Goals of Survey

1. Provide background to State Bridge Engineers for their in-house project planning and decision making,
2. Assist the HSCOBS Executive Committee in identifying items of wide interest, forming a course of action, or developing a strategic direction for the coming years,
3. Show trends in relevant State bridge and structure policies, practices, statistics, and tools.
General Comments

- Number of participants: 46 (as of May 31\textsuperscript{st})
- Number of questions: 58 (up from 33 in 2012)
  - Should the number be capped?
- Compilation of responses: manual (big mistake)
- Helpfulness of data: Totally dependent on how questions are phrased. Example—“How does your State define risk?”
- Less than 20\% of questions/responses show resounding similarity amongst the States in practice, interpretation, or uniformity in opinion
Provide background to State Bridge Engineers for their in-house project planning and decision making.

Selected responses:

- Over 15 ideas each on:
  - Bridge deterioration models
  - Life cycle vs. least cost
  - Full-depth precast concrete deck panels
- Where other States put resources
  - Less than half of the respondents have upgraded for MASH bridge rail standards
  - Approximately half of the respondents do not inspect all retaining walls
  - Only 7 States require a PE registration for bridge inspectors.
Assist the HSCOBS Executive Committee in identifying items of wide interest forming a course of action, or developing a strategic direction for the coming years.

Selected responses:

• Approximately two-thirds of the respondents are not happy with Pontis, and one-half aren’t clear on its future
• T1 Security—15+ ideas provided
• “Most Wanted” from T9: decision-making tool for scheduling preservation action(s)
• Despite increased interaction between designers and geotechs, half disagree that foundations have gotten more economical
• Refined analysis (of LLs) not there yet.
Show trends in relevant State bridge and structure policies, practices, statistics, and tools.

Selected responses:

- Approximately half of the respondents permit abutments on MSEWs. Of those, half are concerned for long-term performance.
- Software for substructure dgn—Lpile, etc.
- Deck preservatives used.
- Most common strategies for long-term performance of decks
  - polymer overlays
  - high-performance monolithic concrete
  - latex-modified concrete overlay
Questions submitted indicate a focus on maximizing structure longevity BUT...

A. More than half of the respondents use only least initial cost for bridge type selection. Little change from 2012.
B. Only 11 States have a design permit vehicle, and routinely use design Strength II
C. Less than half of the respondents have bridge deterioration models.
D. (not from survey) little pursuit in codifying a 75-yr design life for anything but LL (or coming?)
“Final” Results...coming.

Thank you for your attention...and submitting Q’s and responding.