

**ACEC – INDOT
BRIDGE INSPECTION COMMITTEE**

MEETING NO. 7 MINUTES

March 2, 2010

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

Jim Mickler	INDOT, Greenfield District
Gerald Nieman	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Debbie Lewis	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Bill Dittrich	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Brian Harvey	INDOT, Planning and Production Division
Bruno Canzian	INDOT, Local Programs
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
Jeremy Shaffer	Inspect Tech
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. Mike Cox updated the group on the changes to the draft boilerplate inspection contract. Mike has coordinated with Jody Coblenz to allow a contingency amount into each contract. The group concluded that a contingency of \$10,000 would be a sufficient amount for most circumstances. The group also agreed that the contingency amount should be the same for each county. Bruno will meet with Jody again after this meeting to finalize some of the details concerning these changes to the contracts. Bruno noted that INDOT should start getting an estimate for all county wide bridge inspections into the TIP before the contracts are submitted. This would reduce the time needed to receive a notice-to-proceed for each contract. Mike Obergfell suggested that in item 5D of the draft contract, the "negotiated hourly rate" be changed to INDOT approved hourly rate with overhead. The group agreed that any non-routine inspection as described in item #5 would cost more than the cost per bridge in item #4a. Bruno noted that all purchase orders are completed at the district level. Bruno requested that the proposed contract changes be reported to the districts. Bruno noted that an extra \$920,000 should be encumbered, \$10,000 per each county, or approximately \$250,000 per year over a four year period. Bill Dittrich stated that there needs to be more coordination between the districts and the central office in regards to county wide bridge inspections. The LPA consultant Manager needs to send an e-mail of notice-to-proceed to the county and central office. Bruno recommended that counties start the RFP process 6 to 9 months in advance of the

oldest inspection date. This would help ensure that the inspections are done on time. Bruno stated that the STP is set by INDOT Programming and an allocation has to be in the STP before the FMS can be approved. Bruno would like to get an estimated amount of funds in the STP so that the FMS approval would be more mechanical and quicker. Bridge inspection funds must be in the STP, not necessarily in the TIP. Mike Obergfell mentioned that at the last Team Indiana Meeting, issues with bridge inspections were brought up. He was not for sure what the issues were and the group was not aware of possible issues either. Mike will continue to try and find out what the possible issues are and what the Executive Committee was alluding to. Mike recommended that Bruno inform the Executive Committee of increasing bridge inspection costs. The group concluded that this discussion should involve the issues of non-compliance and loss of federal funding. LTAP recently called Bill Dittrich asking for fee ranges for bridge inspections. Mike Obergfell is putting together a presentation for Road School concerning this topic. The fees that he will present are \$800 to \$1200 per routine inspection, \$1,400 to \$10,000 plus for fracture critical inspections, and \$2,600 to \$4,000 per bridge for an underwater inspection. He will note in his presentation that these costs can be highly variable depending on the bridges to be inspected. Bill Dittrich also noted that inspection costs will also likely go up as more extensive cleaning of bridges will be required for inspection work. This will have to be done to remain in compliance with the new inspection manual. Mike Obergfell will draft a letter to the county commissioners from ACEC to help make them more aware of rising bridge inspection costs. Bill noted that a plan needs to be developed to deal with unknown foundations. He stated that Inspect Tech has an item to code an unknown foundation as high, low, or moderate risk. This item is further discussed in item 5 of these minutes.

4. Mary Anne O'Toole updated the group on the progress of the Bridge Inspection Manual. Collins will wait for two more weeks to hear comments back from this group before they finalize the manual. Mary Anne discussed several items in the manual that still are questionable. The manual does not distinguish between a phase 1 or phase 2 inspection. Federal guidelines require the same level of inspection every 24 months. The group questioned the need to perform inventory work every routine inspection, as measurements rarely change. Less man hours are required for phase 2 inspections due to less inventory work and much of the work to prepare the reports has already been done. Jeremy Shaffer agreed that there should be a reference to the inspection type in the collection module. The group also discussed load ratings. There were several questions concerning the frequency of performing load ratings, liability, reuse of old load ratings from previous cycles, and if the team leader should be responsible for the load ratings. The group suggested that there should be a flag mechanism for the inspection team leader to request an update from the load rating engineer. The load rating chapter prepared by RQAW will be forwarded to the committee for review. The group then discussed the submittal and approval process. Further clarification will need to be made on the specifics of the submittal and approval process for individual inspections as well as county wide inspections. The inspection manual requires a 12 month inspection frequency for special inspections on bridges that are posted for load or have low ratings. This is in reference to item 91 of the coding guide. The group determined that this would have a dramatic effect on some counties that have a lot of poor bridges. The group recommended that a set guideline be placed in the manual for these bridges. Bill Dittrich suggested that the committee may need to look at increasing the inspection frequency for bridges that meet certain criteria and are in much better condition. Bill noted that guidelines

would have to be developed for all bridges in the state for increased routine inspection frequencies to be accepted. The group requested guidance on report requirements for complex, special, fracture critical, and underwater inspections. INDOT inspectors are not meeting the required level of reporting at this point. The group agreed that inspection report requirements should be the same for state and county bridges. Bill Dittrich noted that special inspections can include damage conditions, but if the whole bridge is deteriorated the routine inspection frequency should be reduced.

5. Bill Dittrich stated that the meeting minutes from this committee are going to be moved to a new address. He is going to try and make them easier to find. Drew Storey recommended that a link to the minutes be put on the IN Bridges. From this point forward the minutes will be sent to Gerald Nieman for posting on the INDOT website. The minutes will be approved as written if no comments or changes are requested within 2 weeks of their distribution to the committee. There were several members of the committee worried about the security of the bridge inspection data. There are large amounts of users accessing the software using the CO Public password. Inspect Tech and INDOT are worried about security and access to working documents. Bill Dittrich is also worried about the Scour Critical Plans of Action that were completed last year. This data is spread around quite a bit in the collector and is not very easy to access. Bill has mapped the location of this data as it appears in the Inspect Tech Software. The group agreed that this map will need to be made available to all team leaders.
6. Bill Dittrich discussed the recent FHWA review. The QC/QA process is progressing and implementation is expected in June for INDOT inspectors and July for county inspectors. There will be a delay period before the QC/QA requirements are implemented on the county level. The inspection manual is expected to be completed by June 1st. Load ratings are done except for many underfill structures that were unable to be load rated. Item #63 and #65 are codes for the method of load rating. There are 9700 bridges on the county level that are coded a 5 for "No Rating Analysis Performed". This could lead to funding suspensions if not updated to a required rating method.
7. Bill Dittrich will draft a memo for scour assessment at unknown foundations. This will address the determination of high, low, or medium risk for these structures. The group discussed risk factors such as school bus routes. It was decided that school bus routes aren't widely known and can change; therefore, they should not be included in the risk factor determination. Bill noted that there is still a problem with clearances in the Inspect Tech software. A complete error check displayed several errors with this coding.
8. The group discussed the implementation of a small task force for the roll-out of the Inspect Tech software. The task force would be comprised of the consultants from this group and Drew Storey of Inspect Tech. The task force would meet to discuss recommendations to bring forward to this group for approval. This would hopefully reduce the agenda and lengthiness of future meetings of this group. The task force will meet before the next meeting of this group. Mike Obergfell recommended that all team leaders and team members that are going to be using the software attend Road School and bring their laptops.

9. The group would like to continue the discussion of the approval process at the next meeting. Many in the group felt that this still needs further clarification. Several in the group questioned whether the approval process was being used in place of the QC/QA program. It is also unclear if the original inspector should be able to approve a report. The group felt that the QC/QA process should be only for a certain percentage of bridges and not each and every bridge inspected. It is still unclear where Gerald and Debbie's review will fit into the approval process. Jeremy Shaffer walked the group through the current approval process. Right now, Gerald and Debbie are out of the approval process. They would just have time to review and disapprove with comments. Once their time limit for review is up, the report would be considered approved.

The next meeting for the ACEC - INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 16th, 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 3:00 p.m.

Prepared by,

Butler, Fairman, and Seufert, Inc.