Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee

Monday, March 20, 2017

1:30 P.M.

City of Santa Fe Offices @ Market Station
500 Market Street, Suite 200, Santa Fe, NM
(Map: http://tinyurl.com/l6kejeq)

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
DATE 3/15/17 TIME 3:25 pm
SERVED BY Mark Tibbetts
RECEIVED BY

AGENDA

- Call to Order
- Roll Call
- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from February 20, 2017

1. **Communications from the Public**
2. **Items for Discussion and Possible Action:**
   a. Presentation of Process of Inspection and Maintenance of Bridges within the MPO Planning Area– *Patrick Romero, PE, NMDOT District 5*
   b. Update on NM599 Studies and Status of NE/SE Connector– *Stephen Lopez, PE,* NMDOT District 5
   c. Update on the Call for Projects for the FFY 2018-2023 MPO Transportation Improvement Program – *MPO Staff*
   d. Update on Transportation Improvement Program projects
3. **Matters from the MPO Staff**
4. **Matters from TCC Members**
5. **Adjourn** - Next TCC Meeting: Monday April 24, 2017

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations, contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520, five (5) working days prior to the meeting date.

SUMMARY OF ACTION
SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
CITY OF SANTA FE OFFICES @ MARKET STATION
500 MARKET STREET, SUITE 200
MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017, 1:30 PM

MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF	NONE	7
MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS	INFORMATION/DISCUSSION	8
NEXT MEETING	APRIL 24, 2017	8
ADJOURN	ADJOURN	9

SANTA FE MPO TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
CITY OF SANTA FE OFFICES @ MARKET STATION
500 MARKET STREET, SUITE 200
MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017, 1:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Santa Fe MPO Technical Coordinating Committee was called to order by John Romero, Chair, at 1:30pm, Monday, March 20, 2017, at the City of Santa Fe Offices @ Market Station, 500 Market Street, Suite 200, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT
John Romero, Chair
Richard MacPherson, City of Santa Fe
Stephan Lopez, NMDOT
Dave Quintana, City of Santa Fe
Thomas Martinez, Santa Fe Trails
Paul Kavanagh, Santa Fe County
Diego Gomez, Santa Fe County
Erik Aaboe, Santa Fe County

MEMBERS ABSENT
Edward Escudero, Pueblo of Tesuque
Ray Matthew, Excused
Anthony Mortillaro, Excused

OTHERS PRESENT
Patrick Romero, NMDOT
Fred Pearson
Justin Reese, Santa Fe County
Wade Patterson, DOT Liaison
Mark Tibbetts, MPO Officer
Keith Wilson, MPO Senior Planner
Eric Aune, MPO Transportation Planner
Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Aaboe, seconded by Mr. MacPherson, to

approve the agenda as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FEBRUARY 20, 2017

MOTION A motion was made by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Mr. Aaboe, to approve the minutes as presented.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

None.

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

A. PRESENTATION OF PROCESS OF INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE OF BRIDGES WITHIN THE MPO PLANNING AREA

Mr. Romero made a Power Point presentation which is incorporated herewith into these minutes as Exhibit "1".

Mr. Aaboe asked what is the total inventory in District 5 that are structural deficient.

Mr. Romero said he does not have that but he will get it for him.

Chair Romero asked what is the difference between structurally deficient and functionally obsolete. Thank you for all the assessments you do for us.

Mr. Romero said structurally deficient is a rating of 4 or less. Functionally obsolete is that the alignment is wrong or the deck is geometrically incorrect or the height is not right. If you are both you are just structurally deficient.

Mr. Aune asked do the Feds or States require certain certificates for folks like you out in the field.

Mr. Romero said you have to have a program manager and a team leader. The person in charge on site has to be a PE or a combination of inspections done and credentials.

Mr. Aune asked does your inspection look at waterway design as it effects these

bridges.

Mr. Romero said no, another division does that. The District office does scour analysis.

Mr. Romero said most of these bridges were built in the 60s and are meeting their life expectancy at the same time. There are a lot of projects in this area. This is why we spend so much money on bridges and they take priority.

Mr. Romero said if you look at the bridges in the area we have the oldest infrastructure in this District because we were the first developed area in the State. We have been taking care of them and they have lasted long but 50 or 60 years old is a lot for them. They are doing fine but it makes sense to start replacing bridges at the end of their life cycle.

Chair Romero asked is that something the MPO can consider. Figure out that total pot of money we have to spend and instead of spreading out equally look at which bridges are in the most need.

Mr. Romero said we are doing pretty good as far as the State bridges go. There is a balance to be had.

Mr. Gomez asked is it a liability for local entities if we know we have a structurally deficient bridge.

Mr. Romero said if you get a notice from him that says to close the bridge you need to close that bridge.

Mr. Lopez said if the load capacity is reduced you put a sign on the bridge that gives the load ratings.

Mr. Romero said if it is structurally deficient it does not mean you can't put a load on it. We do a load analysis and advise you what to post the load limits as.

Mr. Wilson asked is there a funding source that these guys can compete on.

Mr. Romero said we have more of a hand in prioritizing bridges now. When he prioritizes bridges he looks at ADT.

Chair Romero asked if there is a structurally deficient rating is there a rating we should consider that if it is below that we need to fix the bridge.

Mr. Romero said at 5 or lower. We start making decisions at that point. You need to be proactive as well. Get rid of the salt going through the decks. Plan ahead. Consider an overlay. That extends bridge life 10 to 20 years. That keeps the salt out of

the way.

Mr. Gomez asked are you talking about epoxy overlay.

Mr. Romero said yes, with asphalt overlay the water sits with the salt and it keeps corroding the bridge deck. Yes, epoxy or concrete overlay.

Mr. Aaboe asked what is your limit for inspecting.

Mr. Romero said we inspect 20 feet or over. If it is culverts and if the span with 2 is over 20 feet it is a bridge.

Chair Romero asked is there a bridge certification course for his guys to help them read these reports and come up with projects and talks about new technologies.

Mr. Gomez said there is the bridge inspection class in Las Cruces.

Mr. Romero said that is 2 weeks long. He can sit down with your staff and give them a list and information for prioritization.

Mr. Wilson said we have never prioritized bridges. We rely on your priorities and feed them into the TIP and STIP.

Mr. Romero said the Guadalupe bridge going over the river, we have a construction ready rehab project there.

Mr. Lopez said with the Guadalupe Street Bridge, we had one bidder. It came in over what we have. We are trying to identify funding now to see if we can take that bidder. We hope to go to construction in the Summer.

B. UPDATE OF NM500 STUDIES AND STATUS OF NE/SE CONNECTOR

Mr. Lopez said our plans are 60% ready for this project. Before we commit to letting the project will have another public meeting in May or June to make sure it is accepted by the stakeholders.

Mr. Gomez asked did they show an overpass.

Mr. Lopez said no. It restricts full access. There will be no access directly across from 70 to 599.

Chair Romero said we brought up a lot of points at our last meeting. If those could be addressed that would be appreciated.

Mr. Lopez said Paul Brasher explained them to him. The intent of this is an interim improvement until the prioritization study is completed. We don't think this improvement will effect the prioritization study.

Chair Romero said one of the main concerns is if you take into account crashes and they cease to exist does that move us down on the priority list.

Mr. Lopez said by the time the study is complete they will use 2014 and 2015 crash data which included the crashes. The interim improvements will not be included in the study due to the timing.

Chair Romero asked for this new call for projects is the District going to include an interchange for this.

Mr. Lopez said we have to go based on what the study recommends. To be impartial, we will go with the most important need for 599 as identified in the study.

Chair Romero said if it could be based on the 2010 study it would get us an interchange in 2022. If this new study says something different we could amend that then and not wait for this next study.

Mr. Lopez said the interchange was the 2nd priority in the initial prioritization study. We have to wait until the next study is done.

Chair Romero said we don't want to wait for the next study and miss this call for projects.

Mr. Lopez said at the public meeting put that documentation in.

Chair Romero asked so we won't make this call for projects.

Mr. Wilson said we can do something like hold a spot on this list of projects. It may change.

Chair Romero said we could change it but he would rather have the potential for putting it in now.

Mr. Wilson said the consensus of this group at the last meeting was if we had to pick one project as a priority it would be this.

Mr. Lopez said the study will be done by end of year. It could be an option that could be entertained.

Mr. Gomez said we also talked about pushing traffic into other roads that are not equipped to handle it.

Chair Romero said he hates to miss this opportunity. How do we, as the MPO, influence that it be requested if we have a consensus.

Mr. Wilson said he thought Mr. Brasher was on board with that strategy. Send requests to your policy makers. This body can only encourage this. He would rather see a project come forward. April 14th is the deadline for submission of projects to the MPO. Then they will work with the District and then formalize the draft TIP. It will be better to bring it in now than force it in at the end.

Mr. Lopez said DOT is coming up with next 5 year project list now.

Chair Romero said that is why we are working on this. If this is in, he probably won't put in any other projects. If not he will.

Mr. Lopez suggested that the group put together some documentation asking for this project as a group.

Chair Romero said he wants to make motion to direct the MPO to issue a letter to the State asking them to include this in list of projects.

Mr. Wilson said ask staff to send DOT the priorities coming up and expressing the conversations here.

MOTION A motion was made by Chair Romero, seconded by Mr. Gomez, to direct MPO staff to submit a letter to the NMDOT District 5 Engineer requesting he include NM 599 and Via Veteranor (CR 70) for the upcoming call for projects for the FY 2018 - 23 TIP and note on the request that this specific project is subject to the upcoming corridor study recommendation and any changes it may have from the currently approved corridor study and that the MPO-TCC feels that this project is consistent with the adopted MTP and the most current corridor study developed by the NMDOT. Also the MPO-TCC feels that it is not only a significant project but that it effects all the member agencies of the MPO.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Lopez said regarding the NE/SE Connector, he met with the County to discuss the flaws in the report. A revised report has been developed and submitted. He will follow up with the County on the results of the review and hopefully we can move forward with the responsibilities on the connector. It is an important project for the County. We want to continue moving forward on the project.

C. UPDATE OF THE CALL FOR PROJECTS FOR THE FFY 2018-2023 MPO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Mr. Wilson said this is just a reminder. He kept it on the agenda for that purpose. We talked about this in the last item. He has received a couple of questions on the ITS check list. Fill it in the best you can.

Mr. Lopez said if you have ITS improvements included in a project you need to say what they are. That is part of the criteria.

Mr. Pearson asked does the County pending review have any affect on the eligibility for the call for projects.

Mr. Lopez said it gives impetus to the completition of the MOU. The direction has changed now from direction 5 or 6 years ago. DOT will design the NE and the County will design the SE but the County will construct both.

Mr. Wilson said if the County wants to ask for Federal funds now is the time to bring it in. To be eligible the Phase AB has to be approved. You can apply now.

D. UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Chair Romero said we don't have to go one by one at every meeting. Maybe we can review the entire document every 3 month or something like that. If there is something to be reported that is a significant change from what is on the list please do so.

Mr. Lopez said on S100230 DOT management is requesting that it be removed from TIP and STIP and be in next one.

Mr. Wilson said the plan to review one by one quarterly is fine. If there is a major change, benchmark or correction to be made, email him so that he can slot it in.

Chair Romero said let's get in the habit of doing that.

Mr. Lopez said the District is planning more projects in the slope failure on La Bajada and the La Cienaga interchange as well. We will be doing environmental plaining in next STIP cycle.

7. MATTERS FROM THE MPO STAFF

None

8. MATTERS FROM TCC MEMBERS

Chair Romero said he would like to ask that the MPO staff talk to the other MPOs please. When we do Federally funded projects we have to coordinate change orders. There are lots of chefs stirring the pot. If the improvements are on local entity roads he would like to omit District inspection and just let the entity whose road it is make the decision. We own the roads. It will help free up District time and benefit everyone. Could you see if all the other MPOs agree with that.

Mr. Wilson asked you would still go to the CLE, right.

Chair Romero said yes and if Federal funds are involved. Can we operate on our own if we own the road.

Mr. Quintana said the focus of the District would be to focus on reimbursement.

Mr. Lopez said we have to be responsible for audits.

Chair Romero said we can make the call on impeding traffic or what grade of concrete we use. The day to day stuff.

Mr. Lopez said it is about the risk the City takes.

Mr. Wilson said you are not missing out on approval, you still have the CLE.

Mr. Lopez said the CLE has to respond to the Feds too, if there is a change in the scope. It is the DOT's call to make.

Chair Romero said understanding that the District does not agree, he still asks the other MPOs if they agree. As long as we follow the Federal process. If we have to get our legal departments together to create a liability form that puts the responsibility on the City or County that is fine.

Mr. Lopez said understood. This is not his decision to make.

Mr. Aaboe said he is not asking you to make a decision, just that we figure out if the statewide MPOs agree.

Mr. Quintana said this is streaming the process.

9. NEXT MEETING MONDAY, APRIL 24, 2017

10. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

John Romero, Chair

Elizabeth Martin, Stenographer

X X

Project Bridge Color Template

Bridge_Number: 06661

Proj_Doc_Date: 3/9/2017

PROJ_DOC_DESC Active

Proj_Control_Number:

Project_Number:

Document Type **INSPECTION REPORTS**

X **PB1** X

EXHIBIT 1

New Mexico Department of Transportation
Bridge Management Section — Bridge Inspection Report

Bridge Number:	**000000000006661**	Inspection Date:	03/09/2017
SR:	74.2	SD/FO:	ND

IDENTIFICATION

Road Route Name:	NM-173	Location (9):	0.5 MI W OF JCT NM-511
SHD District (2):	District 5		
Place Code (4):	Bloomfield	County Code (3):	45 SAN JUAN
Feature Intersected (6):	SAN JUAN RIVER	Mile Post (11):	17.499 mi
Latitude (16):	36° 48' 18"	Patrol No.	Bloomfield (45-66)
Project No:	S-1349(5)	Longitude (17):	107° 41' 60"

BRIDGE NOTES

Description: 4 Simple spans at 49ft, 49ft, 49ft & 49ft. 5 Rolled steel girders per span, CIP concrete deck, concrete stub abutments and concrete pier caps on steel H piles.

Directions:

From JCT NM-511 and NM-173 travel west on NM-173 to MP 17.5 at structure.

CONDITION

Deck (58):	6 Satisfactory	Culvert (62):	N N/A (NBI)
Super (59):	6 Satisfactory	Channel/Channel Protection (61):	7 Minor Damage
Sub (60):	5 Fair		

APPRAISAL

Bridge Rail (36A):	1 Meets Standards	Approach Rail (36C):	0 Substandard
Transition (36B):	0 Substandard	Approach Rail Ends (36D):	0 Substandard
Str Evaluation (67):	5 Above Min Tolerable	Deck Geometry (68):	5 Above Tolerable
Underclearance, Vertical and Horizontal (69):	N Not applicable (NBI)		
Waterway Adequacy (71):	9 Above Desirable	Approach Alignment (72):	6 Equal Min Criteria
Scour Critical (113):	8 Stable Above Footing		

	Team Leader	Reviewed By
Signature and Date	PATRICK ROMERO 03/09/2017	***Signature and Date***

LOAD RATING AND POSTING

Inventory Rating Method (65):	1 LF Load Factor	Operating Rating Method (63):	1 LF Load Factor
Inventory Rating (66):	HS20.8	Operating Rating (64):	HS33.7
Design Load (31):	4 M 18 (H 20)	Posting (70):	5 At/Above Legal Loads
Posting Status (41):	A Open, no restriction		

AGE AND SERVICE

Year Built (27):	1967	Detour Length (19):	19.9 mi
Year Reconstructed (106):		ADT (29):	906
Type of Service on (42A):	1 Highway	Year of ADT (30):	2015
Type of Service under (42B):	5 Waterway	Truck ADT (109):	31%
Lanes on (28A):	2	Future ADT (114):	1,130
Lanes under (28B):	0	Year of Future ADT (115):	2035
Route Posted Speed Limit:			

STRUCTURE TYPE AND MATERIALS

Number of Approach Spans (46):	0	Membrane (108B):	0 None
Main Span Material Design (43 A/B):	3 Steel 02 Stringer/Girder	Deck Protection (108C)	8 Unknown
		Number of Spans Main Unit (45):	4
Deck Type (107):	1 Concrete-Cast-in-Place	Wearing Surface (108A):	0 None
Approach Span Material (44A):	_	Approach Span Material (44B):	-1

GEOMETRIC DATA

Length Max Span (48):	48.88 ft	Structure Length (49):	201.12 ft
Curb/Sdwlk Width L (50A):	0.00 ft	Curb/Sidewalk Width R (50B):	0.00 ft
Width Curb to Curb (51):	27.00 ft	Width Out to Out (52):	28.87 ft
Approach Roadway Width (32): (w/ shoulders)	27.50 ft	Median (33):	0 No median
		Structure Flared (35):	0 No flare
Skew (34):	0.00°	Horizontal Clearance (47):	27.00 ft
Minimum Lateral Underclearance R (55):	0.00 ft	Minimum Vertical Clearance Minus:	0
Minimum Lateral Underclearance L (56):	0.00 ft	Minimum Vertical Clearance Plus:	0

CLASSIFICATION

Defense Highway (100):	0 Not a STRAHNET hwy	NBIS Length (112):	07 Rural Mjr Collector
Direction of Traffic (102):	2 2-way traffic	Functional Class (26):	Long Enough
Highway System (104):	0 Not on NHS	Historical Significance (37):	5 Not eligible for NRHP
Owner (22):	01 State Highway Agency	Custodian (21):	01 State Highway Agency

INSPECTION

Frequency (91):	24 months	Inspection Date (90):	3/9/2017
Next Inspection:	3/9/2019	FC Frequency (92A):	
FC Inspection Date (93A):	NA	Next FC Inspection:	NA
UW Frequency (92B):		UW Inspection Date (93B):	NA
Next UW Inspection:	NA	SI Frequency (92C):	
SI Date (93C):	NA	Next SI:	NA

NMDOT MISC. DATA

Old Bridge Number:		Known Utilities:	N
Stay In Place Forms:	No	Stay In Place Form Type:	0
Overlay Thickness:		Culvert Fill Depth:	0

SIP Notes:

No SIP forms.

Approach Roadway Condition:

Asphalt pavement has isolated transverse cracking up to 1/4". Transition has moderate impact loading due to uneven approach. Embankments have steep slopes with moderate vegetation. Bridge signing: Delineators.

Channel & Channel Protection:

Wide, rocky and sandy channel perpendicular to structure with continuous flowing river.

Recommendation and Inspection Notes:

1. Recommending underwater inspections on piles. 2. Monitor moveable bearings. 3. Repair erosion slopes along abutment 2. 4. Clean debris off bridge seats, pier caps and bearings. 5. Upgrade traffic safety features.

Vertical, horizontal and map-like cracking up to 0.04", 26' CS-2.											
304/2	Open Expansion Joint	ft	155.00	0%	0.00	61%	95.00	39%	60.00	0%	0.00
Compression joints have minor dirt and debris buildup. Joint 2, 3 and 4 has failed with separation and loss of adhesion.											
2310/2	Leakage	ft	60.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	60.00	0%	0.00
Adhesive bond has failed in isolated areas over pier caps.											
2350/2	Debris Impaction	ft	95.00	0%	0.00	100%	95.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Joints have moderate debris build up throughout all joints.											
311/2	Moveable Bearing	each	5.00	0%	0.00	100%	5.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Steel moveable bearings has light rusting, was observed from distance from top of west bank.											
515/2	Steel Protective Coating	sq.ft	20.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	20.00	0%	0.00
Steel movable bearings have heavy rust.											
1000/2	Corrosion	each	5.00	0%	0.00	100%	5.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Light rusting throughout.											
313/2	Fixed Bearing	each	35.00	0%	0.00	100%	35.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Steel fixed bearings have light to moderate rusting.											
515/2	Steel Protective Coating	sq.ft	20.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	20.00	0%	0.00
Paint system on steel fixed bearings has failed. Bearings have heavy rust.											
1000/2	Corrosion	each	35.00	0%	0.00	100%	35.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Fixed bearings have light to moderate rusting.											
331/2	Re Conc Bridge Railing	ft	202.00	65%	131.00	35%	71.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
CBR on north side (inlet) 30% of the rail has isolated vertical cracking up to 0.04", 30' CS2, with isolated spall 2" x 2", 1' CS-2. CBR on south side (outlet) has vertical and diagonal cracking up to 0.04", 40' CS-2.											
1080/2	lamination/Spall/Patched Ar	ft	1.00	0%	0.00	100%	1.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
CBR on north side (inlet), isolated spall 2" x 2", 1' CS-2.											
1130/2	Cracking (RC and Other)	ft	70.00	0%	0.00	100%	70.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
CBR has isolated vertical cracking up to 0.04", 70' CS2.											
7369/2	Wingwalls	(LF)	48.00	46%	22.00	54%	26.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
SW Wingwall has isolated spalls up to 4"x 4". Wingwalls have longitudinal, transverse, horizontal and vertical cracks up to 1/16". NW wall has vertical and diagonal cracks up to 1/32" and minor map cracks less than 1/32". NE and SE walls have isolated vertical and diagonal cracks less than 1/32".											
1080/2	lamination/Spall/Patched Ar	(LF)	1.00	0%	0.00	100%	1.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
–											
1130/2	Cracking (RC and Other)	(LF)	24.00	0%	0.00	100%	24.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Wingwalls have vertical, horizontal cracking up to 0.03", 11' CS-2, isolated transverse and longitudinal cracking along the top of wingwall up to 0.04", 13' CS-2											
1190/2	Abrasion(PSC/RC)	(LF)	1.00	0%	0.00	100%	1.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
NE wingwall has heavy abrasion along end by abutment up to 1' x 3', 1' CS-2.											
7371/2	Guardrail	(LF)	120.00	93%	112.00	0%	0.00	7%	8.00	0%	0.00
12" W rail on timber with flared ends bolted to Wingwalls. Rail has isolated areas of traffic damage, moderate rusting and is low to standards.											
7000/2	Damage	(LF)	8.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	8.00	0%	0.00
Damage to guard rail on east bond lane at approach, 8' CS-3.											
7379/2	Diaphragm Steel	each	64.00	0%	0.00	100%	64.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Diaphragms over piers and abutments have moderate rust and water stains. Other diaphragms have minor rust.											
1000/2	Corrosion	each	64.00	0%	0.00	100%	64.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Diaphragms over piers and abutments have moderate rust and water stains. Other diaphragms have minor rust.											

ELEMENT CONDITION STATE DATA

Elm/Env	Description	Unit	Total Qty	% in 1	Qty. St. 1	% in 2	Qty. St. 2	% in 3	Qty. St. 3	% in 4	Qty. St. 4
12/2	Re Concrete Deck	sq.ft	5,807.00	55%	3,195.00	25%	1,452.00	20%	1,160.00	0%	0.00
The topside of the deck has been partial depth patching and sealed with PCBO in the spring of 2012, as not on previse report. There are some reflective cracking, longitudinal and transvers cracking up to 0.20", 25% (1452 sf.), CS-2. Along top deck edges there is heavy dirt buildup. Deck wear surface is in good condition. Underside of deck has patching throughout, 20% (1162 sf.) of the deck is in CS-3. Isolated wood forms were left in place.											
510/2	Wearing Surfaces	sq.ft	5,801.00	100%	5,801.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Deck has a PCBO seal that acts as wearing surface and is in good condition.											
1080/2	Delamination/Spall/Patched Ar	sq.ft	1,160.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	1,160.00	0%	0.00
Deck has patching throughout, 20% (1162 sf.) of the deck is in CS-3.											
1130/2	Cracking (RC and Other)	sq.ft	1,452.00	0%	0.00	100%	1,452.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
There are some reflective cracking, longitudinal and transvers cracking up to 0.20", 25% (1452 sf.), CS-2.											
107/2	Steel Opn Girder/Beam	ft	980.00	93%	916.00	7%	64.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Girders have minor rusting throughout all the girders, 5% (49') paint loss CS-2. Girders 1, 2 and 3 have isolated moderate rusting, 15' CS-2. Overall the girders are in good condition.											
515/2	Steel Protective Coating	sq.ft	7,193.00	99%	7,113.00	0%	0.00	1%	80.00	0%	0.00
Paint system at girder ends and at top flanges under joints have moderate rusting.											
1000/2	Corrosion	ft	64.00	0%	0.00	100%	64.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Girders have minor rusting throughout all the girders, 5% (49') paint loss CS-2. Girders 1, 2 and 3 have isolated moderate rusting, 15' CS-2. Overall the girders are in good condition.											
215/2	Re Conc Abutment	ft	62.00	5%	3.00	42%	26.00	53%	33.00	0%	0.00
Abutment 1 has heavy scaling throughout with exposed aggregate, 90% (28') in CS-3. Isolated vertical and horizontal cracking up to 0.04", cracking is within the area of the scaling. Abutment 2 has horizontal and vertical cracks up to 0.08", 5' CS-3, isolated horizontal and vertical cracking throughout the rest of the abutment up to 0.04", 26' CS-2. Bottom of abutment 2 is exposed due to erosion, under girder 4. Slopes have severe erosion under girder 2 and 4.											
1130/2	Cracking (RC and Other)	ft	31.00	0%	0.00	84%	26.00	16%	5.00	0%	0.00
Horizontal and vertical cracks up to 0.08", 5' CS-3, isolated horizontal and vertical cracking throughout the rest of the abutment up to 0.04", 26' CS-2.											
1190/2	Abrasion(PSC/RC)	ft	28.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	100%	28.00	0%	0.00
Abutment 1 has heavy scaling throughout with exposed aggregate, 90% (28') in CS-3.											
225/1	Steel Pile	(EA)	12.00	0%	0.00	67%	8.00	33%	4.00	0%	0.00
Steel H pile paint loss long throughout, but more so along the bottoms near the water. Piles closer to the water and just above have pitted with heavy rusting up to 7', with isolated minor section loss and scaling. Cap 1 has minor to moderated rusting and pile 4 has isolated section loss 1'. Cap 2 has moderate rusting on all piles. Cap3 has moderate rusting with minor section loss. Pile 2 and 3 had scaling along the bottom. Recommending underwater inspection for lower section of piles.											
515/1	Steel Protective Coating	sq.ft	1,508.00	67%	1,008.00	30%	450.00	3%	50.00	0%	0.00
Painted steel piles paint system has failed at isolated areas, some minor section loss along the bottom.											
1000/1	Corrosion	(EA)	12.00	0%	0.00	67%	8.00	33%	4.00	0%	0.00
Steel H piles paint loss long throughout, but more so along the bottoms near the water. Piles closer to the water and just above are pitted with heavy rusting, with isolated minor section loss.											
234/2	Re Conc Pier Cap	ft	84.00	68%	57.00	32%	27.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Cap 1 has spalls up to 6" x 4", 1' CS-2, isolated map-like cracking up to 0.02", 5' CS-2, at inlet side of cap and outlet end. Cap 2 has horizontal cracking along the top up to 0.04", 14' CS-2, isolated diagonal cracking on inlet cap end up to 0.04", 1' CS-2. Cap 3 has vertical and horizontal cracking at inlet up to 0.02", 2' CS-2, map-like cracking between girder 3 & 4 up to 0.02", 4' CS-2. All three caps have water staining due to joints leaking from above.											
1080/2	Delamination/Spall/Patched Ar	ft	1.00	0%	0.00	100%	1.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00
Cap 1 has spalls up to 6" x 4", 1' CS-2.											
1130/2	Cracking (RC and Other)	ft	26.00	0%	0.00	100%	26.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00

PAST INSPECTION

Inspection Date:	03/09/2017	Type:	1 Regular NBI
Inspector:	Garcia, Cassie	Pontis User Key:	PROME05 PATRICK ROME

Scope:

NBI:	☑	Other:	☐	Element:	☑
Underwater:	☐	Fracture Critical:	☐		

INSPECTION NOTES

1. Weather Conditions: Sunny 50 degrees.
2. Bridge Inspectors Present: Patrick Romero P.E., Carlos Vigil, Cassie Garcia.
3. Work Done Since Last Inspection: None noted.