



INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

100 North Senate Avenue
Room N758
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

PHONE: (855) 463-6848

Mike Braun, Governor
Lyndsay Quist, Commissioner

MEETING MINUTES

ACEC-INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee Meeting – February 12, 2026
Indiana Government Center-South, Conference Room 17, Harrison Hall
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Attendees:

Anthony Marino, INDOT – Chair
Jonathan Olson, BF&S – Vice Chair
Kyle Kent, United Consulting – Secretary
Rob Coop, USI Consultants
Matt Lee, Hamilton Co.
Jacob Gould, INDOT
Cristy Burlage, INDOT
Bill Dittrich, INDOT
~~Rob Connor~~, Purdue
Mark Riehle, Lochmueller Group
Maricar Gonzales, INDOT
~~Erich Hart~~, INDOT
Bobby Chandler, Clark Dietz
John Lukac, HWC

Alfred Wessling, EGIS
~~Stewart Kline~~, Tippecanoe Co.
Nathaniel Foy, INDOT
Anne Rearick, INDOT
~~Adam Post~~, INDOT
~~Charley Bernth~~, INDOT
~~Sean Hankins~~, INDOT
Sharon Street, INDOT
Joshua Heigert, FHWA
Ron Muñoz, SJCA
Jennifer Hart, INDOT
~~Josh Biller~~, INDOT
Pat Connor, INLTAP – Teams
~~Stephanie Wagner~~, INDOT

Black Text – Information taken directly from meeting agenda.

Blue Text – Commentary on agenda items discussed during meeting.

Agenda:

1. Approve the November 2025 meeting minutes.
 - [Nathaniel Foy will be responsible for publishing the meeting minutes to the website.](#)
 - [Minutes from previous committee meeting \(11/13/2025\) were approved.](#)
2. FHWA Annual QA/Metrics Reviews discussion.
 - [Each of the Metrics below was discussed briefly; Josh Heigert will be supplying INDOT with a full write-up later.](#)
 - Metric 1: Substantially compliant; under IP with few remaining administrative actions required.
 - Metrics 2, 3, 5, New1 (Damage, Special Qual.): Compliant.
 - Metrics 6 (Routine Interval): PCA closed, now Substantially compliant (IP for Initial Inspections).
 - [This is an important focus for us right now; we're on a 1-year improvement plan for this metric.](#)

- We need to develop a way to track that an initial inspection has been done following a bridge rehabilitation or replacement.
 - INDOT is asking consultants to send e-mails with details on these new bridges and to confirm that the initial inspection was completed within 90 days of the bridge being open to traffic.
 - Metric 8, 10, 11, New2 (Special, In-Depth Interval): PCAs closed; Compliant.
 - Metrics 12: Conditional compliant; PCA in-place for implementation.
 - This PCA is new this time around.
 - Metric 13: PCA closed; Conditional compliant pending intermediate review.
 - Metric 14: Conditional compliant and PCA still active.
 - Metrics 15, 17, New3 (In-Depth Insp. Procedures), 20, 21, 22: Compliant.
 - Metric 16: Conditional compliant; PCA in-place for implementation.
 - This PCA is new this time around.
 - Metric 18: Conditional compliant and PCA still active and deadline extended.
 - Deadline extended by 18 months by FHWA.
 - Metric 19: Conditional compliant and PCA still active.
 - Metric 23: PCA closed, now Substantially compliant pending FHWA data submittal.
 - If INDOT's upcoming data submission is free of errors, FHWA will consider INDOT to be substantially compliant.
3. Metric 12 (Quality Inspections) PCA discussion.
- Only 8 of 19 bridges sampled by FHWA for field and file review were compliant.
 - Not all reported condition ratings were within +/- 1 of FHWA's assessed ratings.
 - Jon Olson mentioned that ODOT has some good literature and examples in their bridge manual to assist inspectors with making condition ratings.
 - Tony suggested an online training course be created to assist inspectors with condition rating accuracy.
 - Not all notable deficiencies were identified and/or properly documented in the reports.
 - Not all reported condition ratings were supported by the report narrative.
 - Not all LPA inspections followed AASTHO MBE procedural requirements, such as:
 - Demonstrating necessary level of access to members.
 - Surfaces with corrosion or deleterious materials were properly cleaned for inspection.
 - Providing appropriate recommendations to address noted defects.
 - Need for structural reviews.
 - Tony mentioned that the issues Josh Heigert uncovered were a fair mix from INDOT bridges and LPA bridges.
 - Data collection, procedure review, and make recommendations for program updates, to include review of consultant QC/QA procedures and soliciting feedback from the consultant inspection community.
 - Develop program revisions to update Part 4 of the IBIM by end of November 2026.
 - Carry out additional educational outreach following issue of program revisions.
 - Carry out supplemental reviews throughout 2027 and 2028 to monitor effectiveness of program revisions and enact other actions as may be required.
 - Tony wants to bring consultants in and share with them the results of FHWA's inspections for educational purposes.
 - Tony foresees the possibility of developing a task group charged with creating QA/QC guidelines.
 - Jon Olson suggested removing company-specific identifiers and sharing the FHWA inspection results with the committee.

4. Metric 16 (NSTM Inspections) PCA discussion.

- Only 7 of the 18 bridges with NSTMs sampled for review were compliant.
 - Seven (7) bridges did not meet the criteria of requiring hands-on inspection of all members and/or identifying any necessary specialized techniques.
 - Nine (9) bridges did not have reports that demonstrated that the general and/or bridge-specific NSTM procedures were followed.
 - One bridge file reviewed did not clearly identify who was the lead/responsible team leader.
 - One RRFC bridge file did not provide evidence that the NSTMs received an arm's length inspection.
 - One NSTM report showed reused photographs and/or photographs that appeared to have been taken from a distance and zoomed in.
- FHWA noted that most of the bridge-specific NSTM Inspection Plans were not stand-alone documents, but rather work plans developed by inspectors based on previous reports and included within the NSTM inspection reports.
 - Jon Olson asked that minimum requirements be listed for these NSTM reports, noting that many of the standards point to each other without providing specific requirements. ODOT has a good example in Appendix E of their inspection manual.
 - Tony noted that consultants can send him a copy of their NSTM plans for a voluntary review.
- INDOT will issue memorandum on requirements for Floor Beams as NSTMs.
 - Tony is aiming to release this memo by the end of March.
- Additional educational outreach detailing the compliance requirements for NSTM inspections.
- Complete program revisions to update Part 5 of the IBIM by the end of November 2026.
- Carry out additional QA Audits on NSTM Inspection Plans, NSTM field inspection operations including having INDOT personnel shadow consultants during inspection activities, and NSTM inspection reports throughout 2026 and 2027. INDOT will review LPA inspections and INDOT's on-call consultant will review INDOT inspections.

5. Metric 18 (Scour) PCA discussion.

- Expect to be issuing instructional memorandum before upcoming workshop.
- Validate SNBI Items B.AP.03 (Scour Vulnerability) and B.AP.04 (Scour POA) for all LPA bridges.
- SNBI Items B.AP.03 and B.AP.04 are near complete (>99%) for all State bridges.
- Validation deadline for LPA bridges: August 31, 2026.
 - Tony will be sending out instructions on how to perform this step as part of the instructional memorandum.
- Task Group currently meeting to refine Scour Assessment/Screening qualitative procedures and to provide INDOT feedback on upcoming revisions to Part 6 of the IBIM.

6. Metric 13 and Metric 14 discussion and updates (Jennifer Hart).

- "Strength and performance" needs to be better-defined internally. INDOT to provide additional guidance.
- BRADIN was updated on December 12th, 2025, which included some SNBI updates.
- INDOT was found conditionally compliant for Metric 13, with only a few stragglers in NBI items 66 and 67 from past data.
- For Metric 14, we have until the end of the year to complete the action items.
 - One action item is to establish an audit process for posting requirements vs postings in-place.
- Revisions to BIM will address incorrect sign types (like axle weight signs).

- Communication needs to be improved between those performing inspections and those performing load ratings. Helps head-off surprise ratings when conditions drop.
- The report approval deadline of February 13th may generate more “rating needed” e-mails.
- Tool created to watch and pull the condition drop date. This should help fix date mix-up between condition drop date, inspection date, report approval date, and BRADIN update date.
- INDOT is hoping to migrate for version 7.7 of BrR. Some bugs have been found and addressed. Anticipate e-mail to industry in a couple weeks to move to 7.7.1 version.
 - INDOT plans to run their models through the new version and summarize what has changed.
 - Adoption of LRFD 10th edition included in update.
- LR reminder from Tony: If posting values at the bridge are determined to be incorrect based on load rating results, CFR needs to be filed upon discovery.
- Inspection memo reminder from Tony: Consultants need to be providing their counties (and copying INDOT) with a list of the county’s posted bridges prior to field work. This provides the county with time to address any signage deficiencies prior to inspection, which reduces the number of sign-related critical findings.
- INDOT’s on-call consultant will be performing random audits of in-place posting signs.
- INDOT is working on a tool to pull posting photos from iTAMS, read them, and compare them to BRADIN values.
- LR updates in Bridge Inspection Manual will discuss G and T sign types. G is the typical commercial vehicle sign we’re used to, and T is the truck silhouettes. Sign of axle numbers with weights is non-compliant.
- Jon Olson requested that bridge inspection memos that update the bridge inspection manual be archived once the relevant manual section is updated.
- Discussion on new section of BIM Part 2, which states that a posting value of less than 5 requires a critical finding and 6-month inspection.
 - Tony stated that this is meant to apply to structures where a load rating is performed, and the calculations result in posting values less than 5 but not less than 3. In these situations, a 6-month inspection is required along with a critical finding. Immediate corrective action in this case would be updating signage, and final resolution would include some sort of structural intervention like shoring.
 - This does not apply to bridges where the calculations show higher posting values, but the bridge is posted lower at the owner’s request.
 - This does not apply to bridges currently posted less than 5 but not less than 3. This only applies to bridges where this reduction is observed to happen. For now, we don’t need to run a query of our existing structures and retroactively file CFRs and assign 6-month inspections.
 - Tony will send out additional clarifying information on this procedure.

7. Upcoming BIM Memos discussion.

- Part 2 updates, QC/QA update, Scour Screening/Assessment – issue shortly.
- Memorandum detailing requirements for stand-alone, bridge-specific NSTM Inspection Plans.
- Memorandum detailing RRFC NSTM requirements (with possible structural review provision).
 - Twin flatcar bridges can be considered non-NSTM if it can be demonstrated that there is a composite reinforced concrete deck, or if it can be demonstrated that load path redundancy exists.
 - The cost of this analysis is reimbursable at 80/20.
- Requirement for a structural review to support the finding that the “strength and/or performance of component is affected” when a component rating is lowered to 4.
 - Definition of “Structural review” will be later explained in a memo.
 - Goal is to have an engineer put eyes on all of these structures, not just an ATL.

8. FHWA fed data tape submittal discussion.
 - Announcement was issued regarding February 13th deadline to approve reports.
 - Overall, INDOT is in excellent shape for FHWA bridge submittal.
 - Nathaniel Foy update on current status.
 - INDOT appreciates everyone's quick responses and effort at cleaning up the iTAMS data.
 - Biggest item remaining is a handful of 90+ day reports still open, but these are in the process of being closed.
 - Bill Dittrich commented that there are a few stragglers for element level bridges.
 - Bill noted that for element level bridges, the wearing surface element needs to be a child element to the deck, not a standalone element, because otherwise it will create an error.
 - Nathaniel is holding off on creating new assets until the fed tape pull is complete; this will head off additional errors in the fed tape.
9. SNBI Item B.IE.10 (Inspection Data Update Date) discussion.
 - Will be bulk populated by INDOT to reflect FHWA data tape submittal acceptance.
 - Going forward, this item will report when an active inspection and appurtenant inspection report is advanced to the **Approved** status.
10. iTAMS Workflow (Open for Corrections to Audit) change: Maricar Gonzales update.
 - Audit process will be explained in a memo from INDOT, which will likely happen after the Fed Tape submission.
 - It is possible that using the Open for Corrections status could create a duplicate Routine inspection.
 - Jon Olson mentioned that the export of many-to-one data does not work in iTAMS Inspections tab.
11. Inspection Report Masters – header changes discussion.
 - Inspector line has been changed to "Team leader (ATL)".
 - Assigned User line has been changed to "QC Approver".
 - Both can only be populated by inspectors accredited by INDOT as ATLs.
 - INDOT is looking to add an additional Inspector line that can be populated by team members.
12. Other business discussion items (follow up from Q4 2025 meeting).
 - iTAMS export of many-to-one (X:1) data through iTAMS – **now working and in Prod.**
 - iTAMS fields for Proposed work, Replacement/Rehab/Preventative Maintenance/Other and Estimated Costs – nothing new to report and no implementation schedule.
 - County Summary Reports – nothing new to report and no implementation schedule.
 - Change to ACEC Bridge Inspection Committee proposal – nothing new to report.
13. iTAMS railing crash test and seismic vulnerability discussion.
 - Seismic vulnerability should be coded "0" until further direction provided by INDOT.
14. Training:
 - NHI 130053: Bridge Inspector Refresher Training ~~—schedule a class after June 2026.~~
 - INDOT is checking dates in May for the Refresher training.
 - NHI 130055: Safety Inspection of In-Service Bridges ~~—schedule a class after June 2026.~~
 - INDOT is checking dates in April for the 2-week training course.
 - NHI 130078: NSTM Course – pausing decision on hosting for now.
 - SBRITE NSTM Course – pausing decision on hosting for now.

- NHI 135017: Stream Stability and Scour at Highway Bridges for Bridge Inspectors ~~—likely to schedule a class in mid-fall, 2026.~~
 - INDOT has secured April 14th for this one-day course and is checking for additional demand on the consultant side to potentially offer another course date.
- Nathaniel is reviewing team leader credentials in iTAMS and contacting ATLs whose credentials were not properly uploaded in iTAMS.
- INDOT confirmed their annual September deadline for inspectors to reaffirm their credentials in iTAMS.
- Tony reiterated that INDOT's goal is to host the refresher course twice per year, once in Spring and once in Fall.
- Tony confirmed that if an inspector's credentials lapse, they are permitted to participate in bridge inspections, just not as a team leader. Once the inspector takes the refresher course, their credentials are restored.

15. Round table open forum discussion/issues/needs.

- Speaking on behalf of the consultants, Jon Olson requested that the iTAMS workflow more closely match the Code of Federal Regulations with regard to inspection coding timeline. The CFR required that coding be completed 3 months after the end of the month where the field work took place.
 - Josh Heigert confirmed that Jon's interpretation of the CFR is correct.
 - Tony stated that INDOT prefers to be slightly more conservative than the federal regulations in this instance, especially because INDOT recently completed a plan of corrective action under this metric.
 - The iTAMS workflow schedule will remain 75 days for Submitted for review and 90 days for Approval.
- Rob Coop asked about iTAMS field B.W.3 and why it was populated with data for a new bridge.
 - B.W.3 will need to be populated with data for each calendar year starting with 2026, though earlier years are also acceptable. Even if there is no work done in any given year, data must be added to the record according to the SNBI coding options.
- Discussion on inspection of closed bridges.
 - Jon Olson requested some clarification on this section of the new BIM Part 2.
 - Tony stated that closed bridges now receive Special inspections, not Routine inspections.
 - Bridges permanently closed receive inspections on a 12-month interval.
 - Bridges closed for construction receive inspection on a 9-month interval.
 - No separate work plan is required for these special inspections as the general inspection procedures are sufficient for this work.
- Shari requested that contract amendments be more clear. She needs to see original values, new values, and the change between them all clearly tabulated. Strikethroughs and markups are not preferred.
 - Shari plans to send around a redacted version of a good amendment example.

16. Next Meeting – ~~May 2026.~~

- Next meeting set to June 18, 2026