

Quality Assurance Review
National Bridge Inspection Standards &
Bridge Maintenance Program
Scioto County

March 29, 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: _____ **Scioto County Engineers Office** _____

Checklist completed by: _____ Paul W. Sheets _____ Date: _____ 3/14/2022 _____

PART I: Records and Staffing

I. MAINTENANCE, REHABILITATION AND REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

A. NUMBER OF BRIDGES WITH MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY

- 1. Greater than 20' long (NBIS length 23CFR 650c) (Metric 22) 210
- 2. Bridges >= 10' and <= 20' long (Metric 22) 288

B. PROCEDURES AND BUDGET

- 1. Contract repairs and replacement per year

- List typical work items

Replacements: Number: Culverts: 2 Bridges: 1

Rehabilitations: Number : Culverts: _____ Bridges: _____

Maint.Contracts Number : Culverts: _____ Bridges: _____

-List approximate annual budget: \$100,000

- Are Fed Funds used? Yes X No _____

- Are Credit Bridge funds used? Yes X No _____

2. In-house repairs and replacements

Replacements: Number: Culverts: 69 Bridges: 1
Rehabilitations: Number: Culverts: _____ Bridges: _____
Maint.Contracts Number: Culverts: _____ Bridges: _____

- List approximate annual budget _____ Varies _____

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?
 Sherriff?
 Commissioners?

II. INSPECTION PROGRAM

A. NUMBER OF BRIDGES WITH INSPECTION RESPONSIBILITY

1. Greater than 20' long (NBIS length, ORC 5501.47, 5543.20) (Metric 22) 210

2. Between 10' and 20' long (ORC 5501.47, 5543.20) (Metric 22) 288

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: Darren C LeBrun

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: 24

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) ODOT Level 1 2021, ODOT Level 2 2021, ODOT Refresher 2017

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

- Name: Darren C LeBrun

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: 24

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) ODOT Level 1 2021, ODOT Level 2 2021, ODOT Refresher 2017

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

(Metric 1&3)

- Name: Paul W. Sheets & Ethan J. Nelson

- Yrs. Inspection related experience: PS 22 and EN 3

- List courses attended (& approx. dates) PWS ODOT Level 1 1999, ODOT Level 2 2009, ODOT Refresher 2019, EJM ODOT Level 1 2019, ODOT Level 2 2019

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

%TIME on inspections:

<u>20</u> Bridge/Culvert inspection	<u>20</u> Surveying
<u>20</u> Bridge Design/Plan prep	<u>40</u> Other -
<u>0</u> Bridge Construction	<u> </u> 100%
<u>0</u> Bridge Maintenance	
<u>0</u> Overload/Super load	

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

a. List Ohio PE # 64975 b. Name Darren C. LeBrun PE, PS

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

- Name: None Required

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

Other equipment not listed above.

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) -

Ladder
Bucket Truck
Safety equipment

6. Use of equipment (Metric 16)

a. How many bridges need a snooper? 0

b. How many bridges is it used on? 0

c. How often? N/A

E. INSPECTION PROCEDURES

1. Approximately how many inspections were made during last calendar year? (Metric 6) **498**

2. Approximately how many inspections are scheduled for the current calendar year? (Metric 6) **498**

3. Average number of inspections per day (Metric 6) **15**

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

a. Beam/Girder: Simple Span: 2 hrs. Multi-span: 2 hrs.

b. Slab bridge: Simple Span: 0.5 hrs. Multi-span: 1 hrs.

c. Truss (pony): Simple Span: 2 hrs. Multi-span: 2.5 hrs.

d. Through/deck): Simple Span: N/A hrs. Multi-span: N/A hrs.

e. Culvert: Single cell 0.5 hrs. Multiple Cells: 0.5 hrs.

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

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

Are photos available for every bridge? (Yes X No ___)

Are photos posted in Assetwise? (Yes X No ___) Many are, but some are not.

Are defects photos taken during inspection? (Yes X No ___)

Are Bridge comments recorded in Assetwise? (Yes No)

Are previous bridge comments brought to the bridge? (Yes No)

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: Darren C. Lebrun and Consultant based on Condition

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

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

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

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)
Program Manager review of photographs and reports.

We have three (3) qualified bridge inspectors that rotate inspecting bridges each year.
Comments reviewed by reviewer for potential action items.

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

Yes No (Assetwise check)

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

Yes No (Assetwise check)

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

Initial Inspection? (Yes No)

Routine Annual Inspections? (Yes No)

Special Inspections? (Yes No)

Underwater Inspections? (Yes No) N/A

Fracture Critical Inspections? (Yes No)

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

1. No. of bridges considered scour susceptible? (Service over Water) Number 0.

2. Number of bridges inspected by probing? Number varies as needed.

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 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)
Observed Scour Assessment for Bridges during a field review.

7. Who determines the need for diving inspections and by what criteria?

Darren C. LeBrun Structures which cannot be inspected visually at low water by wading or probing, will require diving techniques.

Typically the threshold is for those substructure units in water deeper than 5-ft but depending on access, tools available, visibility and safety this may need to be adjusted.

G. INVENTORY

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

Who checks? Team Leader

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

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

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

3. How is the inventory data input into Assetwise?

- 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 NO

Changes from new construction or rehab? YES 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 Number 20: If, No, Why not? NA

b. Bridges requiring underwater inspections.

Number 0 NA

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

Number 0 NA

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 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)

[In a separate document](#) _____

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

[Sign Superintendent](#) _____

I. LOAD ANALYSIS AND POSTING

1. Number of plans for existing bridges available for NBIS length bridges. 148

2. Number of plans for non-NBIS bridges ($\geq 10'$ and $\leq 20'$ long) 269

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)

- AAWSHTO BrR

- Hand Calculated
- Engineering Judgement (BR100)
- BARS or other proprietary software program
- Other Explain BRASS CULVERT

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)

NA

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

Number of bridges posted 31. Number of bridges with posted Signs in the field 31.

10. List bridges closed due to condition rating (rough check) 0

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) 19

13. Number of NBIS bridges with Gusset Plates analyzed. (Metric 13) 19

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 N/A Months
19. Are the underwater elements identified and located? (Metric 17) (Yes No) N/A
20. List any complex bridges: (Metric 19)
21. Do the complex bridges require specialized inspection procedures and additional inspector training? (Metric 19) (Yes No) N/A

Describe:

Part II: Field Review

Inspection Reports (metric 12)

As part of this review, **six** 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:

SCI-C0001-0375_(7330006) Concrete Tee Beam

Item 58 Deck..... 6 Agreed

Item 59 Superstructure.....5 Agreed

Item 60 Substructure..... 6 Agreed

Item 61 Channel..... ..6 Agreed

Item 61.01 Scour..... 6 Agreed (However, there may be something going on at the center of the old portion of the original abutment. There is no undermining detected, but it looks a little deep if the footing is a spread footing.) This condition should have a closer look on the next inspection.



Too deep for my hip waders to probe. Very old portion of old abutment (former ODOT bridge)

Item 62 Culvert.....N

Item 36 Railing..... 1(0) 0 1(0) 0 GR too low and does not meet standards off bridge.

Item 72 Approach Alignment 5 Agreed

Comments: Good Comments in Assetwise.

Defect Photos: Good Photo in Assetwise.

Channel Photos: Great Photos in Assetwise

SCI-C0002-0951_(7330111) Steel Beam Continuous

Item 58 Deck..... 8 Agreed

Item 59 Superstructure.....6 Agreed

Item 60 Substructure.....6 Agreed

Item 61 Channel.....6 Agreed
 Item 61.01 Scour.....7 Agreed
 Item 62 Culvert.....N
 Item 36 Railing..... 1 0 1 0 (0 0 0 0) Does not meet standards
 Item 72 Approach Alignment 4 Agreed
 Comments: Good comments.
 Defect Photos: Photos are good.
 Channel Photos: Good Channel Photos in Assetwise

SCI-C0018-0721_(7337590) **Prestressed Box-beams Continuous**

Item 58 Deck..... 7 Agreed
 Item 59 Superstructure.....7 Agreed
 Item 60 Substructure.....6 Agreed
 Item 61 Channel.....4 Agreed No channel defect comments or photos in Assetwise! This rating may be a little low, as channel alignment is not bad, but the banks at the wingwall is eroding.



Item 61.01 Scour..6 Agreed Flow line up against abutment, but no apparent exposure or undermining detected.

Item 62 Culvert.....N
 Item 36 Railing..... 1 0 1 0 (0 0 0 0) Not up to any current standards
 Item 72 Approach Alignment 6 Agreed Could be lower as bridge is on a curve and has object markers at the end.



Comments: Missing Channel comments.

Defect Photos: No Channel Defect Photos in Assetwise, no need for others as condition is good.

Channel Photos: Good Channel photos in Assetwise.

SCI-C0018-0646_(7330545) Steel Pony Truss

Item 58 Deck..... 6 Agreed

Item 59 Superstructure.....4 Agreed (Significant section loss in floor beam)

Item 60 Substructure.....6 Agreed

Item 61 Channel.....4 Not sure why channel is a 4. Yes, it is up against the abutment on one side but there is no indication of scour or the potential for scour. Rock present on stream bed.



Item 61.01 Scour.....7 Agreed

Item 62 Culvert.....N

Item 36 Railing 0 0 0 0
Item 72 Approach Alignment 5 Agreed

Comments: [Good Comments!](#)

Defect Photos: [Great Defect Photos in Assetwise, compliments comments well.](#)

Channel Photos: [Good Channel Photos](#)

SCI-C0023-0005_(7330618) Continuous Concrete Slab

Item 58 Deck.....5 Agreed

Item 59 Superstructure.....5 Agreed

Item 60 Substructure.....6 Agreed

Item 61 Channel.....6 Agreed

Item 61.01 Scour.....6 Agreed The water depth was too great for my hip waders to probe for scour, but there is significant rock outcrops at the abutment.



Item 62 Culvert.....N Agreed

Item 36 Railing..... 0 0 0 0 Agreed,

Item 72 Approach Alignment 6 Agreed, No detected speed reduction, road pretty straight and wide. Could considered a higher rating.



Comments: [Great Comments](#)

Defect Photos: [Very good defect photos in Assetwise.](#)

Channel Photos: [Good Channel Photos in Assetwise](#)

SCI-C0002-1352_(7338376) **Steel Beams**

Item 58 Deck..... 6 [Agreed](#)

Item 59 Superstructure.....5 [Agreed](#) Needed defect photo In Assetwise to compliment comments.



Item 60 Substructure.....8 [Agreed](#)
 Item 61 Channel.....8 [Agreed](#)
 Item 61.01 Scour.....7
 Item 62 Culvert.....N
 Item 36 Railing..... 1 0 1 0
 Item 72 Approach Alignment 8
 Comments: [Great Comments](#)
 Defect Photos: [No Defect Photos in Assetwise.](#)
 Channel Photos: [Good Channel Photos in Assetwise.](#)

Field Review Summary:

Scioto County is doing a very good job with their bridge inspection program. I recommend taking more defect photos to complement their good description comments. Some comments are little too brief in some cases lacking the location and severity and extent and excellent in other cases where they were extremely detailed and complete.

The county tends to rate the channels on the low side and the lack of comments in the channel section is an indicator of this (there is not much to say if there is no real problem). Perhaps, if they look at the channel without considering the abutments for the channel Item rating, they would do better on the channel. When it comes to rating scour, focus a little more intensely on the flow line at the abutments using the guide tables in the manual. The County indicated in the questionnaire that there were no scour susceptible bridges, but it looks like scour may be present in some locations. Item 1. In the text box might be something much higher.

<p>F. SCOUR CRITICAL BRIDGES (Guidance in ODOT Manual of Bridge Inspection)</p> <p>1. No. of bridges considered scour susceptible? (Service over Water) Number <u>0</u>.</p> <p>2. Number of bridges inspected by probing? Number <u>varies as needed</u>.</p> <p>3. Number of Scour Critical bridges (item 113 - 3, 2, 1 or 0)? <small>(Metric 18)</small> Number <u>0</u>.</p>

PART III Office file Review

Fracture Critical Member and Fatigue Prone Connection ID Plan.
 Bridge Load Rating Report, including Gusset plate analysis.

[SCI-C0018-0646_\(7330545\)](#) [Steel Pony Truss](#) [Evaluated by Euthenics](#)

Other load rating files

[SCI- CR1 - 3.75 \(7330006\)](#) [Rated in 2020](#) [In house](#) [Br100](#)
[SCI- CR18-7.21 \(7337590\)](#) [Rated in 2020](#) [In house](#) [Br100](#)

All files are complete with all documentation concerning load rating, channel photos and Defect photos, along with previous inspection reports.

PART IV Snapshot Summary of Program

SCIOTO County 2022						
INVENTORY, APPRAISAL & INSPECTION SNAPSHOT						
12/21/2022						
Inventory Data - NBIS Bridges Only						
				<u>NBIS COUNT</u>		
NBIS Bridges > 20'				190		
Bridges 10'-20'				243		
All Bridges				433		
Item 221 Inspection Responsibility						
				<u>CODE</u>	<u>#NBIS</u>	<u>#ALL</u>
Data Tab	Col B\,B\w	County		2	190	433
Item 21 Maintenance responsibility						
				<u>CODE</u>	<u>#NBIS</u>	<u>#ALL</u>
Data Tab		County		2	189	432
Col D		City or other local		4	1	1
		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
				190	433	
Item 42A Type service on bridge						
				<u>CODE</u>	<u>#NBIS</u>	<u>#ALL</u>
Data Tab		Other		0	0	0
Col Q		Highway		1	190	433
		Railroad		2	0	0
		Ped/Bikeway		3	0	0
		Hwy/RR		4	0	0
		Hwy/Ped		5	0	0
				190	433	
Item 42B Type service under bridge						
				<u>CODE</u>	<u>#NBIS</u>	<u>#ALL</u>
Data Tab		Other		0	0	0
Col R		Hwy w/ or w/o Ped		1	0	0
		Railroad		2	2	2
		Ped/Bkwy		3	0	0
		Hwy w/ RR		4	0	0
		Waterway		5	188	431
		Hwy/Waterway		6	0	0
		RR/Waterway		7	0	0
		Hwy/Waterway/RR		8	0	0
		Relief (for waterways)		9	0	0
				190	433	

All data in tables above are complete and all bridge accounted for correct Coding

ITEMS 43A,B,C Structure Type		Data (Col M,N,O)	CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Concrete Slab			101	5	46
Concrete Tee Beam			104	60	122
Concrete Frame			107	7	48
Concrete Culvert (incl frame culverts)			119	2	83
Concrete Continuous Slab			201	3	3
Steel Beam or Girder			302	21	28
Steel Girder w/ Floor System			303	1	1
Steel Thru Truss (includes Pony)			310	18	18
Steel Culvert (incl frame culverts)			319	4	13
Steel Continuous Beam or Girder			402	10	10
Prestressed Concrete Thru Arch			502	3	3
Prestr. Conc. Cont. Box Beam/Girder Multiple			505	54	55
Prestr. Conc. Cont. Box Beam/Girder Multiple			605	1	1
Timber Thru Truss (includes Pony)			710	1	1
Aluminum or Iron Culvert (incl frame culverts)			919	0	1
				190	433
Item 92A Fracture Critical					
			CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Requires FC Inspection		Y	20	n/a
Col U,V,Y	Requires FC Inspection		N	170	n/a
				190	n/a
			FC Switch Y/N is Blank	0	n/a
Item 113 Scour					
				#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Bridge not over waterway		N	2	2
Col AA	unknown foundation		U	0	0
	over tidal waters		T	0	0
	foundations on dry land		9	10	20
	stable above footing		8	92	219
	countermeasures installed		7	3	11
	no scour evaluation made		6	0	0
	stable within footer limits		5	79	173
	stable action needed		4	4	8
	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
				190	433

All data in tables above are complete and all bridge accounted for correct Coding

Item 63 Documented Engineering Judgment			#NBIS	#ALL
	Field Eval & Doc EJ		1	n/a
	BR_100 for these bridges?			
Item 928 Underwater		CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	requires dive inspection	N	190	n/a
Col W,X,Z	requires dive inspection	Y	0	n/a
			190	
Item 709 Plan Information		CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	plans not avail	0	0	9
Col. AW	plan avail	1	132	359
	field measured	2	58	65
	Field Testing	3	0	0
	not applicable	N	0	0
			190	433
Item 63 Method of Analysis		CODE	#NBIS	#ALL
Data Tab	Field Eval & Doc. Engr Judgmen	0	1	11
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	121
	LFR	6	139	188
	AS	7	13	28
	LRFR	8	37	83
	Assigned LFR HS20	D	0	0
	Assigned LRFR HL93	F	0	2
	not appl (RR, etc)	X	0	0
			190	433
REMINDER:				
	Load Factor required for bridges built after 1993	(exceptions: timber, etc,)		
	LRFR required for bridges built after 2010			

All data in tables above are complete and all bridge accounted for correct Coding

Inspection Condition Data - NBIS Bridges Only

Item 41	Operating Status	CODE	# NBIS	# ALL
Data Tab	Open, No restriction	A	159	400
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	0	0
	Posted for load capacity	P	31	33
	Posted for other than load	R	0	0
	Closed for other than load	X	0	0
			190	433

Metric 13	Load Rating Data	
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	0
Col. AV	Item 70 correct?	1
Col. AW	Method of Rating Alike?	0
Col. AX	Op & Inv RF in Tons as req'd?	0
Col. AY	Item 575 correct?	0
Col. AZ	Depth of fill completed?	0

SCI-TR310-0107_(7334702) See Load Rating TAB columns S & T do not correlate.

SCI-TR165-0046_(7335520)

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 Qualification (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	2	100.0%	(C)
Comprehensive		0	2	100.0%	(C)
Refresher		0	2	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	3		98.4%	(SC)
Col. AB	All Routine insp.	5			
	BIM - 18 months	0		100.0%	(C)

See DATA TAB Column CA

All Qualifications are up to date.

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	2	20	98.9%	(SC)

SCI-TR238-0005_(7337620) SCI-TR341-0080_(7339127)

METRIC 12 - Routine Inspection (** from field review)					
Field Ratings		# > +/-1	# Ratings	% PASS	COMPLIANCE
field ratings**		0	24	100.0%	(C)
Comments		Missing	# < 6	% PASS	
Tab	Comments when Rating < 6	26	210	87.6%	(SC)
Adequacy comments **		0	30	100.0%	(C)
		Error	Total Scour	% PASS	
Comment:	Rating should be = Scour	0	208	100.0%	within tolerance +/- 1
Tab	Noncompliant Scour Rating Err	0	208	100.0%	(C)

This flag is misleading, as 90% of the missing comments are only for Channel and not the structure. Many of the bridges I sampled should have a higher rating and did not need comments, while a few others were just missing comments, or were included in the scour or substructure comments. There were just a few that were missing comments for deck or some other element.

METRIC 14 - Posting		Load rating data tab				
From Files review		# errors	#sampled	% PASS	COMPLIANCE	
Op RF < 3 tons but not closed		0	190	100.0%		(C)
Op RF = 0 but not closed		0	190	100.0%		(C)
% Legal < 100 but not posted		0	190	100.0%		(C)
Item 41 = B		0	190	100.0%		(C)
METRIC 16 - Fracture Critical Inspection (from files examination)						
From Files review		Missing	# FC	% PASS	COMPLIANCE	
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)
METRIC 17 - Underwater Inspection (from files examination)						
From Files review		Missing	# UW	% PASS	COMPLIANCE	
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)

Information in this section is complete and in compliance.

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					
<u>Metric</u>	<u>Action Needed</u>				

Action recommendations: The county has just a few items in their load rating to clean up. There are only minor coding errors that need corrected.

The inspection comments that are lacking need attention, but as indicated in my review comments, they are mostly channel comments that might not be warranted. These need to be address with the next inspection and not of immediate concern.