

**ACEC – INDOT
BRIDGE INSPECTION COMMITTEE**

MEETING NO. 11 MINUTES

September 9, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m. by Mike Cox. Those in attendance were:

Jim Mickler	INDOT, Greenfield District
Gerald Nieman	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Bill Dittrich	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Brian Harvey	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Ron McCaslin	INDOT, Central Office
Kurt Fowerbaugh	Shrewsbury & Associates
Michael Cox	Beam, Longest and Neff, L.L.C.
Mike Obergfell	USI Consultants, Inc.
Mary Anne O'Toole	Collins Engineers, Inc.
John Ashton	Collins Engineers, Inc.
Tony Marino	RW Armstrong
Drew Storey	InspectTech
Jon Sera	Butler, Fairman and Seufert, Inc.

A meeting agenda had been previously 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 discussed. The group was given two weeks to finish reviewing the minutes before they will be posted on INDOT's website.
3. The bridge inspection contract appendices were not discussed at the last LPA Manual Committee that Bill Williams attended. It will be on the agenda for the next meeting of that committee.
4. Gerald Nieman discussed coding issues with navigable waterways. He noted that the coding guide asks if a coast guard permit is required for construction. Bridges in Indiana were previously coded as over a navigable waterway if the waterway was listed on the IDNR list of navigable waterways. Gerald included the coast guard wording to the item 38 description in the database. Bill Dittrich recommended that the coast guard wording be removed from item 38X. John Ashton described the wording of the draft coding guide for these items. The group discussed that the Federal Coding Guide states that if item 38 equals zero, then items 39 and 40 should be zero. Then Gerald discussed how items 51 & 52 need to have values if there is a restriction caused by the structure along the roadway. These had previously been coded as zeros for all underfill structures. The group decided that a process should be implemented for getting changes to the inspection manual. Mary Anne proposed a process similar to the design manual update process. Gerald asked Drew Storey if the inspection software could point out updates to coding changes the first time an inspector codes a certain item. Drew discussed using the inbridges home page to update policy changes.

5. Mary Anne passed around drafts of the bridge inspection pocket guides. These are intended to be a quick reference of the inspection manual for use in the field. The pocket guide displays the minimum amount of work that must be completed in the field. Tony Marino recommended that extensive notes be taken in the field including sketches and descriptions. John Ashton felt that a policy would be required to implement a level of criteria required for field notes. The group agreed that the pocket guide would be a great baseline for all inspectors to make sure items are not being overlooked during the field investigations. Bill Dittrich noted that he had much resistance to requiring detailed inspections in the past. He noted that there has not been enough time or money on INDOT's side, but the new coding guide and manual are good steps in the right direction. Bill has handed out the pocket guide to the district inspectors. Mary Anne is looking for feedback on the pocket guide. Once the guide is reviewed and considered complete, the finished versions will be spiral bound for distribution.
6. The group then discussed the delays in receiving notice to proceed on inspection contracts. Bill recommended that counties get RFP's out at least 9 months in advance of the inspections being due. Mike Oberfell recommended that funding be put in the STIP ahead of time for each county wide bridge inspection. Group agreed that a point of emphasis should be made at the county bridge conference to get started early with the consultant selection process. Ron McCaslin checked with the central office on how this procedure is performed. It appears to be handled differently between different districts and the central office. Group recommended that counties be given a warning to start early, get it done, or suffer the consequences. The group recommended sending out the flow chart of the contract approval procedure as an attachment to this warning to display the complexity of the situation.
7. Mike Oberfell questioned the coding of item 64B as it pertains to load ratings. Bill Dittrich had originally created this item for INDOT to keep track of which bridges had been load rated in Bars or Virtus. There are now two separate 64B's to code. The group questioned how this item is to be coded for county bridges. Consultants are currently being directed to code as 1 for "bridge is load rated, but not up to date." A few of the consultants felt that this coding was not appropriate. Then the consultants asked how to code a load rating summary, instead of an actual calculation. Items 63 and 65 do not allow a code for a load summary. Mike Oberfell volunteered to ask Keith Hoernschemeyer how these should be coded. As of right now, the FHWA does not want to see Items 63 and 65 coded as a 5 for "no rating analysis performed." The group recommended that this topic be highlighted at the county bridge conference. Bill Dittrich and Drew Storey will discuss which boxes should be green on the Load Rating Tabs of the inspection software.
8. Drew Storey discussed the upcoming Bridge Inspection Software upgrade to version 5.2. There is also talks of merging the INDOT and County databases to one server at the same time the upgrade is to happen. The update is tentatively scheduled for around September 15th thru the 17th.
9. Jim Mickler had a question concerning large culvert structures that extended beyond the states right-of-way. He stated that many times a culvert will extend under an adjacent railroad track. He continually finds these structures on the repair or replacement priority list due to deterioration of portions of the structure that are not on INDOT's right-of-way. Jim questioned if the inspection should be limited to only

those portions within INDOT's right-of-way. The group concluded that for National Bridge Inventory purposes, the inspection should only pertain to the portion of the structure that is within the owner's right-of-way. This will keep structures from being programmed for replacement when they shouldn't be.

10. Tony Marino asked if the coding for structures with unknown foundations should be changed to spread footings on soil. Mary Anne recommended that the Inspectors should follow the risk based assessment recommendations in the inspection manual. The group discussed that most consultants are changing coding of structures with unknown foundations to spread foundations if engineering judgment dictates.
11. Jon Sera asked if InspectTech had completed the definitions for the logic behind the summary tables. Drew Storey offered to go over this information after the meeting for those who were interested.

The next meeting for the ACEC - INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. Tuesday, November 9th, 2010, at the Indianapolis Sub-district .

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.

This meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Prepared by,

Butler, Fairman, and Seufert, Inc.