Bridge Inspector User Group Meeting Minutes

4/21/2015 – Campbell Town Hall, La Crosse, WI

Agenda

1) Previous Action Items
   a. HSIS updates
      i. RBPMs to have the ability to change the construction screen information based upon and IP database update that will likely occur in late fall/early winter of 2015.
      ii. HSIS currently has the capability to handle Digital signatures, but Central Office still needs to work out finer points of policy and legality.
         1. Action Item 1
            a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
            b. Produce a policy and implementation plan for Digital Signatures
      iii. The Sandbox in HSIS was discussed as the forum in which to load/email yourself a subset of bridge inspections. It has become more difficult under the new system because file sizes are drastically larger. Questions were also raised on when/how to get inspection photos from prior inspections to carry over to a new created one.
         1. Action Item 2
            a. Assigned to: Travis
            b. Travis said he would produce a couple write-up documents to lay out a step-by-step procedure and upload to HSIS quick links.
      iv. This "Agreement" folder would be placed in the files hierarchy within the Files tab in HSIS. It would be used to house agreements concerning railroads, utilities, bordering states/programs, and most importantly contracts from locals who hire out PM duties.
         1. Action Item 3
            a. Assigned to: Shiv
            b. Continue effort to establish this hierarchy within our filing system.
      v. There was a hope as part of the Critical Finding initiative that an auto-prompt in HSIS would pop-up instructing/refreshing the inspector on how to proceed with filing a Critical Finding. Travis said HSIS definitely will be capable to doing such a task. Details would be worked out as the Critical Findings Policy became finalized.
      vi. How to code Feature Under and Feature On (1-way vs 2-way). For structures like IH 90 EB and WB, when divided by a barrier or a pier or if on different structures, how should the traffic pattern be coded in SIA items?
         1. Action Item 4
            a. Assigned to: Travis
            b. Follow up with FHWA on guidelines for how they want it coded.
   b. Activities for Inspections
      i. There was discussion regarding the differences between how HSIS handles box culvert aprons vs normal bridge abutments. We agreed that scour defect

should be applicable to elements outside of just those in the substructure (241-Reinforced Concrete Culvert, for example). Updates will be made. Another feature to be added is an extra column in the history or frequency tab showing the date of the next required inspection.

ii. Central Office will internally evaluate the potential of running separate performance measures for Activities as there was no strong opinion one way or the other from the rest of the group.

iii. There was a desire to update/enhance the current scheduling report to show each structure only once and would include a column of all required activities due upon the next inspection.

1. Action Item 5
   a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
   b. Work out details of implementing this enhancement

c. 12-month Routine inspections

i. For those structures who qualify for 12 month Routine inspections based solely on having a Deck NBI of 4, would we be comfortable leaving them go for 24 months?? Some RBPMs stated that performing a <u>full</u> Routine inspection seemed perhaps excessive given that it was only a deteriorated deck and that major failures would not occur. Could it be possible to do "off-cycle partial Routines" in which only the problematic details would be inspected? While this was discussed, it seemed that for the general case the entire structure should still be inspected. This point was supported by the fact that the inspector will already be at the structure, so the extra time to inspect (for most cases) would be minimal in comparison to the travel time. Additionally, keeping performance metrics on partial vs full Routines was not much different than the Interim/Posting performance measures (which was one driving factor to moving to the new requirement). Central Office's goal was to produce a program-wide policy despite the fact that we realize that exceptions to this statewide policy will exist. Therefore, Central Office is very open to discussion regarding exceptions for particular cases. A good example would be a border bridge with only a Deck NBI of 4. The amount of resources required to do a Full Routine clearly don't sync with the perceived risk we have for the structure.

ii. Operating under the notion that the thoroughness of the Routine inspections was not likely to change, discussion arose regarding the "harshness" of the NBI Quick Assessment Chart for NBI Deck Rating (Page 151 of the Field Manual). Many wondered where the thresholds came from and who created them. There didn't seem to be a solid answer. Questions also came up regarding the difference between Debonding and Delamination in its effect on NBI rating.

1. Action Item 6
   a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
   b. Look into the history of the Table on Page 151 and where those thresholds came from
2. Action Item 7
   a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
   b. Should debonding be treated differently than delamination as it pertains to the NBI rating of the Deck

iii. How will the On-Complete Actions, which change the frequency, be affected by the eventual change to having activities entered without an inspection? For

example, if a bring is inspected in May, checked for re-rate, and subsequently requires a posting, then a Load Posting Verification Form is required. In the future this form will be able to be uploaded as an activity without requiring and inspection. However if this structure now qualifies for a 12 month Routine, it won't automatically be fixed to do so in HSIS because an inspection was never completed.

1. Action Item 8
   a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
   b. Consider ways to mitigate this concern

iv. The report in HSIS for 12 month Routine Inspections comes back with inaccurate results for the whole state and does not allow for each program to query their program to double check.

1. Action Item 9
   a. Assigned to: Travis
   b. Travis will clean up the 12 month Routine inspection report and also hide it from HSIS users given that the list requiring 12 month inspections is something that will be housed and maintained by Central Office

d. Overburden Change
   i. Thin polymer overlays that are not part of projects already requiring WisDOT to rerate, should include 0.5" for the overburden of that wearing surface.
   ii. For other wearing surfaces (namely asphalt and concrete) rounding to the nearest inch was adequate.
   iii. HSIS has the capability to enter overburden in tenth inch increments but the rating unit is unlikely to ever desire information be that refined.
   iv. This topic will be discussed at the next WCHA meeting.

e. ADT Years and Counts
   i. Central Office came up with a process for updating out-of-date ADTs. An automated run of the system will change the ADT for any count that is more than 5 years old. ADTs will be increased by a factor of 0.5% per year from the last year on file to 2015 (when it is updated). Exceptions to this update will be those bridges that service dead-end roads.
   ii. This topic will be discussed at the next WHCA meeting.

f. Bridge Stenciling

g. Late Reasons for inspections in HSIS
   i. Anything to consolidate/add?
      1. Action Item 10
         a. Assigned to: RBPMs
         b. Send Ben K. your list of Late Reasons you believe should be available in HSIS.

h. Critical Findings Policy
   i. Currently the policy is targeted for both State and Locally-Owned bridge structures. It does not currently apply to Ancillary structures but in our changing program it may eventually expand to encompass those structures. There was a thought to perhaps change the current verbiage from "bridge" to "structure" to allow that wiggle room in future interpretation.
   ii. Discussion continued regarding the notification and submittal process. It was reiterated that the following people should be notified prior to any entry in

HSIS: Statewide Program Manager, Assistant Statewide Program Manager, FHWA Bridge Engineer, Rating Engineer, Regional Bridge Program Manager, and County Program Manager (if a Local structure). For the submittal process, we discussed the timeline for entering information both on the Critical Findings report and in HSIS as it related to Inspection types to be entered. The thought was to first enter a Damage inspection checking the CF activity and attaching the beginning of the CF report. Then there would be a close-out inspection, likely an Interim, with the CF activity again checked. This close-out would document fixes as well as include the finalized CF report.

1. Action Item 11
    a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
    b. Finalize policy with emphasis on procedure and timeline of entry of information.

i. Performance Measures
   i. Regional input regarding having separate performance measures for 12 month versus 24 month Routine inspections was limited.
   ii. Regional PMs seemed okay with the idea of running border bridges as a separate set of performance measures seeing as how its not always WisDOT responsibility to inspect a structure on time (due to Border Bridge agreements)
   iii. Central will pursue the topic internally in the future.

j. Program Manager Responsibilities
   i. The main goal was of this initiative was to ensure that the Program Managers were following the responsibilities laid out in the SIM. Part of that includes an element of Quality Control which will be discussed in the next topic. The other part dealt with the delegation of PM duties to a Consultant. In the SIM, there exists verbiage that states a document must be on file that represents the binding agreement between local entity and consultant for the PM services being provided. Central Office would like to house these files and will therefore take the lead on this initiative.

1. Action Item 12
    a. Assigned to: Central Office Staff
    b. Come up with a filing system for and a communication plan to receive the agreements as described above.

k. Quality Control Policy Draft Discussion
   i. Does QC mean the PM has to review all inspection reports? A certain percentage of them? If so, what are they looking for? Would that necessarily establish quality? Should we instead suggest a certain number of inspections be participated in by another inspector? Who would that inspector be? How does that get paid for?
   ii. What qualifies as Quality Control? Is it the process and training that is established to do inspections? How does Joe Balice define QC for us?

1. Action Item 13
    a. Assigned to: Rick Marz
    b. Follow-up with Joe Balice and find out examples or criteria for what a Quality Control Program should entail/encompass

l. NDT/Snooper needs Consultant
   i. Regional PMs need to send their list of bridges that they need a consultant for in place of Joel. This list should be sent to Ben Koeppen.

        ii.   It would be nice if HSIS was able to track those who participate as Team Members on inspections. This would better help us assess the statewide impact that our snooper operators have.

   m. Excessive Inspections

        i.   Ben sent out lists last month asking for follow-up from Regional PMs regarding inspectors in their region performing an excessive amount of inspections in a day. For each instance Central Office wanted a response on whether or not the PM was comfortable with the quality of work they were seeing. Ben will follow-up again with those Regional PMs who have yet to respond.

2) Activity in HSIS for MIC testing?

   a. No formal discussion

3) Tablet update

   a. No formal discussion

4) Movable Procedures

   a. We need to have inspection procedures on file for all special inspection types (UWD, FC, and Movable).