item 59B: Paint Rating						-5	
Item 60: Substructure						-10	
Item 61: Channel						-10	
Item 62: Culvert						-10	
Item 65: Approach Roadway						-5	
Item 71: Waterway Adequacy						-5	
Item 72: Roadway Alignment						-5	
Item 113A: Scour Critical						-10	
						Total	

Score: 100	_=
------------	----



RDID	CE	INICE	FCT	ION	MA	NUAL	
DKID	UC	плэг	CUL	ION	IVIA	INUAL	_

Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

Fracture Critical/Special Inspection Review

	Yes	No	N/A	Reduc.	Score
1. Correct elements identified (Fracture Critical or Special)				-10	
2. Condition ratings within ±1 for all inspected elements				-10	
3. Fatigue Details correctly identified (Part 4 – 11.6.6)				-10	
4. Reported section loss reasonable (within 10%) (Part 4 – 11.6.6)				-10	
5. All cracks noted (Part 4 – 11.6.6)				-10	
6. Damage to elements documented				-10	
7. Bridge appeared to be cleaned during original inspection (Part 1 $-$ 4.3.3)				-10	
8. Inspection team has the proper qualifications (Part 1 – 2.4)				-20	
				Total	

Score:	100		=	
--------	-----	--	---	--



BRIDGE INSPECTION MANUAL

Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

<u>Underwater Inspection – Inventory Review</u>

	Yes	No	N/A	Max Reduc.	Score
1. Waterline elevation accurately recorded (Part 1 – 3.9)				-10	
2. All required soundings accurately recorded (Part 1 – 3.9)				-15	
3. All required photos obtained and documented (Part 1 – 3.6)				-10	
4. C.B. Material adjacent to Superstructure Units determined (Part 1 – 3.6)				-10	
5. Scour and debris noted (Part 4 – 7.4)				-10	
6. Defects noted with dimensions and section loss				-15	
7. Shoreline conditions noted (Part 4 – 7.4)				-10	
8. Plan view showing bridge configuration with north arrow, flow arrow, shorelines, etc. (Part 1 – 3.6)				-10	
9. Foundation type correct (Item 113B)				-10	
10. Underwater Inspection frequency reasonable				-10	
11. Inspection team has the proper qualifications (Part 1 – 2.4)				-20	
				Total	



BDIDGE	INSPECT	ION	MA	VIIIV	1
BRIDGE	INSPECT	IO N	IVIA	NUA	_

Appendix H

PART 2: QA/QC Quality Assurance Post-Inspection Review Form

<u>Underwater Inspection – Condition and Appraisal Review</u>

Condition and Appraisal	Ratings		Within ± 1				
	Inspector (Team Leader)	QAO	Yes	No	N/A	Reduc.	Score
Item 60: Substructure						-10	
Item 61: Channel						-10	
Item 113A: Scour Critical						-10	
						Total	

Score: 100	
------------	--



PART 2: QA/QC	Quality As	surance Post-Inspection Review Forr
		an 80 shall be considered unacceptable.
Routine Inspection – Acceptable	Unacceptable	v – Part 1: N/A
		N/A
Routine Inspection –	,	
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □
Routine Inspection -	Condition and A	ppraisal Review:
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □
Fracture Critical/Spec	cial Inspection Re	eview:
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □
Underwater Inspection	on – Inventory Re	view:
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □
Underwater Inspection	n – Condition an	d Appraisal Review:
Acceptable	Unacceptable	N/A □
(Quality Assurance Officer I	Printed Name)	(Quality Assurance Officer Signature) (Date)

June 2010 Page 2-H-32



Quality Assurance Closeout

- Peer Field and Post Inspection Review reports discussed with Program Manager
- Annual report will summarize findings
- Corrective actions to inventory data may be necessary



Disqualification and Requalification Process

- Disqualification
 - When making same or similar mistakes
 - Probation
 - Reviewed again
 - > 2nd review finds similar mistakes
 - Secondary probation
 - Reviewed again
 - INDOT will place on probation or disqualify at their discretion



Disqualification and Requalification Process

Reasons for disqualification

- Not notifying bridge owner of critical finding
- Lack of load posting notification
- > Failure to correct findings from QC or QA reviews
- > Recurring miscoded items
- Recurring condition rating deviations
- Dishonest or unethical behavior



Disqualification and Requalification Process

- Requalification Process
 - May requalify after a 2-year period
 - Provide a written report on how to correct deficiencies
 - Placed on probation for 12 months



Contact:

Michael Cox

mcox@B-L-N.com