

**Quality Assurance Review**  
**National Bridge Inspection Standards &**  
**Bridge Maintenance Program**

**Monroe County**

**April 21, 2022**

By: Mark Sherman, PE  
CEAO Federal Bridge QA/QC Engineer

The scope of this review is to evaluate the agency's bridge inspection program based upon The Ohio Revised Code, the ODOT Manual of Bridge Inspection (MBI), and the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS). This includes the following checklist, interviews with staff members responsible for the inspection program, review of files and documentation, and field inspection of bridges. Note: the inspection program includes inventory, maintenance and load rating in addition to the field inspections.

Agency Reviewed: Monroe County Engineer

Checklist completed by: Amy Zwick/Jason Popa Date: 3/14/2022

***I. MAINTENANCE, REHABILITATION AND REPLACEMENT PROGRAM***

**A. NUMBER OF BRIDGES WITH MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY**

1. Greater than 20' long (NBIS length 23CFR 650c) (Metric 22) **113**
2. Bridges >= 10' and <= 20' long (Metric 22)      65

**B. PROCEDURES AND BUDGET**

**1. Contract repairs and replacement per year**

- List typical work items

Replacements: Number:    Culverts:      Bridges:   1    
Rehabilitations: Number :    Culverts:      Bridges:   <1    
Maint.Contracts Number :    Culverts:      Bridges:   0  

-List approximate annual budget:     \$175,000    

- Are Fed Funds used?      Yes   X      No
- Are Credit Bridge funds used?    Yes         No   X

**2. In-house repairs and replacements**

Replacements: Number: Culverts: \_\_\_\_\_ Bridges: <1  
Rehabilitations: Number: Culverts: \_\_\_\_\_ Bridges: <1  
Maint.Contracts Number: Culverts: \_\_\_\_\_ Bridges: 3

- List approximate annual budget \$50,000

3. How are projects identified and selected? Check all that apply.

- Inspection reports.  
 Sufficiency rating.  
 Growth/development.  
 Other...explain \_\_\_\_\_

4. How are plans developed for emergency repairs? Check all that apply.

- In-house  
 Consultant  
 Contractor  
 Other explain \_\_\_\_\_

5. Who does the work of emergency repairs? Check all that apply.

- In house  
 Contractor  
 Other explain \_\_\_\_\_

6. How is repair work documented? (i.e. work record, time card, plans?)

- Work orders  
 Time Cards  
 Plans

7. Who is empowered to order emergency road closures and how is it done?

- Engineer – Notification to other empowered parties & EMA director  
 Sherriff– Notification to other empowered parties & EMA director  
 Commissioners– Notification to other empowered parties & EMA director

## **II. INSPECTION PROGRAM**

### **A. NUMBER OF BRIDGES WITH INSPECTION RESPONSIBILITY**

1. Greater than 20' long (NBIS length, ORC 5501.47, 5543.20) (Metric 22) 113

2. Between 10' and 20' long (ORC 5501.47, 5543.20) (Metric 22) 65

### **B. STAFFING**

1. Name of individual who is the **Program Manager** (makes FINAL DECISION). List qualifications/yrs. experience (bridge inspection experience)

(Metric 1&2)

- Name: Amy Zwick, Monroe County Engineer

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: 8

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) \_\_\_\_\_

Bridge Inspection Level 1 & 2 – 2008, Bridge Inspection Refresher Training – 6/18/2019

2. Name of individual in charge of bridge inspection unit (**Reviewer**). List qualifications/yrs. experience (bridge inspection experience) (Metric 1)

- Name: Consultant Charles Jason Popa, PE

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: 30

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) see attached resume

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. **Team Leader** - individual in charge of bridge inspection team (INSPECTED BY). List qualifications/yrs. experience (bridge inspection experience)

(Metric 1&3)

- Name: Consultant Charles Jason Popa, PE

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: 30

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) see attached resume

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**C.** Indicate the percentage of time spent on the listed duties in the previous year

%TIME on inspections:

100 Bridge/Culvert inspection

\_\_\_\_\_ Bridge Design/Plan prep

\_\_\_\_\_ Bridge Construction

\_\_\_\_\_ Bridge Maintenance

\_\_\_\_\_ Overload/Superload \_\_\_\_\_ 100%  
\_\_\_\_\_ Surveying  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other -

**4. Load Rating Engineer** – Name of individual responsible for load ratings (must be PE) (Metric 4)

a. List Ohio PE # 60606 b. Name Charles Jason Popa

**5. Underwater Bridge Inspection Diver** – Name person doing dive inspections (Metric 5)

- Name: N/A

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: \_\_\_\_\_

- List courses attended (& approx dates) \_\_\_\_\_

**D. INSPECTION EQUIPMENT**

1. Type of vehicle used for inspections

- Pickup truck
- Van
- SUV
- Custom vehicle

2. What typical inspection equipment does the inspection team normally carry with them to the inspection site? Check all that apply.

Extension Ladder	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Length 24'	First Aid Kit	<input type="checkbox"/>
6' Folding Rule	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wire Brush	<input type="checkbox"/>
100' Fiberglass Tape	<input type="checkbox"/>	Calipers	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geologist Hammer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Shovel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inspection Mirror	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screw Driver	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flashlight	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pliers	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thermometer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wrenches	<input type="checkbox"/>
Plumb Bob	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sounding Chains	<input type="checkbox"/>
Camera	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hip Boots and Waders	<input type="checkbox"/>
2'-0" Level	<input type="checkbox"/>	Paint Stick/Crayon	<input type="checkbox"/>
Brush Hook/Axe	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scraper	<input type="checkbox"/>
Boat	<input type="checkbox"/>	Probing Rod	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Vertical Clearance Rod	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other equipment not listed above \_\_\_\_\_ I use a canoe when high water dictates the use. \_\_\_\_\_

3. List types of NDT methods used? Circle all that apply.

Dye penetrant; Magnetic particle; Ultrasound; Other \_\_\_\_\_

5. What equipment does your team have available for "hands on" access to FCM bridge members? (Metric 16)

A complete set of single rope climbing gear and an offset bracket.

6. Use of equipment (Metric 16)

a. How many bridges need a snooper? none \_\_\_\_\_

b. How many bridges is it used on? none \_\_\_\_\_

c. How often? N/A \_\_\_\_\_

## E. INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Approximately how many inspections were made during last calendar year? (Metric 6)

2. Approximately how many inspections are scheduled for the current calendar year? (Metric 6)

3. Average number of inspections per day **17** (Metric 6)

4. Approximately how long (hours) does it take to inspect average sized structures

a. Beam/Girder: Simple Span: 0.50 hrs. Multi-span: 1.0 hrs.

b. Slab bridge: Simple Span: 0.5 hrs. Multi-span: 0.5 hrs.

c. Truss (pony): Simple Span: 1.0 hrs. Multi-span: 2.0 hrs.

d. Through/deck): Simple Span: 1.0 hrs. Multi-span: 2.0 hrs.

e. Culvert: Single cell 0.25 hrs. Multiple Cells: 0.25 hrs.

5. Are previous inspection reports available at site for review? (Yes  No  )  
(Metric 15)

Are bridge inspections recorded in field on Paper, or Electronically, or **Both**?

Are photos available for every bridge? (Yes  No  ) (If no, you need to start.)

Are photos posted in Assetwise? (Yes  No  ) (If no, you need to start, and be selective.)

Are defects photos taken during inspection? (Yes  No  ) (If no, you need to start.)

Are Bridge comments recorded in Assetwise? (Yes  No  ) (If no, you need to start.)

Are previous bridge comments brought to the bridge? (Yes  No  ) (If no, why not)

6a. Are the bridge plans carried to the bridge site for review? (Metric 15). (Yes  No  )

6b. Are bridge records available for review in the bridge office? (Metric 15). (Yes  No  )

7. Who determines the need for a routine inspection frequency greater than once Annually, and what criteria is used? (Metric 6)

Explain: \_\_\_ County Engineer per bridge inspector's recommendation. Criteria based on deterioration of load carrying members.

---

8. Do you have bridges requiring inspection more frequently than 12 Months? (Yes  No  )

\_\_0\_\_ Number due to **Damage** \_\_\_\_\_ List frequency of inspection. (Metric 11)\_\_\_

\_\_0\_\_ Number needing **In-depth** \_\_\_\_\_ List frequency of inspection. (Metric 11)\_\_\_

\_\_0\_\_ Number of **Special insp.** \_\_\_\_\_ List frequency of inspection. (Metric 11)

9. Does your inspection team believe it has enough time to do the job? (Yes  No  )

10. List your quality assurance checks made during the inspection process? (Metric 20)

Each inspection is gone over 3 separate times, once in the field, once when the data is entered into Assetwise and once when the inspection is reviewed

11a. Do you have any bridges that need underwater inspections in less than 60-month intervals? (Metric 8)

Yes \_\_\_ No X (Assetwise check)

12a. Do any bridges have fracture critical inspections performed more frequently than 24-month intervals? (Metric 10)

Yes \_\_\_ No X (Assetwise check)

13. Is a Team Leader at the bridge at all times during the following inspections? (Metric 12)

Initial Inspection? (Yes X No \_\_\_)

Routine Annual Inspections? (Yes X No \_\_\_)

Special Inspections? (Yes X No \_\_\_)

Underwater Inspections? (Yes X No \_\_\_)

Fracture Critical Inspections? (Yes X No \_\_\_)

**F. SCOUR CRITICAL BRIDGES (Guidance in ODOT Manual of Bridge Inspection)**

1. No. of bridges considered scour susceptible? (Service over Water) Number 100%.

2. Number of bridges inspected by probing? Number 25%.

3. Number of Scour Critical bridges (item 113 - 3, 2, 1 or 0)? (Metric 18) Number 0.

4. Are Plans of Action (POA) complete and implemented for all bridges coded "Scour Critical"? (Metric 18) Yes X No \_\_\_ If no, Why? N/A

5. How many structures are coded 6 on item 113 Scour Critical? (Metric 18) Number 0.

6. How are scour evaluations performed? (Metric 18)  
Engineering Judgement

7. Who determines the need for diving inspections and by what criteria?  
County Engineer based on past history.

## G. INVENTORY

1. What kinds of inventory quality assurance checks are performed? (Metric 22)

Who checks? Bridge Inspector

How Often?...With every inspection X Less often than once per year

2. How often is the inventory checked for needed updates? (Metric 22)

How Often?...With every inspection X Less often than once per year

3. How is the inventory data input into Assetwise?

X Electronically, Direct into Assetwise from collector App. as bridge is inspected

All at once at the end of the year from a paper copy into Assetwise

As each inspection is complete from paper to computer to Assetwise.

4. When is the updated/new inventory data forwarded to ODOT? (Metric 23)

Changes discovered during inspection? YES X NO

Changes from new construction or rehab? YES X NO

5. NBIS requires that the inspecting organization maintain master lists of the following: (Metric 16,17,11)

a. Bridges that contain fracture critical members, including the location and description of such members on the bridge and the inspection procedures of such members (Each individual FCM member on each FCM bridge must be clearly identified in the bridge file) (Where a FCM Identification Plan exists then look for remaining fatigue life). Master List?

Yes X Number 100%: If, No, Why not? NA

b. Bridges requiring underwater inspections.

Number NA X

c. Bridges with unique or special features (i.e., pin & hanger, draw, suspension)

Number NA X

**Note: An examination of the files will be performed during the review.**

- Bridge Files.....email a copy of a typical file or have them on hand for inspection.
- Scour Critical POA.. email a copy of a typical file or have them on hand for inspection.
- Fracture Critical Plan.. email a copy of a typical file or have them on hand for inspection.
- UW inspection Procedure.. email a copy of a typical file or have them on hand for inspection.



## H. PROCEDURES

1. Are new maintenance problems identified during bridge inspection?

(  Y  X  N ) (Metric 15)

2. How do the inspectors inform maintenance personnel of routine bridge maintenance problems ( written, oral, other)? (Metric 15)

Written work order.

Electronic Communication.

Oral direction.

Other. Explain. \_\_\_\_\_

3. Who do the inspectors notify when emergency repairs, or critical findings are necessary (action required within 1 week)? (Metric 21) Check all that apply.

County Engineer

County bridge Engineer

Bridge Superintendent

Sherriff

How is this emergency action documented? (Must be entered and tracked in Assetwise)

Explain if different than procedure in Assetwise \_\_\_\_\_

4. If a bridge requires emergency repairs, is this noted as part of the inspection report or as a separate document? (Metric 21)

Separate document, End of inspection cycle maintenance report \_\_\_\_\_

5. Who checks proper placement of signs (load posting, clearance, speed restriction, narrow bridge etc.)? (Metric 15)

Bridge Inspector \_\_\_\_\_

## I. LOAD ANALYSIS AND POSTING

1. Number of plans for existing bridges available for NBIS length bridges. 75%

2. Number of plans for non-NBIS bridges ( $\geq 10'$  and  $\leq 20'$  long) 50%

3. Number of bridges analyzed using the *AASHTO Manual for Bridge Evaluation* (Metric 13)

By Whom (Metric 13)

Load Rating Engineer

County Engineer

Bridge Engineer

Consultant

5. When are bridges load rated, after initial rating. Check all that apply

Every 5 years regardless.

When there is a significant change in condition rating.

When wearing surface thickness increases more than 1-1/2 inches

When permit load is requested

other

6. Methods used (Metric 13)

AASHTO BrR

Hand Calculated

Engineering Judgement (BR100)

BARS or other proprietary software program

Other Explain \_\_\_\_\_

7. Number of NBIS length bridges not load rated (Metric 13) Number 0

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

8. List the NBIS length bridges considered "not ratable" including reason for being considered "not ratable" (Metric 13)

\_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_

9. Number of NBIS length bridges load posted (Metric 14) (Assetwise Check)

Number of bridges posted 34. Number of bridges with posted Signs in the field 34.

10. List bridges closed due to condition rating (rough check) 1

11. List bridges rated less than 100% Ohio legal load and not physically load posted, and resolution. (Assetwise Check)

0

12. Number of NBIS bridges with Gusset Plates (Metric 13) \_\_\_\_\_

13. Number of NBIS bridges with Gusset Plates analyzed. (Metric 13) \_\_\_\_\_

14. Describe filing system (where files are kept): (Metric 15)

- Inspection reports, including old inspections:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Design Calculations:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Plans:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Load analysis calculations:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Inventory forms:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Photos and sketches:

On paper file in Office  
 Electronically  
 In Assetwise  
 All three  
 Other

- Repairs and maintenance history

- On paper file in Office
  - Electronically
  - In Assetwise
  - All three
  - Other
- Scour evaluation:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Scour POA:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Fracture Critical File:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Load Posting/Closing:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Underwater inspections:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Special inspection eqpt. or procedures:
    - On paper file in Office
    - Electronically
    - In Assetwise
    - All three
    - Other
  - Flood data, waterway adequacy, channel cross sections:
    - On paper file in Office

- Electronically
- In Assetwise
- All three
- Other

**Note the NBIS Retention period:** BR-86 report 10 years, All records 3 years after bridge removed, Load rating calculations 3 years after a new rating is done.

15. What is the FC bridge inspection frequency? (Metric 16) Every 24 Months

16. Is the FC Plan completed for all FC bridges? (Metric 16) (Yes X No )

17. Are the FCM Identified in the FC Plan? (Metric 16) (Yes X No )

18. What is the underwater inspection frequency? (Metric 17)      Every      Months     

19. Are the underwater elements identified and located? (Metric 17) (Yes X No )

20. List any complex bridges: (Metric 19)

N/A

21. Do the complex bridges require specialized inspection procedures and additional inspector training? (Metric 19) (Yes  No )

Describe:

## Part II: Field Review

### Inspection Reports (metric 12)

As part of this review, **seven** bridges were field reviewed to compare conditions with the most recent inspection report. The individual condition ratings for all of the field sampled bridges properly reflected the field conditions within the tolerance of 1 rating value when compared to the Manual. Summary ratings correspond with the NBIS inspection items.

#### Field Review:

##### MOE-T0307-0228\_(5634806)      Steel girder

Item 58 Deck.....7 **Agreed**  
Item 59 Superstructure.....5 **Agreed**  
Item 60 Substructure.....5 **Agreed**  
Item 61 Channel.....6 **Agreed**  
    Item 61.01 Scour.....7 **Agreed**  
Item 62 Culvert.....N  
Item 36 Railing..... 0 0 0 0  
Item 72 Approach Alignment .....3 **Agreed**  
Comments: **Great Comments**  
Defect Photos: **Great Defect Photos**  
Channel Photos: **Good Channel Photos**

##### MOE-T0307-0075\_(5634768)      Steel beams

Item 58 Deck..... 4 **Agreed**  
Item 59 Superstructure..... 4 **Agreed**  
Item 60 Substructure.....3 **Agreed**  
Item 61 Channel.....5 **Agreed**  
    Item 61.01 Scour.....7 **Agreed**  
Item 62 Culvert.....N **Agreed**  
Item 36 Railing.....0 N N N **Agreed**  
Item 72 Approach Alignment .....8 **Agreed**  
Comments: **Great Comments**  
Defect Photos: **Great Defect Photos**  
Channel Photos: **Good Channel Photos**

##### MOE-C0015-0710\_(5632854)      Steel Truss

Item 58 Deck..... 6 **Agreed**  
Item 59 Superstructure.....5 **Agreed**  
Item 60 Substructure.....5 **Agreed**  
Item 61 Channel.....7 **Agreed**  
    Item 61.01 Scour..... 7 **Agreed**  
Item 62 Culvert..... N  
Item 36 Railing ..... 0 0 0 0 **Agreed**  
Item 72 Approach Alignment .....8 **Agreed**  
Comments: **Great Comments**  
Defect Photos: **Great Defect Photos**  
Channel Photos: **Good Channel Photos**

MOE-C0029-0854\_(5631106)

Steel Beams

- Item 58 Deck.....7 Agreed
- Item 59 Superstructure.....6 Agreed
- Item 60 Substructure.....5 Agreed
- Item 61 Channel.....6 Agreed
  - Item 61.01 Scour.....7 Agreed
- Item 62 Culvert.....N Agreed
- Item 36 Railing..... 0 0 0 0 Agreed
- Item 72 Approach Alignment .....6 Agreed
- Comments: [Great Comments](#)
- Defect Photos: [Great Defect Photos](#)
- Channel Photos: [Good Channel Photos](#)

MOE-C0029-0879\_(5631173) Prestressed Concrete Beams

- Item 58 Deck..... 8 Agreed
- Item 59 Superstructure.....8 Agreed
- Item 60 Substructure.....5 Agreed
- Item 61 Channel..... 6 Agreed
  - Item 61.01 Scour..... 7 Agreed
- Item 62 Culvert..... N Agreed
- Item 36 Railing..... 0 0 0 0
- Item 72 Approach Alignment .....8 Agreed
- Comments: [Excellent Comments](#)
- Defect Photos: [Great Defect Photos](#)
- Channel Photos: [Channel Photos](#)

MOE-T0183-0013\_(5634504)

Steel Girder

- Item 58 Deck.....4 Agreed
- Item 59 Superstructure.....4/3 There are two adjacent floor beams that have severe section loss causing excessive live load deflections, with one end of one floor beam beginning to crush and the flooring to fall apart at the high stress point. While I do not view this as a critical finding at this time, it is surely on its way. I recommend re-evaluating the floor beams and repost the bridge to a much lower percentage as the analysis dictates.



- Item 60 Substructure.....5 [Agreed](#)
- Item 61 Channel.....5 [Agreed](#)
  - Item 61.01 Scour..... 6 [Agreed](#)
- Item 62 Culvert.....N [Agreed](#)
- Item 36 Railing..... 0 0 0 0 [Agreed](#)
- Item 72 Approach Alignment .....4 [Agreed](#)
- Comments: [Excellent Comments](#)
- Defect Photos: [Great Defect Photos](#)
- Channel Photos: [Great Channel Photos](#)



**MOE-T0183-0050 \_(5634512) Cont. Concrete Slab**

- Item 58 Deck.....5 Agreed
- Item 59 Superstructure.....6 Deck and slab are the same. Both 5s
- Item 60 Substructure.....4 Agreed
- Item 61 Channel.....5 Agreed
  - Item 61.01 Scour.....7 Agreed
- Item 62 Culvert.....N
- Item 36 Railing..... N N N N Agreed
- Item 72 Approach Alignment .... 4 Agreed
- Comments: Excellent Comments
- Defect Photos: Great Defect Photos
- Channel Photos: Good Channel Photos

**Field Review Summary:**

Monroe County is doing a very good with your bridge inspection program. We were in Agreement with nearly every rating, with only the steel girder bridge being called into question. **MOE-T0183-0013 \_(5634504) Steel Girder**, due to loss of section on adjacent floor beams. Ratings and comments were good and in conformance with the inspection manual. Channel and Defect photos were very good.

**PART III Office file Review**

Fracture critical bridges: 35 bridges in the list

Fracture Critical Member and Fatigue Prone Connection ID Plan:

- MOE CR29A 0005 000 (5631017) Richland Engineering
- MOE-T0152-036 (5634202)
- MOE-CO29A-0005 (5631017)

Bridge Load Rating Report, including Gusset plate analysis:

- MOE CR29A 0005 000 (5631017) Richland Engineering
- MOE-CO29A-0005 (5631017)

Underwater inspections: None

POA for Scour : Standard Form on file.

Scour susceptible bridges: 100% with 25% checked by probe.

Critical findings: None to date.

All files are complete with all documentation concerning load rating, channel photos and defect photos, along with previous inspection reports. Their files are complete and comprehensive, documenting the history of every bridge through reports, plans and photographs.

## PART IV Snapshot DATA Summary of Program

<b>MONROE County 2022</b>					
<b>INVENTORY, APPRAISAL &amp; INSPECTION SNAPSHOT</b>					
12/19/2022					
<b>Inventory Data - NBIS Bridges Only</b>					
				NBIS COUNT	
NBIS Bridges > 20'				113	
Bridges 10'-20'				66	
All Bridges				179	
Item 221 Inspection Responsibility			CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Col BV, BW	County	2	113	179
Item 21 Maintenance responsibility			CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	County		2	113	179
Col D	City or other local		4	0	0
	Railroad		27	0	0
	Private (tohter than RR)		26	0	0
	State Park		11	0	0
	Local Park		23	0	0
	State Agency		1	0	0
	Township		3	0	0
				113	179
Item 42A Type service on bridge			CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Other		0	0	0
Col Q	Highway		1	113	179
	Railroad		2	0	0
	Ped/Bikeway		3	0	0
	Hwy/RR		4	0	0
	Hwy/Ped		5	0	0
				113	179
Item 42B Type service under bridge			CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Other		0	0	0
Col R	Hwy w/ or w/o Ped		1	0	0
	Railroad		2	0	0
	Ped/Bkwy		3	0	0
	Hwy w/ RR		4	0	0
	Waterway		5	113	179
	Hwy/Waterway		6	0	0
	RR/Waterway		7	0	0
	Hwy/Waterway/RR		8	0	0
	Relief (for waterways)		9	0	0
				113	179

All data is complete and correct in this section.

ITEMS 43A,B,C Structure Type	Data (Col M,N,O)	CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Concrete Slab		101	3	15
Concrete Box Beam/Girder Multiple		105	7	8
Concrete Frame		107	0	3
Concrete Deck Arch		111	2	2
Concrete Thru Arch		112	1	1
Concrete Culvert (incl frame culverts)		119	1	2
Concrete Continuous Slab		201	3	3
Concrete Continuous Frame		207	1	1
Steel Beam or Girder		302	46	86
Steel Girder w/ Floor System		303	18	18
Steel Thru Truss (includes Pony)		310	17	17
Steel Culvert (incl frame culverts)		319	2	9
Steel Continuous Beam or Girder		402	4	4
Prestr. Conc. Cont. Box Beam/Girder Multiple		505	6	6
Timber Thru Truss (includes Pony)		710	1	1
Timber Deck Arch		811	1	2
Aluminum or Iron Culvert (incl frame culverts)		919	0	1
			<b>113</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Item 92A Fracture Critical</b>				
		CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Requires FC Inspection	Y	35	n/a
Col U,V,Y	Requires FC Inspection	N	78	n/a
			<b>113</b>	<b>n/a</b>
	FC Switch Y/N is Blank		0	n/a
<b>Item 113 Scour</b>				
			#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Bridge not over waterway	N	0	0
Col AA	unknown foundation	U	0	0
	over tidal waters	T	0	0
	foundations on dry land	9	5	5
	stable above footing	8	93	151
	countermeasures installed	7	3	4
	no scour evaluation made	6	0	0
	stable within footer limits	5	8	12
	stable action needed	4	4	7
	scour critical - unstable	3	0	0
	scour critical - scour present	2	0	0
	scour critical - failure imminent	1	0	0
	scour critical - bridge failed	0	0	0
			<b>113</b>	<b>179</b>

MOE-C0077-0400\_(5631645) MOE-T0041-0238\_(5633826) MOE-T0102-0088\_(5631726)  
MOE-T0152-0236\_(5634202) MOE-T0156-0263\_(5634156) MOE-T0263-0263\_(5633850)  
MOE-T0834-0107\_(5633559)

*The bridges above have a non-critical finding scour rating of 4, that requires corrective measures. Once the measures are implemented the scour rating should move to a 7. See Column AA in Data TAB of the Snapshot for olive highlights.*

*Note: (If these measures were taken, then the rating needs changed. If not, then you need a plan for corrective measures. A code of 4 or less should not be in the system for more than a year.)*

All data is complete and correct in this section.

Item 63 Documented Engineering Judgment				# NBIS	# ALL	
	Field Eval & Doc EJ			12	n/a	
		BR_100 for these bridges?				
Item 92B Underwater				CODE	# NBIS	# ALL
Data Tab	requires dive inspection		N	113	n/a	
Col W,X,Z	requires dive inspection		Y	0	n/a	
				113		
Item 709 Plan Information				CODE	# NBIS	# ALL
Data Tab	plans not avail		0	8	21	
Col. AW	plan avail		1	49	65	
	field measured		2	56	93	
	Field Testing		3	0	0	
	not applicable		N	0	0	
				113	179	
Item 63 Method of Analysis				CODE	# NBIS	# ALL
Data Tab	Field Eval & Doc. Engr Judgment		0	12	27	
Col. AV	Work Stress		1	0	0	
	LFR		2	0	0	
	LRFR		3	0	0	
	load test		4	0	0	
	No rating done		5	0	2	
	LFR		6	55	75	
	AS		7	15	30	
	LRFR		8	30	44	
	Assigned LFR HS20		D	0	0	
	Assigned LRFR HL93		F	1	1	
	not appl (RR, etc)		X	0	0	
				113	179	
<b>REMINDER:</b>						
	Load Factor required for bridges built after 1993			(exceptions: timber, etc.)		
	LRFR required for bridges built after 2010					

*Note: Given the changes coming in 2023 and the now required shear analysis, please make sure your load rating documentations are complete and include a BR100 with complete statements of assumptions, measurements and methodologies for anything using engineering judgement.*

All data is complete and correct in this section.

## Inspection Condition Data - NBIS Bridges Only

Item 41	Operating Status	CODE	# NBIS	# ALL
Data Tab	Open, No restriction	A	83	142
Col AM	Open, posting recommended	B	0	0
	Open, Half width constr.	C	0	0
	Open because of temp. fix	D	0	0
	Open using temp. structure	E	0	0
	New struture not yet open	G	0	0
	closed for load cap. reason	K	1	2
	Posted for load capacity	P	29	35
	Posted for other than load	R	0	0
	Closed for other than load	X	0	0
			<b>113</b>	<b>179</b>

Metric 13	<u>Load Rating Data</u>	
Load Rating Tab		# OF ERRORS
Col. AN	Op RF greater than Inv RF?	0
Col. AO	Posting and % Legal OK?	1
Col. AP	"0" used instead of blank	0
Col. AT	% legal <> lowest RF	3
Col. AV	Item 70 correct?	0
Col. AW	Method of Rating Alike?	0
Col. AX	Op & Inv RF in Tons as req'd?	1
Col. AY	Item 575 correct?	0
Col. AZ	Depth of fill completed?	0

### Check Load Rating TAB for details below

**MOE-T0570-0120\_(5635000)** See Load Rating TAB Column AT (Columns AR and AS need to be the same)

Method of Rating in Columns X & Y (0, 0) means the OPER and INV rates in columns E & F have to be in TONS.

Data check formular In Column BB thinks the OPER and INV ratings are in TONS, but they are not.

MOE-T0570-0120\_(5635000)      MOE-T0472-0003\_(5634318)      MOE-C0029-0240\_(5630959)

All Three bridges above have the EV3 as the lowest Factor controlling the % legal

All other data is complete and correct in this section.



## KEY METRICS

(C)	Compliant	(CC)	Conditionally Compliant
(SC)	Substantially Compliant	(NC)	Non- Compliant
		(NC)	(SC) If corrected within 6/12 months Refresher=6 mo, Comprehensive=12 mo

### METRIC 2 - Program Manager Qualificatio (from files examination)

From Files review	Missing	#sampled	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
PE /Experience	0	1	100.0%	(C)
Comprehensive	0	1	100.0%	(C)
Refresher	0	1	100.0%	(C)

### METRIC 3 - Team Leader Qualification (from files examination)

From Files review	Missing	#sampled	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
Degree /Experience	0	3	100.0%	(C)
Comprehensive	0	3	100.0%	(C)
Refresher	0	3	100.0%	(C)

### METRIC 6 Insp. Frequency Routine

Bridge Inspections Overdue	# OVERDUE	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
Data Tab NBIS - 24 months	0	100.0%	(C)
Col. AB ORC - Calendar Year	0	100.0%	(C)
Col. AB All Routine insp.	0		
BIM - 18 months	0	100.0%	(C)

### METRIC 8 - Insp. Frequency Underwater

Dive Inspections Overdue	# OVERDUE	# UW	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
Data Tab Col. Z 60 months	0	0	100.0%	(C)

### METRIC 10 - Insp. Frequency FC Member

FC Inspections Overdue	# OVERDUE	# FC	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
Data Tab Col. Y 24 months	0	35	100.0%	(C)

All data is complete and correct in this section.

METRIC 14 - Posting		Load rating data tab			
From Files review	# errors	#sampled	% PASS	COMPLIANCE	
Op RF < 3 tons but not closed	1	113	99.1%	(SC)	
Op RF = 0 but not closed	0	113	100.0%	(C)	
% Legal < 100 but not posted	0	113	100.0%	(C)	
Item 41= B	0	113	100.0%	(C)	

MOE-T0570-0120 \_(5635000) Same problem as metric 13 in the load rating data.

<b>METRIC 12 - Routine Inspection</b>		(** from field review)				
<b>Field Ratings</b>		<b># &gt; +/-1</b>	<b># Ratings</b>	<b>% PASS</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	
	field ratings**	0	24	100.0%	(C)	
Comments		<b>Missing</b>	<b># &lt; 6</b>	<b>% PASS</b>		
Tab	Comments when Rating < 6	2	112	98.2%	(C)	
	Adequacy comments **	0	30	100.0%	(C)	
		<b>Error</b>	<b>Total Scour</b>	<b>% PASS</b>		
Comments	Rating should be = Scour	1	109	99.1%	within tolerance +/- 1	
Tab	Noncompliant Scour Rating Err	0	109	100.0%	(C)	

MOE-T2001-0013 \_(5630290)

MOE-T2706-0001 \_(5634997)

Both bridges above are missing Channel comments. I see there are comments concerning the channel and scour in the Substructure item. If those comments cover the channel too, then just put a short note in the channel comments, "see substructure" and leave it at that.

MOE-C0039-0002 \_(5630797) Scour controls

<b>METRIC 16 - Fracture Critical Ins</b>		(from files examination)			
<b>From Files review</b>		<b>Missing</b>	<b># FC</b>	<b>% PASS</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>
	Fract Critical Member ID	0	2	100.0%	(C)
	Fatigue Prone Detail	0	2	100.0%	(C)
	Gusset Plate Calculations	0	2	100.0%	(C)
	FC Inspection Procedure	0	2	100.0%	(C)

  

<b>METRIC 17 - Underwater Inspecti</b>		(from files examination)			
<b>From Files review</b>		<b>Missing</b>	<b># UW</b>	<b>% PASS</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>
	UW Inspection Procedure	0	1	100.0%	(C)
	Location of UW elements	0	1	100.0%	(C)
	UW frequency identified	0	1	100.0%	(C)

All data is complete and correct in this section.

## PRELIMINARY FHWA 23 Metric Matrix

23 metrics used by FHWA to measure NBIS compliance

### Compliance Codes for the following Metrics:

(C)	Compliant
(SC)	Substantially Compliant
(CC)	Conditionally Compliant (Adhering to approved PCA)
(NC)	Not Compliant

Metric	Description	(C)	(SC)	(CC)	(NC)
1	State Bridge Inspection Organization				
2	Program Manager Qualification				
3	Team Leader Qualification				
4	Load Rating Engineer Qualification				
5	UW Bridge Inspection Diver Qualification				
6	Routine Inspection Frequency - Low Risk				
7	Routine Inspection Frequency - High Risk				
8	UW Inspection Frequency - Low Risk				
9	UW Inspection Frequency - High Risk				
10	FC Inspection Frequency				
11	Frequency Criteria				
12	Inspection Quality **				
13	Load Rating				
14	Posted or Restricted Bridges				
15	Bridge Files				
16	FC Bridges				
17	UW inspection procedures				
18	Scour Critical Bridges				
19	Complex Bridges				
20	QC/QA				
21	Critical Findings				
22	Inventory **				
23	Updating of Data				

\*\* based on results of Field Review

Metric	Action Needed

Overall, Monroe County is doing a very good job with its bridge program, with very minor data corrections needed. Metric 14 just needs the Operating and Inventory put into Tons of the change the method of analysis. Address the comments and substructure ratings on three bridge and you will be in full 100% compliance with all 23 FHWA Metrics.