

**ADEPT ENGINEERING BOARD  
 NATIONAL BRIDGES GROUP**

**MEETING NOTES**

**Venue:** Online Video Conference due to Covid 19 Pandemic

**Date and Time:** 10:30hrs on Tuesday 18 May 2021

**Present:**

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Kevin Dentith (Chairman) [KD]       | Devon County Council                     |
| Stuart Molyneux (Vice Chairman)[SM] | Salford City Council                     |
| Alistair Dore (Secretary) [AD]      | Wakefield Metropolitan District Council  |
| Andy Willison [AW]                  | City of York Council                     |
| Drew Strang [DS]                    | SCOTS                                    |
| Colin Ferris [CF]                   | Dept for Infrastructure Northern Ireland |
| Colin Jenkins [CJ]                  | Warrington Borough Council               |
| Julian Haines [JuH]                 | Wiltshire Council                        |
| Brian Hill [BH]                     | Hampshire County Council                 |
| Keith Harwood [KH]                  | Hertfordshire County Council             |
| Andy Matthews [AM]                  | WSP                                      |
| Chris Plant (CP)                    | Staffordshire County Council/Amey        |
| Richard Waters [RiW]                | Lincolnshire County Council              |
| Chris Wright [CWr]                  | Herefordshire County Council             |
| Abul Tarafder [AT]                  | Leicester City Council                   |
| Alan Mclean [AMc]                   | Surrey County Council                    |
| Philp Gray (PG)                     | Transport for London                     |
| Jim Hall (JiH)                      | Denbighshire                             |
| James Salmon [JS]                   | Bedfordshire                             |
| John Burrige [JB]                   | Dorset County Council                    |
| Andy Matthews [AM]                  | WSP                                      |
| Bob Edwards [BE]                    | -  |
| Bob Humphreys [BH]                  | Gwynedd Council                          |
| Howard Robinson [HR]                | Rhinophalt                               |
| Phil Eadon [PE]                     | Rhinophalt                               |

ITEM		ACTION
<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>	
1.1	<b>Apologies for Absence</b> Stuart Heald - Suffolk County Council	
<b>2</b>	<b>GUEST PRESENTATION – RHINOPHALT</b>  Howard Robinson and Phil Eadon of Rhinophalt gave a presentation of the Rhinophalt product.  Rhinophalt is a spray applied resin based material for extending the life of carriageway surfacing.	

	<p>Most work in the UK to date had been on carriageway rather than bridges but the product could extend the life of bridge deck surfacing and delay resurfacing works being required.</p> <p>Ideally the treatment should be applied one to two years before normal maintenance is required and every five years thereafter.</p> <p>The product is based on a natural mineral, gilsonite, and is covered by a HAPAS certificate and MCHW specification clause 950.</p> <p>Product offers up to 35% porosity reduction.</p> <p>Questions:-</p> <p>KD How do you achieve skid resistance?</p> <p>PE - Original surfacing must be OK to start with, also apply a dust which gives immediate friction until binder has worn off aggregate.</p> <p>KD – Use on footbridges compared to slurry?</p> <p>PE – Slurry can debond, Rhinophalt locks in and can be done more quickly.</p> <p>JS – How quickly can product be applied, cost of Traffic Management may be key?</p> <p>PE – Can be applied at 7 to 8kmh on a lane, gives approximately 24,000m2 on a single night shift.</p> <p>DF – Does product affect recycling?</p> <p>PE – No, Gilsonite is a natural product.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 9 FEBRUARY 2021</b>	
3.1	<p><b>Accuracy</b> - agreed</p> <p>3.2 <b>Actions/Matters Arising</b></p> <p>2.2 Dr Panici's Scour slides, AD to share.</p> <p>6.1 BOF notes, KH to share after this meeting via AD.</p> <p>6.4 – Bill Harvey response to be shared by KD after this meeting</p> <p>7.2 – Network Rail intend to continue to use protocol, Liz Kirkham to write to DfT.</p> <p>DS – Not legally wrong but morally wrong. BE4 is an assessment code not a design code. Should not be used for design. Cost sharing protocol of 1999 does not address beyond decisions post 1999.</p> <p>AD – Historic Railway Estate (Highways England) working to the same policy.</p> <p>SM – CRT also.</p>	<p><b>AD</b></p> <p><b>KH/AD</b></p> <p><b>KD/AD</b></p> <p><b>LK</b></p>

	17.1 – Nothing received to date.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>SAFETY ITEM</b>	
4.1	CP – Recent bridge inspection under Network Rail possession with a scaffold was told by COSS it was safe to go on, bonding engineer informed them power was still on. (Near miss)	<b>KD</b>
4.2	AD – Very similar issue when working for Jacobs about 15 years ago.	
4.3	KD - Suggested we might want to share safe working procedures, happy to share Devon SWP's.	
4.4	KH – Has had similar problem with a power cable.	
4.5	CW – Receives Highways England Safety alerts, recent alert on failure of precast coping on a bridge will be shared via AD	
4.6	DS – SCOSS and CROSS have combined and now have a new website, now includes fire safety.	
<b>5.</b>	<b>ADEPT ENGINEERING BOARD – relevant items from recent meeting</b>	
5.1	KD – Receives emails from Liz Kirkham but not much of relevance so far.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>UK BRIDGES BOARD</b>	
6.1	KH – Case to UKBB for highway maintenance. Four themes with sub-groups now set up. Gary Sterrit is leading.	
6.2	Atkins State of the Nation report remains unpublished. Report looks at level of funding to get UK highways infrastructure up to acceptable level. Likely to employ consultants to assist.	
6.3	KD – Network Rail strengthening protocol was mentioned.	
6.4	KD – Cambridge working party on carbon toolkit states that materials used in construction have largest effect on carbon. KD disagrees, believes long diversions have worse effect.	
6.5	KD – Also discussed BICS alternatives, RAC Foundation survey and upcoming Bridges 2021 econference.	
<b>7.</b>	<b>BRIDGE OWNERS FORUM (BOF)</b>	
7.1	KH – BOF minutes are worth reading they are very comprehensive.	
7.2	KH – Theme of meeting was carbon. EA dis a presentation on manufacturing infrastructure and understanding the baseline. Carbon offsetting is not a long term practical option.	

7.3	Highways England stated that 97% of carbon was from use of network, only 3% from their construction activities.	
7.4	Welsh government proposing to use SAVI to analyse carbon in maintenance.	
7.5	Rochester Bridge Trust good presentation on minimising carbon, worth a look.	
<b>8</b>	<b>NETWORK RAIL ISSUES/LIAISON</b>	
8.1	Nothing further to report above protocol issue discussed above. No correspondence with Colin Hall since last UKBB. Awaits tomorrow's UKBB meeting.	
<b>9.</b>	<b>BRIDGE STRIKE PREVENTION GROUP (BSPG)</b>	
9.1	KD – No meeting, nothing further to report.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>ABNORMAL LOADS LIAISON GROUP</b>	
10.1	AD – report from Stuart Heald as follows:- <i>No contact has been made with either the regional or national Abnormal Loads Liaison Group for some time and meaningful dialog with Highways England has also not progressed. I along with other colleagues directly responded to the DfT's recent correspondence in respect to the relevance of their 'National Heavy and High Load Routes' but have not yet received a response. I am planning to give a presentation on abnormal load management to the group alongside Cascade Ltd at the next meeting and would like some guidance as to what the group would like to hear.</i>	<b>ALL</b>
10.2	JH – Would like some advice on how to set up regional groups.	
10.3	KD – Agrees regional groups would be useful, asked all to respond to Stuart's request.	
10.4	AW – Is national Abnormal Loads group led by Network Rail?	
10.5	CJ – Last national meeting included hauliers, Police, Local Authorities, Highways England, Network Rail. Meeting was worthwhile. Stuart Heald represents ADEPT NBG.	
<b>11</b>	<b>EUROCODES – Update</b>	
11.1	AM – PD6687/1 has been revised.	
11.2	AM – Draughting committee due to meet to go through final parts of new Masonry Parapet assessment code.	

<b>12</b>	<b>ASSET MANAGEMENT</b>	
12.1	<p>KH – SAVI was published in March 2020, review due any time now. Any queries should be emailed to:-</p> <p><a href="mailto:savi@hertfordshire.gov.uk">savi@hertfordshire.gov.uk</a></p>	
12.2	KD – No HAMFIG meetings held since last NBG meeting.	
	<b>Hot Topics</b>	
<b>13</b>	<b>WORKING WITH COVID</b>	
13.1	<p>KD – Should we plan to meet at Westminster in September?</p> <p>AD – Prefers face to face, would hope on the government’s roadmap we would be permitted to be back in September. Maybe a combined face to face and video conference?</p> <p>SM – Generally agrees, but different authorities have different rules so may take a while longer to get everyone back face to face.</p> <p>JH – Maybe one face to face and two virtual per year?</p> <p>A show of hands was requested. 13 out of 22 attendees would currently attend a meeting in Westminster next time (conditions allowing).</p> <p>General discussion ensued, AD will look at possibility of booking Westminster for autumn meeting.</p> <p>KD – May move to October?</p> <p>KD – As an industry feels we’ve done well coping with Covid 19.</p>	<b>AD</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>DMRB/MCHW Review</b>	
14.1	<p>KD – Bob Edwards is document owner for CS454. Proposal to increase Cmin factor for Abloads.</p> <p>JH – Seems high.</p> <p>BE – Maybe just refer back to BD21?</p>	
<b>15</b>	<b>BICS ALTERNATIVE SCHEMES</b>	
15.1	AD – Shared results of BICS survey (email e17/21)	
15.2	KD- Shows that 100+ Local Authorities are following a supported scheme, good news.	
15.3	KD – Suggested putting question on Bridge Inspector competency in RAC FOI?	
15.4	DS – Maybe dangerous as FOI is a public document.	

15.5	AD- Agrees.	
15.6	CJ – Is a 50% uptake a success story?	
15.7	KD – Possible that some authorities haven't decided yet.	
15.8	JS – Issues with qualified staff availability and getting staff qualified.	
15.9	CJ – Retention of staff? Offer an accreditation course through Universities? NVQ equivalent?	
15.10	KD – Do people struggle to get bridge inspectors?	
15.11	General discussion on the value of Bridge Inspectors and the lack of availability. Issues with lack of decent wage at inspector level, lack of support in small teams was generally agreed by all.	
15.12	BH – Is our representative on LANTRA BICS scheme, any other comments?	
15.13	KD – BICS has not been a complete failure if people are now taking bridge inspector competency more seriously. If wages can be increased then it will be easier to support people in those roles.	
15.14	AW – Bridge engineers are also undervalued.	
15.15	JS – Seems to be reactive, money only becomes available when a bridge is closed.	
15.16	CW – Believes RAC FOI survey results have made more money available.	
15.17	KD – Bridges should get 14% of an authorities Highway Budget.	
<b>16</b>	<b>CANAL AND RIVER TRUST</b>	
16.1	KH – Were going in the right direction but really slowly. CRT have agreed to charge actual costs based on actual rates. No scaffold licence fees either. CRT are introducing a timesheet system to support this.	
16.2	CRT provided a note recently to which ADEPT have responded, we await comments later this week.	
16.3	JH – Concerned that clause on movement of boats around a closure (by road) could be very expensive.	
16.4	KH – Only obliged to do so if CRT are.	
16.5	RW – Recent scour protection job, CRT fees estimated at £5000, outturn cost was around £1500. Happy with relationship.	
16.6	AD – Similar experience on recent job in Wakefield over commercial navigation. Well done to all involved over last few years for getting us this far!	

16.7	AW – Hopeful we can reach a workable agreement.	
16.8	JH – Councils often make grants to CRT, if large bills received then would hope Council would review those grants.	
16.9	KH – JH comment did come up during meetings with CRT.	
<b>17</b>	<b>FLOUROPOLYMER PAINT SYSTEM IN USE</b>	
17.1	AD - Used on large sculpture in Wakefield he has been required to adopt. Very pleased with finish, painters were also impressed that the paint “went off” quickly. They had expected a loss of gloss over a cold night, but didn’t happen.  AW – Experience also good, only about a year since applied to a York City bridge but still looks very good.	
<b>18</b>	<b>FRP BRIDGES DISUSSION ON EXPERIENCE</b>	
18.1	KD – Asked those affected to report back on their experience.	
18.2	AD – Used a Duraslab deck on a bridge in Wakefield, plans to use a small Polydeck footbridge to replace a timber bridge also aware that colleague in Doncaster has had good experience of smaller Polydeck footbridges.	
18.3	AW – Aware that North Yorkshire County Council also have a number of such footbridge structures and are happy with them.	
18.4	KD – In his experience ACME panels are not so good.	
18.5	RW – Has done a number, with two from Polydeck, also look like timber. No complaints so far.	
18.6	JH – Polydeck also do larger structures, some issues with movement causing bolts to wear holes in planks.	
<b>19</b>	<b>STAMFORD TUNNEL NETWORK RAIL WORKS</b>	
19.1	RW – Mainly cut and cover, but some tunnelled, failed assessment in 1990’s. Network Rail only just getting round to repairing it.	
19.2	Network Rail reserves the right to allow it to degrade back to the BE4 24 Tonne limit. RW has written back to Network Rail to state that this is not acceptable behaviour on the part of Network Rail.	
19.3	KD – Has this been raised at access planning group meeting?	
19.4	RW – No, awaiting actions from last meeting.	
<b>20</b>	<b>KNOWLEDGE HUB AND SHARING ABG MINUTES</b>	

20.1	AD will share minutes from other Area Bridge Groups with all via email if they are submitted to him but feels a proper online archive would be better, eg Knowledge hub.	
20.2	KD – Knowledge hub appears to be defunct. KD/AD to approach LK to see if it can be resurrected.	
<b>21</b>	<b>PROTECT DUTY CONSULTATION</b>	
21.1	KD - If asked all should respond. It relates to public safety in public open spaces which includes bridges in light of Westminster attack.	
<b>22</b>	<b>DETERIORATION MONITORING</b>	
22.1	<p>KD – In touch with Adrienn Tomor who has some funding to put towards a research project to produce a new design code for masonry arches. Funding would be towards building a new/replacement arch bridge.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note:- Adrienn has since been in touch with Devon and are considering building an arch bridge in Devon to replace a substandard RC slab bridge</i></p>	
<b>23</b>	<b>BRIDGE BEARINGS SEIZED – DOES IT MATTER?</b>	
23.1	<p>KD – Exeter University looking into natural frequency of bridge decks with respect to need to replace bearings. May result in a presentation to NBG?</p> <p>Exeter University, with Devon County Council support, has applied for grant funding to research population based Structural Health Monitoring – known as ROSEHIPS. The idea is many bridges are of similar type, age and condition – if, say, 10 masonry arches were inspected and all found to be in a certain condition, if there are 100 other bridges of the same type that were previously in the same condition then they could be assumed to be in similar condition to the sample population.</p>	
<b>24</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE- OFFICERS TENURE ENDS FEBRUARY 2022</b>	
24.1	KD - Officer tenure ends in February 2022. We will need to appoint Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary.	
<b>25</b>	<b>RICHARD FISHER NOTE ON OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTATION</b>	
25.1	AD – Relates to email e19/21, agenda and note prepared by Richard Fish on document ownership.	
25.2	KD- Prior ownership of County Surveyors Society (CSS) documents is ADEPT, should we be doing more?	
25.3	KH – CSS document is ours, remaining documents referred to in RF note are by others.	
25.4	PG – LoBEG document went to this group and UKBB, was it adopted?	

25.5	KH – No it was not adopted.	
25.6	JH – Would be useful to maintain a list of current relevant documents.	
25.7	AW – Concerned that a BCI review should be cautious.	
25.8	PG – LoBEG document was tweaking.	
25.9	KD- Set up some working groups? Larger authorities may be better placed with respect to staff availability?	
25.10	AD – As bridge engineers we use other peoples documents all the time, DMRB, BSI etc Agrees we should take responsibility for our own document.	
25.11	KD – Will look to put together a small working group to review CSS BCI documentation.	<b>KD</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
26.1	KD – Drew Strang is retiring and this will be his last meeting with us. Kevin gave his heartfelt thanks for all of Drews work with the group and wished him the best for his retirement.	
26.2	Kevin’s thoughts were mirrored by the group offering Drew their thanks and best wishes.	
26.3	DS – Is taking early retirement and thanked the group, he has enjoyed his time with us.	
<b>27</b>	<b>FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES AND EVENTS</b>	
27.1	NCE – Future of Bridges  29th Annual Bridge Conference – eBridges 26th- 27th May 2021	
<b>28</b>	<b>DATE AND VENUE FOR NEXT MEETINGS</b>	
28.1	Due to conflict with holidays of Chair and Secretary the meeting date is likely to be late September now, or possibly October - TBC  Meeting closed at 16:30 Hrs	<b>AD/KD</b>