

Bridge Inspector User Group Meeting Minutes

1/22/2015 – SE Regional Office, Waukesha, WI

Agenda

- 1) HSIS Updates – Travis described several of the updates coming in the next installment of HSIS along with other requests
 - a. Putting photos in desired order will come with request to BITS in fall.
 - b. On-complete actions added to HSIS
 - c. Possibility of allowing RBPMs to change construction screen. Will discuss further at the Spring User Group Meeting. Likely needs approval through BITS; looking at summer or fall implementation.
 - d. Activity types
 - i. UWVP removed as activity; will just be performed if necessary.
 - ii. Scour POA, Critical Finding, and Deck Evaluation added.
 - iii. With new update, inspectors will be able to enter activity without having to create a new inspection.
 - e. Larger agreements regarding bridges should be kept in HSIS as we migrate to making HSIS the official bridge file.
 - i. Agreements should be emailed to Travis or Shiv
 - ii. Shiv is working on a separate agreement tab
 - f. Digital Signatures
 - i. WAMS ID will be assigned permissions and will be linked to an inspector ID
 - ii. Travis still making strides with this
 1. Action Item 1
 - a. Assigned to: Travis
 - b. Update at Spring User Group Meeting
 - g. Appraisal Tab will be upgraded to include more information and provide a quick reference without having to open the inspection reports. This will come with new HSIS update coming soon.
 - h. Column Sets
 - i. Utility that will allow you to make a custom set of column headers for any assist queries that you run.
 - ii. Does not work on reports.
 - iii. Coming with new HSIS update.
 - i. Will pictures from previous reports roll over?
 - i. Yes, there will be a box to check upon creating a new inspection
 - j. For initial inspections, is there a way to pre-populate the form with the elements and assessments?
 - i. No template yet.
 - k. Pulling multiple inspections from HSIS at once.
 - i. Go to General Inventory > Files > then check the boxes of inspections you want to pull > click on the “option box” > selected > get
 - ii. Creates a zip file with all selected inspection pdfs in it.
 - l. When entering inspections, there was a desire to be able to enter data in whatever order the inspector wanted.

- i. Travis said he would look into it.
 - 1. Action Item 2
 - a. Assigned to: Travis
 - b. Look into the ability to enter inspection in any order
 - m. There was a desire to be able to query the date of last deck sealing for a subset of structures.
 - i. This seems to require merging information from the construction and maintenance tabs and is likely 6-9 months out for HSIS upgrades.
 - ii. Also, is there an easy way to enter things like this for a collection of structures (Marquette Interchange, for example)?
 - n. The 9999 year on the construction tab
 - i. Can we enter the year that it's expected to be done (or add it)?
 - ii. Do systems use this year field?
 - iii. Travis will follow up during the Spring User Group Meeting
- 2) UWVP and UWP changes
- a. How will these be scheduled?
 - i. UWVP no longer an activity; no need to be scheduled.
 - ii. UWP will remain activity for those structures that are deemed at risk
 - 1. Action Item 3
 - a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - b. Set risk criteria, email out scheduling reports
 - iii. Get Eric to add other activities to scheduling reports
 - b. Will there be separate performance measures for them?
 - i. To be discussed at Spring User Group Meeting
- 3) Previous Action Items
- a. HSIS concerns addressed above
 - b. Activities on HSIS scheduling reports mentioned above (2.a.iii.)
 - c. New scheduling and performance reporting framework rose no concerns
 - d. 12 Month Routine Inspections
 - i. These were highlighted as being full Routine Inspections requiring a qualified inspector.
 - ii. What qualifies as a "full" inspection? Can an inspection still be called routine if only the deck element is checked? Should we really be requiring a full Routine?
 - 1. One alternative could be a required 24 month Interim inspection offset 12 months from the Routine.
 - a. This gets into the confusion of two purposes for one inspection type, although there would be a way to work it in HSIS.
 - iii. How do we feel about non-qualified personnel (not Team Leaders) inspecting the structure? Does that present some risk?
 - 1. Would team members be qualified enough? Even if they were, they wouldn't be able to enter a routine inspection.
 - 2. We have the two week course and a certification process for a reason. If we are truly concerned about these bridges being higher risk, we should be having them inspected via certified inspectors.
 - iv. There are special cases where the 12 month routine inspections may seem inappropriate (cases to be investigated further).

1. Structures requiring snoopers to inspect them will put further pressure on our dwindling Central Office inspection staff.
2. Structures with only an NBI Deck 4 that qualifies them for 12 month inspections. Is NBI Deck 4 really a case of public safety?
3. Border Bridges
- v. RBPMs want clarification on requirements and thresholds.
 1. Action Item 4
 - a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - b. Bring forth a final set of requirements and thresholds for the 12 month routine inspections.
- e. Overburden Change with Re-rate Flag
 - i. Direction from rating unit was to use nearest inch for any overburden change
 - ii. When Re-rate flag is check, who actually re-rates and what gets done?
 - iii. Polymer overlay is 3/8"; if we go to nearest inch then no rerate is required...?
 1. Action Item 5
 - a. Assigned to: Ben
 - b. Check correspondence with Josh and provide a definitive answer at Spring User Group Meeting.
- f. ADT Count and Year update
 - i. There was the thought of updating local ADTs based on a linear percent increase per year and just changing the year to 2015.
 - ii. Another option was the old standby of "count the mailboxes in the area and multiply by 10".
 - iii. A main goal of this is not to create more work. We don't want inspectors spending all their time gathering and updating ADT data.
 - iv. If we could get our inspectors (locals and consultants) to check these for reasonability during inspections that would be great. Kind of hard to enforce though.
 1. Action Item 6
 - a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - b. Create a method that will result in updated ADT data. Run thoughts through RBPMs prior to Spring User Group Meeting
- g. Example Procedures for special inspections (Fracture Critical, Dive, Lift/Movable)
 - i. These will be included in the new Structures Manual Update that is currently taking place.
 - ii. Currently Dive procedures seem to be in good shape, while the FC and Movable still need some work.
 - iii. Broadly, what should be included (and this is not exhaustive) would be things such as equipment used, what inspectors should specifically be looking for, commentary, hazards, site considerations and conditions, and contact info.
 1. Note that contact info should be kept current.
 - iv. Cass Street Bridge inspection was a good example that Rick Marz mentioned
 - v. This procedure can be included in one of two ways (or both)
 1. In the inspection form itself –OR–
 2. Attached as a pdf
- h. Effectiveness defect language
 - i. No new information
- i. Coding delams in deck with overlays

- i. If the seal is a good seal on a delam/spall should it be coded as CS1 or CS2?
 - ii. How will this affect the deterioration curve?
 - iii. One possibility was to say that if it was milled/overlaid it should go CS1, otherwise CS2.
 - iv. Although it could just be based on inspector experience and discretion.
 - j. Digital Signatures
 - i. Covered in HSIS updates above
 - k. Region access to Inspection Manual updates
 - i. It seemed as though those that wanted access got it.
 - l. Bridge Stenciling
 - i. Ben still needs to follow up with Julie Brooks regarding the information she has already put together.
 - 1. Action Item 7
 - a. Assigned to: Ben
 - b. Start making headway with stenciling guidelines and possible details to be included on new projects.
 - ii. Who is the intended audience? Is it for the public calling in an accident? Or is it for County, State, and First Responder employees?
 - iii. In the SE region in particular, there is pressure to keep the stenciling discrete to the public.
 - iv. Should the B-/P- be included? What about county code?
 - m. Late Reasons for inspections
 - i. Suggested to add Railroad Coordination, Resource Limitations (instead of Inspector Availability), Under Construction, and lumping Inspector Error in with Admin Error.
 - ii. List will be discussed again for finalization at Spring User Group Meeting.
- 4) Critical Findings Policy
 - a. Talk with Travis to see if we could get HSIS to prompt procedure when CF activity is checked.
 - b. Incident Types
 - i. Urgent
 - ii. Severe
 - iii. Significant
 - iv. Follow-up
 - 1. Where does type 4 go? Should it still be uploaded?
 - a. Still upload it.
 - c. Example for good implementation of this policy would have been for when significant section loss is discovered in girders.
 - i. Start by making the appropriate contacts.
 - ii. Track what you do and why you do it.
 - iii. Rating Unit comes back with a Re-rate (if necessary)
 - iv. Closeout
 - d. Closeout is the biggest driving factor behind implementing this policy. What happens when we find something notable in the field? We shouldn't just be noting that we got a call; we should also be noting the result of the inquiry/critical finding.
 - e. Several RBPMs noted concern that terms didn't necessarily marry what was published through the RIMC Field Guide that just came out.

- f. Will this Critical Findings Report be a DT form or just something we have posted on the Extranet site?
 - g. Action Item 8
 - i. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - ii. By the Spring User Group Meeting, have a more finalized copy to present after incorporating things discussed at this meeting and after further internal discussions.
- 5) Performance Measures
- a. 12-month versus 24-month Routine Inspections
 - i. Should these be reported separately because of risk implications or together because they are Routine Inspections?
 - b. Border Bridges
 - i. RBPMs expressed interest in making these separate measures?
 - c. Closed Bridges
 - i. They do not currently show up and it was agreed they should not show up on performance reports at any point in the future.
 - ii. Main cause for discussion was to bring awareness that these structures are still out there and should be removed (before they become threatened by collapse).
 - d. Action Item 9
 - i. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - ii. Determine best reporting methods for performance measures.
- 6) Program Manager Responsibilities Policy
- a. Who is responsible to inspect "Other State Agency" bridges?
 - i. That state agency.
 - ii. Couldn't it possibly affect the travelling public and therefore be our concern?
 - iii. FHWA does not expect us to inspect these structures.
 - b. What about Pedestrian Bridges that go over our facilities?
 - i. They should be inspected because a failure would affect public safety.
 - ii. No FHWA or State requirement on these; just a recommendation.
 - iii. A majority of these are getting inspected even without the requirement.
 - c. Over-clearances on Pedestrian or Private Structures
 - i. Some buildings have skywalks that go over public roads.
 - 1. How should these obstructions be captured for permitting purposes?
 - ii. Not all pedestrian bridges (if any) have over-clearance data in HSIS and again pose a threat to the permit process and perhaps public safety.
 - d. What responsibilities do RBPMs have? What can they cause to be done?
 - e. Action Item 10
 - i. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - ii. Reproduce draft document on PM Responsibilities and prepare to finalize draft.
- 7) Quality Control
- a. Who can perform a QC check?
 - i. Can a PM QC his own work if he is also the Team Leader?
 - ii. Would a Highway Commissioner be knowledgeable enough to provide an acceptable QC check?
 - iii. Can a Team Member QC check a Team Leader?
 - b. What form can Quality Control come in?
 - i. What have Feds accepted from other states?

- ii. Dave Bohnsack performs QC by signing all state inspections in his region. He looks at all NBIs and reads a representative sample.
 - 1. Only RBPM to do something that in-depth
 - iii. Al Bjorklund used to switch structures each cycle and spot-check Dan Harrington's work.
 - iv. Is it something that is done each inspection year? Twice during the year?
 - v. Possibilities on forms of QC?
 - 1. Certain percentage of program reviewed
 - 2. Switch inspectors/consultants each cycle for different set of eyes
 - 3. PMs from other counties/regions review inspection
 - c. How is Quality Control defined?
 - i. What constitutes a QC check?
 - ii. Possibilities
 - 1. NBI Numbers
 - 2. Element Accuracy
 - 3. Photos and Documentation
 - 4. Condition State Quantities
 - 5. Maintenance Actions
 - 6. Combination of above?
 - d. How do we get the Counties to follow through with this QC procedure? The state seemingly has no "hammer" besides the fact that it is a good business practice to ensure that you produce quality products.
 - i. Should we offer options for QC programs at the local level and let them pick the form of QC that they want to use?
 - ii. We should look for feedback from locals on what they want/do for QC.
 - e. Maybe somewhere down the line, we could build into HSIS a series of completions; one for inspector completion, one for QC completion.
 - f. Action Item 11
 - i. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
 - ii. Come up with a draft or an idea of the direction the State wants to proceed with in regards to its QC Program Requirements.
- 8) Next year's PCA
 - a. During the Spring User Group Meeting discuss the possibility of implementing an inspection submission timeline.
- 9) Snooper Help
 - a. What are the NDT and snooper needs that Joel historically filled for the Regions?
 - b. Action Item 12
 - i. Assigned to: RBPMs
 - ii. Gather list of structures with NDT/snooper needs, hours needed per structure, proposed dates of inspection, and scope of work.