

**ACEC – INDOT  
BRIDGE INSPECTION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING NO. 6 MINUTES**

December 10, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Mike Cox. Those in attendance were:

Jim Mickler	INDOT, Greenfield District
James Yapp	INDOT, Greenfield District
Bill Dittrich	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Brian Harvey	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Keith Hoernschemeyer	FHWA
Bill Williams	Monroe County Engineer
Michael Cox	Beam, Longest and Neff, L.L.C.
Mike Obergfell	USI Consultants, Inc.
Mary Anne O'Toole	Collins Engineers, Inc.
Jeremy Koonce	Collins Engineers, Inc.
Adam Post	United Consulting Engineers & Architects
Erich Hart	RQAW
Drew Storey	Inspect Tech
Jon Sera	Butler, Fairman and Seufert, Inc.

A meeting agenda had previously been distributed and the following items were discussed:

1. Mike Cox started off the meeting with a brief overview of the agenda.
2. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as written and will be posted on INDOT's website.
3. Bill Dittrich discussed the transfer of current bridge inspection data over to the Inspect Tech Bridge Inspection Data Collection Software. A letter has been sent out requesting that all data be submitted by December 31<sup>st</sup> for inclusion into the new software. INDOT hopes to have the new software up and running by January 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>. INDOT will be hosting some training at the County Bridge Conference on these dates. There is also additional training planned for February at undetermined locations around the state. Bill noted that there are still a few minor errors with the software and there will be more once the software is used for county wide inspections. Most of these errors will have to be worked out as they occur. Bill recommended that this group can discuss the errors and make recommendations on which ones are most critical. The letter requesting data submittals by December 31<sup>st</sup> also requested that all old report books be picked up, corrected, and returned by December 25<sup>th</sup>.
4. Mike Cox discussed the Load Rating Policy Statement. Mike had previously asked the group to review the statement and respond to him with any remarks. The group discussed making a clarification between an INDOT Load Rating Engineer and a Consultant Load Rating Engineer on the county inspection level. The group recommended that the policy statement should reference the Inspection Manual for the definition of who is the Load Rating Engineer. Mike will wait a week or two longer for additional comments from the group. If there are no major corrections or

comments, Mike will finalize the statement and send to Bill Dittrich for distribution early next year. Bill presented to the group the load rating tabs in Inspect Tech. He noted that much of the data fields would not be required at the county inspection level.

5. Drew Storey provided an update on the progress of changes to the Inspect Tech software. Drew displayed that color coded boxes have been added to the input screens next to items that are required. Some of the required data fields will be auto populated with "00" as they do not pertain to county bridges. Bill showed the group some new fields that will be required. They included a contract form which includes Designation Number that will be required for inspection contracts and federal aid bridge projects. Mike Obergfell recommended that additional descriptions be added to the guidelines for the contract form. Bill also noted that team leaders will not have the ability to add or drop special inspection requirements. They will have to request changes through the administrator, which will be Bill Dittrich. Mike Obergfell questioned the ability to include photos of all elements rated a four or less in the new software. He felt that the cover page form in the software would not allow enough room for additional photos. Bill responded that the additional photos will be attached to the bridge file in the program and will not have to be on the cover page. Bill Dittrich discussed future report book submittals. INDOT is planning on having a separate book for the summary tables and the bridge inspection reports. There will be a master list available for each bridge coded with a "Y" for special inspections. There will also be an audit option that shows all changes you have made since the past report. Drew stated that one button will produce the entire report for all bridges in the county. Drew will send out a draft of a county report to Mike Cox for distribution to the group. The group discussed the need for further clarity concerning critical deficiency, critical finding, and maintenance deficiency. Mike Obergfell recommended that the appendix report requirements be reduced due to excess work that he felt shouldn't be required. The group recommended the removal of the required status of Appendix #4 items and that they should be listed as optional. Bill Dittrich reiterated the importance of having all report books submitted as soon as possible to allow approval by the end of the year. Drew Storey stated that Inspect Tech is currently working with INDOT to try to get the server ready for the large number of users required once the system is rolled out for county bridge inspection use. There are concerns due to problems which occurred during the roll out for INDOT bridge inspections. The group discussed the option of shutting off several screen tabs that are not required for county bridge inspections. INDOT does not want to shut off the additional tabs until everyone has had a chance to use the form for six months. Drew Storey handed out a timeline for the bridge inspection collector software (see attachments). The schedule also included tentative dates for training. The group questioned that ability to export data from the collector. Drew stated that you could only query a certain amount of data at a time in the collector. It is possible to export data in the manager version; however the manager is not included in the license package with INDOT at this time. Mike Obergfell recommended that INDOT provide the exported data as was originally promised during the initiation of the movement to the Inspect Tech software. Bill Dittrich will look into a solution to this and report to the group at the next meeting.
6. Mike Cox stated that he attended a meeting with INDOT to discuss changes to the appendix portion of the boiler plate bridge inspection contract. He stated that there was a problem with the amount of funds that would need to be encumbered under the revised draft. A \$20,000 allowance for intermediate inspections in each county

would reduce the amount of funds available for bridge construction projects. The group discussed lowering that amount and setting the dollar amount based on the number of bridges in each county; this would allow for more funds to be available for intermediate inspections in a county with a larger number of bridges in their inventory. Bill Dittrich noted that it is becoming much quicker for a county to get supplemental agreements approved. The group felt that some dollar amount should be included in the appendix for emergency type inspections where there is no time to pursue a supplemental agreement.

7. Mary Anne O'Toole informed the group that Collins is mostly through with the draft of the Bridge Inspection Manual. There are 12 chapters in the standard inspection section. There are 9 chapters in the administrative section. There are another 19 small chapters on non-destructive testing. She would like the group to start reviewing the chapters by December 31<sup>st</sup>. The group recommended that she send out an e-mail with directions on where to download the information and a list of assignments for those in the group to review. Mary Anne will send out assignments to the members of the group before the end of the year.
8. Mike Cox updated the group on the status of the QA/QC chapter for the bridge inspection manual. Mike noted that after the last meeting, Gerald performed a query of all county bridges with a rating of 4 or less, or posted for 10 tons or less. The results showed that a large number of county bridges fall within this category. He suggested that the QC/QA chapter be revised to require a maximum number of 15 to 20 bridges per county requiring a follow up quality assurance visit. Mike Obergfell questioned the wording of section 7.3.2. The group recommended that review be required for a certain percentage of bridges with a set minimum required. The group also discussed whether many of the requirements of the chapter should be mandatory from the start. It appeared that many of the tasks could take a few inspection cycles to get fully in place. The group was specifically concerned with requirements of a second team leader and the building of bridge files with plans and load ratings. Bill noted that this will have an affect on some smaller firms with only one team leader currently in place. Jim Mickler questioned the wording of section 7.2.10. He requested that the term "analysis" be changed in the Fracture Critical Inspection statement. The group then discussed the disqualification process. Keith Hoernschemeyer stated that if an inspector is coming back under requalification, they would be under peer review in the first 12 months.
9. Drew Storey requested that an approval process be developed by the group for making changes in the Inspect Tech Data Collection Software. He recommended that the group review proposed changes and make recommendations to Bill Dittrich.

The next meeting for the ACEC - INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2010, at a location to be determined.

Individuals are invited to comment on items presented in these minutes and/or submit additional topics for discussion at the next meeting. Please e-mail comments to Jon Sera at [jsera@bfsengr.com](mailto:jsera@bfsengr.com).

This meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Prepared by,

Butler, Fairman, and Seufert, Inc.