

## ADEPT ENGINEERING BOARD

### NATIONAL BRIDGES GROUP

#### MEETING NOTES

**Venue:** Online – MS Teams

**Date and Time:** 10:30 on Thursday 2 March 2023

**Present:**

Name	Present	Init.	Email	Representing
Keith Harwood	✓	KH	<a href="mailto:keith.harwood@hertfordshire.gov.uk">keith.harwood@hertfordshire.gov.uk</a>	Chair
Helen Rowe	✓	HR	<a href="mailto:helen.rowe@kent.gov.uk">helen.rowe@kent.gov.uk</a>	Secretary
Jim Hall	✓	JH	<a href="mailto:james.hall@denbighshire.gov.uk">james.hall@denbighshire.gov.uk</a>	CSS Wales, Chair
Bob Humphreys		BH	<a href="mailto:RobertEdwardHumphreys@gwynedd.gov.uk">RobertEdwardHumphreys@gwynedd.gov.uk</a>	CSS Wales
Caroline Haycock		CH	<a href="mailto:caroline.haycock@kier.co.uk">caroline.haycock@kier.co.uk</a>	East Mids
Abul Tarafder	✓	AT	<a href="mailto:abul.tarafder@leicester.gov.uk">abul.tarafder@leicester.gov.uk</a>	East Mids, Chair
Clive Woodruff	✓	CWo	<a href="mailto:clive.woodruff@essexhighways.org">clive.woodruff@essexhighways.org</a>	East, Chair
Stuart Heald		SH	<a href="mailto:stuart.heald@suffolkhighways.org">stuart.heald@suffolkhighways.org</a>	East, Sec
Colin Ferris	✓	CF	<a href="mailto:colin.ferris@infrastructure-ni.gov.uk">colin.ferris@infrastructure-ni.gov.uk</a>	Infrastructure NI
Kevin McCarron		KM	<a href="mailto:kevin.mccarron@infrastructure-ni.gov.uk">kevin.mccarron@infrastructure-ni.gov.uk</a>	Infrastructure NI
Aidan McCusker		AMcC	<a href="mailto:aidan.mccusker@gov.im">aidan.mccusker@gov.im</a>	Isle of Man
Alex Holden		AH	<a href="mailto:alex.holden@gov.im">alex.holden@gov.im</a>	Isle of Man
Stuart Molyneux		SM	<a href="mailto:stuart.molyneux@salford.gov.uk">stuart.molyneux@salford.gov.uk</a>	North West, Chair
Colin Jenkins	✓	CJ	<a href="mailto:cjenkins@warrington.gov.uk">cjenkins@warrington.gov.uk</a>	North West, Sec
Alastair Swan		AS	<a href="mailto:alastair.swan@newcastle.gov.uk">alastair.swan@newcastle.gov.uk</a>	North, Chair
Nigel Burn		NB	<a href="mailto:Nigelburn@gateshead.gov.uk">Nigelburn@gateshead.gov.uk</a>	North, Sec
Donald MacPherson	✓	DM	<a href="mailto:donald.macpherson@aberdeenshire.gov.uk">donald.macpherson@aberdeenshire.gov.uk</a>	SCOTS, Chair
Maria Lucey		ML	<a href="mailto:luceym@stirling.gov.uk">luceym@stirling.gov.uk</a>	SCOTS
Alan Mclean	✓	AMcL	<a href="mailto:Alan.Mclean@surreycc.gov.uk">Alan.Mclean@surreycc.gov.uk</a>	South East, Chair
Scott Gregory	✓	SGr	<a href="mailto:scott.gregory@hants.gov.uk">scott.gregory@hants.gov.uk</a>	South East, Sec
Rob Causton	✓	RC	<a href="mailto:rcauston@cornwall.gov.uk">rcauston@cornwall.gov.uk</a>	South West, Chair
John BurrIDGE	✓	JB	<a href="mailto:john.burridge@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk">john.burridge@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk</a>	South West, Sec
Emma Cockburn		EC	<a href="mailto:Emma.cockburn@sw-ha.uk">Emma.cockburn@sw-ha.uk</a>	South West
Maureen Robson		MR	<a href="mailto:MaureenRobson@tfl.gov.uk">MaureenRobson@tfl.gov.uk</a>	TfL
Philip Gray	✓	PG	<a href="mailto:philipgray@tfl.gov.uk">philipgray@tfl.gov.uk</a>	TfL
Sharan Gill		SGi	<a href="mailto:sharanjit.gill@tfl.gov.uk">sharanjit.gill@tfl.gov.uk</a>	TfL
Chris Wright	✓	CWr	<a href="mailto:chris.wright2@balfourbeatty.com">chris.wright2@balfourbeatty.com</a>	West Mids, Chair
Chris Plant	✓	CP	<a href="mailto:chris.plant@staffordshire.gov.uk">chris.plant@staffordshire.gov.uk</a>	West Mids, Sec
Mark Watson	✓	MW	<a href="mailto:mark.watson@doncaster.gov.uk">mark.watson@doncaster.gov.uk</a>	Yorks/Humber, Chair
Claire Richardson	✓	CRi	<a href="mailto:Claire.Richardson@kirklees.gov.uk">Claire.Richardson@kirklees.gov.uk</a>	Yorks/Humber, Sec
<b>Guest members</b>				
Kevin Dentith	✓	KD	<a href="mailto:kevindentith@hotmail.co.uk">kevindentith@hotmail.co.uk</a>	Independent, Ex Chair of ADEPT NBG
Ikram Muhmmad	✓	IM		FM Conway
Peter Moore	✓	PM		FM Conway



	<p>area – see section 10.</p> <p>Volunteers for BCI Steering Group or SAVI please.</p>	
<b>2.3</b>	<b>BICS Update, Sector Scheme, Bursaries</b>	
2.3.1	BICS now has 25 qualified inspectors, 30 senior inspectors.	
2.3.2	<p>Sector scheme to be introduced for BICS through Lantra – looking for an ADEPT rep for the Steering Group.</p> <p>CRi asked about sector scheme, she thought it was already in place as Sector Scheme 31?</p>	
2.3.3	Rochester Bridge Trust now offering bursaries for 50% of BICS qualification for anyone earning less than £50k per year.	
2.3.4	<p>KH - Do we want to get someone in to explain the updates on BICS so we are all working to the same aims?</p> <p>CRi said yes we ought to be in touch with how the national scheme is working, but she would like a slot at the next session to present the scheme they have developed (action added in AOB).</p> <p>Need more discussion at next meeting – agenda update.</p> <p>KD – Bob Humphries may be good option to do update presentation?</p>	KH
<b>PRESENTATIONS</b>		
<b>3.</b>	<b>FM Conway – Carbon Reduction Strategy and Projects</b>	
3.1	<p>Presentation Summary (slides appended for more information):</p> <p>FM Conway introduced their business and how they are tackling carbon reduction with some of their clients. They explained how they self deliver much of their services and the impact this can have on carbon output through recycling etc. They briefly covered their <a href="#">Net Zero Strategy</a>, some of their carbon calculation tools (Materials tool and ConEst) and how they are working towards PAS2080 Accreditation. They also introduced some of their carbon saving innovations and partnerships including electric cargo bikes, electric vessels for surveys and future developments of electric safety boats and the VOK Electric Bikes which have larger cargo capacity. They gave a brief summary of some of the carbon saving initiatives implemented on their Structures Projects specifically.</p>	
3.2	<p>Client perspective:</p> <p>AF talked about how WCC found themselves pushing against an open door with FM Conway to introduce these measures.</p> <p>Discussed how to implement electric vehicles – trialed an electric digger, it was more expensive, but it comes back to supply and demand. As a client we have to say we want this to bring these costs down.</p> <p>They tried to collaborate with neighbouring boroughs who also use FM Conway to utilise more electric vehicles in close proximity. It's not easy, we can't increase budget to cover carbon savings so it's about thinking differently.</p> <p>Having a long-term partnership is key to enabling a contractor to innovate in this area – FM Conway with WCC is 12 years (2014 to 2026). WCC have found 80% of their emissions are coming from 4-5 materials – concrete, asphalt, natural stone, fuel, street furniture so this is where they are focusing their efforts.</p> <p>Standard details can stifle innovation so they are changing these and giving designers more freedom to assess specific site issues.</p> <p><u>Questions:</u></p>	
3.3	<p>JH - What are the GRP vs steel savings?</p> <p>PM - Savings are in transport due to them being lighter, very little maintenance due to no corrosion.</p>	
3.4	HR - How applicable are these strategies if the structures are more	

spread out?

PM – Lots of these tactics are used on the 3 Rochester bridges too, eg. Using the electric boats from nearby marina.

LA - You need to think about lasting change so you have to pick the right solutions for your locale.

3.5 WCC and FM Conway happy to answer further questions by email.  
Andy Foster - Westminster City Council email:

[afoster1@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:afoster1@westminster.gov.uk)

Peter Moore – FM Conway email:

[Peter.moore@fmconway.co.uk](mailto:Peter.moore@fmconway.co.uk)

4. **Westway Movement Joint (Roller Shutter Joint) Project – Anil Kumar & Philip Gray**

4.1 Presentation Summary (slides appended for more information):

Project briefing provided by TfL explaining how they replaced the roller shutter joint on Westway. AK introduced project scope, basics of what an RSJ is, the constraints of Westway and the procurement approach adopted for the scheme. He then went into more detail on the pre-construction verification/design phase looking at how the movement was verified using a number of surveying techniques, what standards were used, testing on trial assemblies and temporary works for the project. Summarised with key successes of the scheme.

Questions:

4.2 JH - Is RSJ on half joint?

AK - Confirmed no they are not.

4.3 CJ - Did TfL carry out the performance spec on highway bridges along heavy abnormal load routes along local roads?

PG - No they didn't.

4.4 CJ - Do expansion joints fail prematurely on abnormal load routes less than 40 years?

PG - On Westway RSJ, no it was design life expired. Other types of expansion joints however, yes they can fail earlier.

4.5 PG highlighted lots of constraints in London, can't close roads, need to coordinate multiple boroughs.

4.6 AK highlighted more lessons learnt, such as clear contractual documents – e.g. contractor didn't allow for verification of expansion joint needs, so they had assumed like for like replacement – that would have been disastrous as the analysis showed that wasn't sufficient.

4.7 KH – How did you calculate for climate change?

PG - This is incorporated within the 100mm increase. No specific calculation for this.

4.8 PG highlighted value of groups like ours as it helped them find details of the Forth Road Crossing replacement so they could share learning.

4.9 KH - Are there plans to reduce the numbers of expansion joints by using eg flexible concrete joints instead on the existing structure?

PG - They assessed this, but with tenancy issues and lack of funding they couldn't justify this level of intervention.

AK - In new construction areas they are removing joints from designs wherever possible and are using fully integral or semi-integral designs.

5. **Liaison with Network Rail – Chris Plant**

5.1 Chris Plant chairs the Access Planning Group which includes:

5.2 Members on the group include:

Chris Plant – ADEPT (Chair)

Colin George – National Highways (Secretary)

- Nicola Head - TfL  
David Castlo – Network Rail  
Amanda Hoyland – Network Rail  
Peter Walker – Canal & River Trust
- 5.3 CP is trying to get historic minutes of previous meetings so everyone can catch up on what has gone before. CIHT website seems to have broken links – it's going to be refreshed.
- 5.4 Track access survey conducted by this group – David Castillo taken it away and looking at it, seems positive so far.  
David Castillo is looking at why our possessions are being cancelled – apparently the problem affects Network Rail internal inspection teams too.  
Often the COSS is agency and only getting RAMS night before the shift – so pointless us sending RAMS very far in advance. Need to have meetings more in advance with these staff so they can understand the plan.  
There's a lack of signallers on some of the nights. David Castillo thanked us for doing the survey – considering doing it annually.
- 5.5 David Castillo looking to give us feedback from their ACE system on our possessions.
- 5.6 All parties agreed we should share the rules of access to others' networks – share rules of engagement on CIHT website.
- 5.7 All parties would like to share regional contacts.
- 5.8 NR have a new IT System – we can ask for copies of their inspection reports on our structures. CP asked if we can be given limited access logins so we can go see them without having to ask to save on the back and forth.
- 5.9 CP discussed how a critical TfL inspection was cancelled due to rail strikes – NR explained individual staff don't have to notify if they are striking until the day of pretty much so very hard to plan 3<sup>rd</sup> party works around this. The group asked if we can have a critical flag if it is really important work to be prioritised if strikes do go ahead and there's limited resource?
- 5.10 Question asked of NR and CRT to share their programme for upcoming major works – no answer as yet.
- Questions:
- 5.11 KH – Who is liable for costs of abortive works in the instance of strikes?  
CP can ask this – NR went very quiet on this when similar was asked by TfL.  
CWo shared that he had experienced cancellations as a result of strikes and tried to recover costs from NR and didn't get anywhere. BAPA agreements don't allow for cancellations.  
Compensation has been discussed before but the most recent solution offered by NR was not acceptable – LA to pay into a pot to pay out for abortive costs – almost an insurance policy for LAs funding cancellations themselves?
- 5.12 RC gave example of agreement not being signed now because costs cannot be recovered appropriately. Can we put this in the BAPA ourselves to make them liable for direct and indirect costs incurred?
- 5.13 CP asked if we have discussed before about a clause that NR would pay costs over £10k for cancellations – it was on a one off agreement and LAs tried to introduce this for all BAPAs but NR declined this.
- 5.14 KH and CP agreed we need to continue to collate survey results – next

	meeting in Jan and want to be able to report on possessions. Need both good and bad possessions – not just ones that have gone wrong, all possessions! Best to keep up to date as we go CP to circulate survey again.	ALL
5.15	We need to push for recovery of costs from NR – if we overran they would charge us so we need to try for a fair arrangement. To be raised at the next meeting.	CP CP
<b>6</b>	<b>Net Zero Bridges Group – Cameron Archer-Jones</b>	
6.1	Presentation Summary (slides appended for more information): CAJ gave brief update on progress by NZBG since last presentation. Net zero bridges group has a website now – <a href="http://www.netzerobridges.org">www.netzerobridges.org</a> – website has various useful info on there, encourage people to go and have a look. Main work has been around trying to agree a standardised approach to carbon calculation methods, there is now a guidance note on the website explaining the agreed approach for bridges. They are now collating data on bridge projects using this method and want this to expand. They are also including case studies on the website.	
6.2	Next steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Working Group to look at carbon actions on procurement under the PAS2080 guidance. Looking for external collaborators on that (must be familiar with PAS2080).</li> <li>2) Steel and concrete bridges guidance – what is possible in high exposure structures?</li> <li>3) Bridge carbon database – will start with new builds but can also capture partial new build schemes.</li> <li>4) Increased external comms – LinkedIn page etc.</li> </ol> <p><u>Questions:</u></p>	
6.3	CAJ – Have ADEPT NBG surveyed members on our carbon initiatives? KH – No, we are probably behind the curve on this. CAJ – Happy to walk the group through a survey if it was helpful – it’s a simple MS form.	
6.4	JH – can the links be put on the BOF website?	KH
<b>7.</b>	<b>Carbon Reduction Project - Victoria Walsh, Devon County Council</b>	
7.1	Presentation Summary (slides appended for more information): VW presented Devon’s decarbonisation model for highways construction specifically – covering whole life costs not just new build structures. She explained the continuous improvement model approach and how they used this to develop their dynamic decarbonisation strategy. She highlighted Devon have been pushing for national standards and are sharing their approach to help develop this. They work with FHRG to share the innovation and have set up a project with FHRG and Exeter University to develop the CCAS standards. These have been trialled by some local authorities and final version should be published this summer and will be freely available to ADEPT and FHRG members. <u>Questions:</u>	
7.2	CAJ – Will you be able to use this tool to inform carbon budgets? VW – yes, Devon is very keen on data led decisions.	
7.3	CRi – Is the cycle used per project? Or annually? VW – No. They ask suppliers for a selection of their works and collate the data on those, then multiply that data up for other projects. Try to ensure balance between real time data and usefulness.	
7.4	CRi – The algorithm feels like a black box – how to you build it? VW – CCAS has this, you will need techy people after this to do some	

- SQL logic.
- 7.5 AT – Most testing with county councils – is it applicable to city councils too? Can it consider diversion routes etc?  
VW – Had to balance interest and time authorities could spare. At the moment the model doesn't consider wider network implications. Devon's carbon calculator does consider this, but that isn't in CCAS.
- 7.6 CAJ – How do you define where your asset ends and where it interacts with another one? Bridges we think we have a fairly closed system scope, but how do you define where the lines are between say a bridge and a retaining wall/embankment approach?  
VW – Comes back to your asset management approach. Devon look at it in the way they commission the works, so if the work is commissioned by structures it goes to structures. As long as someone is counting it and its not double counted then that's the critical part. The key is making sure the one who can do something about the output has the ownership of the output.
- 7.7 CAJ – NH are developing a carbon tool – are you interacting with them?  
VW – Yes, presented a few times to them and liaising with them.
- 7.8 CAJ – Do you have a checking method with cost vs carbon?  
VW – Yes – there are more dashboards on this to make sure cost effectiveness is achieved with carbon reductions.  
CAJ – clarification – are you making sure the concrete specified on the construction bill of quants is matching the carbon input?  
VW – Yes. Trying to strike the balance right between perfection and usefulness.
- 7.9 JH – What were the comments from the trial around the resource required to do this trial?  
VW – Resource was the biggest challenge. Developing carbon literacy was first step and helps make things clearer. Most local authorities do already hold this data. CCAS document tries to cater for different readiness states. All the work in Devon has been done with existing staff and taken things slowly, they've had to go through a bit of a culture setting process to embed it in the day job, should be like CDM, environmental consideration, etc.
- 7.10 JH – does the resource requirement drop once the model is built?  
VW – it does and it doesn't. Yes once the model is in it will drop, but then it becomes day to day normal operation in staff work process, so staff should do this as part of every project (contracts, policies, schemes).
- 7.11 KH – How do we get from where we are now to where everyone is doing this.  
VW – has a personal view. Practitioner led guidance to make sure it is suitable for our industry. Until we get statutory requirements we will always be struggling.  
CAJ – Agree with VW on this. Its got to be integrated within the team not an external party with a feedback loop, it needs to be able to be reactive. Technical readiness is there for a set process/regulation.  
KH – not clear on who does the mandating for LA's. NH And NR have regulators so they are easily regulated, LA's don't have this.  
CAJ – establish carbon budgets and distribute that budget in the same way they apply monetary funding.  
VW – thinks CAJ is right and we will see the carbon budgets becoming more likely to be a mandatory part of budget setting and DfT banding for funds.

7.12	<p>KH – How integrated are you with other groups like UKRLG? VW – CECA, CIHT, Asset Management Board, DfT, so many groups. There’s no one place to go to get them all. If anyone wants to follow up please feel free to email her. CAJ – Baselines of work activity and unit values will help if they can be shared as this helps quell opposition. KD – ADEPT Engineering Board – Meg is on that board, suggest you get this in front of them too.</p>	
<b>STANDING ITEMS</b>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>UK RLG/ADEPT Feedback – ADEPT Engineering Board/Asset Management Board</b>	
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Consultation on heavier fuel tankers.</b>	
8.1.1	A coordinated response went in from this group, assume individual authorities went back in. CSS Wales sent a coordinated response as did SCOTS. No feedback on trials or results as yet.	
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Making the case for Investment in Maintenance</b>	
8.2.1	The “Making the case for Investment in Maintenance” Document is going to be updated by the Asset Management Board. The current document is focussed on demonstrating how bridges help achieve the current agenda (levelling up at present) – e.g. how do our works affect health/economy etc. They are finding it difficult to find case studies comparing the big picture agenda piece to the small picture projects we deliver. Atkins can help with developing an example into a good case study, let KH know if you have any good examples.	ALL
8.2.2	CRi – Clarifying what is being asked – examples of measurable benefit of highways maintenance? KH – They need more numbers based examples rather than anecdotal wordy ones.	
8.2.3	CP – How does that tie into options within SAVI? Do more, do less, do minimum. KH – Needs to go further – why is it important to fix the bridge rather than how much should we spend to fix it.	
8.2.4	CP – Tomtom are currently doing a study looking at network impacts of bridge weight limits for example. KH – those sound very applicable, can we share those?	CP
<b>8.3</b>	<b>ABC Board</b>	
8.3.1	There’s a new UKRLG ABC board – Adaptation, Biodiversity, Climate Change. Hazel MacDonald is on the Board and as chair of Bridges Board we should hear about bridge specific areas from this. Minutes are available on LGTAG website, they should be on CIHT but they aren’t there yet.	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Liaison with Other Groups</b>	
<b>9.1</b>	<b>ADEPT Rights of Way Group</b>	
9.1.1	James was leading on this – can we carry on with this now James has left? Is it valuable? RC & CP expressed that the group needs to continue, it was very broad and very useful. Everyone had different levels of understanding/records etc. It covered things like departures from standard for PRoW footbridges. PRoW structures are so diverse, we cannot be too prescriptive as a result. There needs to be guidance to identify the best source of information for managing those structure types. Need a best practice guidance, e.g. inspections, competency etc. Should be local	

9.1.2	<p>authority led.</p> <p>KH – do we have any volunteers to take over James' role? Can people nominate someone from their regional groups?</p> <p>CP – Keen volunteer but they aren't part of this group – does that matter?</p> <p>RC – Happy to still be part of the group from technical perspective.</p>	ALL
<b>9.2</b>	<b>HRESAF, ALLG, BSPG</b>	
9.2.1	HRESAF - No exciting updates. 3 structures refused retrospective planning so infilling now needs removal.	
9.2.2	<p>ALLG - Currently doesn't exist – hoping it will start up again. KH to speak to Hideo at National Highways.</p> <p>HR raised issue around Ab loads arriving without notification if just oversized and suitability of legislation to safeguard asset owners in this instance. Would ALLG be best placed to discuss this?</p> <p>KH – yes would be best if running. Stuart Heald best person to try to pick this up with in the meantime.</p>	KH
9.2.3	BSPG - Still carrying on but no report for this meeting.	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Knowledge Sharing and Discussion</b>	
10.1	CSS/Railtrack Cost Sharing Protocol Update - JH	
10.1.1	DfT will provide funding if required to engage a Consultant. Currently the group is being led by Fred Hartley of CRT, with HRE, DfT, Transport Scotland etc.	
10.1.2	<p>JH explained CSS Cost Sharing Protocol – it outlines the cost sharing for strengthening of bridges depending on whether they pass a BE4 assessment. It can be found on the BOF website – <a href="#">CSS Guidance</a>.</p> <p>JH thinks document is very good however when speaking to others he found consensus that NR was letting bridges deteriorate to BE4 level. In addition the assessment data is held by NR so it was difficult for the Highway Authority to say whether BE4 is met or not. Feels very one sided.</p> <p>JH highlighted some of the big issues are around AWL on footways and parapets as these are not covered in a BE4 assessment.</p> <p>Inland waterway bridges should be covered as should HRE.</p> <p>JH – BE4 Assessment isn't just 24 tonnes, its 24 tonnes on 2 axles.</p>	
10.1.3	<p>CWr – NR always refer back to the act of parliament not this guidance document.</p> <p>JH – 1968 Transport Act is key. It defines when the highway authority is responsible. It never managed to answer the question around assessments in future, so question is what happens when assessments are redone after 1968?</p> <p>JH argued that Section 117 isn't the only part of the act that needs to be considered. DfT offered legal help to understand that position better.</p>	
10.1.4	<p>JH – wants feedback on CSS to provide evidence for the required updates. Next meeting is on 10<sup>th</sup> August so need feedback by then. Can people share this message with regional groups and gather feedback from other sources too?</p> <p>KH – we did put together a collated list of comments? Would it be worth sending this around again?</p>	ALL
10.1.5	<p>JH – yes please.</p> <p>CP – Example of weak bridge – local agreement where CRT to improve arch, LA will improve carriageway. CP asked if CRT would then maintain the arch to 40 tonnes if they do, but they declined. CP to send example to JH.</p>	KH
		CP

	<p>HR – gave example of recent bridge deck replacements under this scheme – swept path, raised parapets, technical approval – HR to send example to JH.</p> <p>RC said NR guidance states they have to follow highway TAA process if it carries highway – JH and HR both had similar experience that NR were bullying LA's into accepting. RC to send guidance that states this to group.</p> <p>RC, KH gave examples of replacements of low bridges without consulting highway authority at all. Both to send examples to JH.</p> <p>CWr had similar example around 90 degree turns near bridge. NR had very limited highway engineering knowledge. NR seem to be going down project manager route rather than engineering/legislative experts. CWr to send example to JH.</p> <p>CP – Example of NR replacement with substandard footpath widths, LHA refused to accept it, NR built it anyway and ignored them. Send to JH.</p>	<p>HR</p> <p>RC</p> <p>RC, KH</p> <p>CWr</p> <p>CP</p>
10.1.6	<p>KH – When NR talk to us they are at the implementation phase, not at the earlier stages when change can be effected.</p>	
10.1.7	<p>CP – the agreement has been in place for 24 years. There must be examples of maintenance being needed to the strengthening measures, to help in discussion of how this is included in the document.</p>	
10.1.8	<p>JH also part of Bridgeguard 3 assessments group. About half across NR have been found now by Colin Hall. Soon NR will be approaching Local Highway Authorities (this year) asking for agreement on the current status.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Codes and Standards</b>	
<b>11.1</b>	<b>MCHW and DMRB Updates</b>	
11.1.1	<p>Colin George is now representing NH (taken over from Neil Loudon) at Bridges Board. Revised MCHW should be published in March 2025. There will be an awful lot of review before then and this will have a lot of impact on the DMRB too.</p>	
11.1.2	<p>CD 354 review is being asked of this group soon. KH to circulate.</p>	KH
11.1.3	<p>KH asked how we would like to progress reviews. Do we want coordinated response from this group or individual responses? CRi – too much work for this group. People will respond if they feel strongly. RC – is there a Sharepoint way to collate feedback? KH – Tried CARS system, don't like it. CF concurred and shared screenshot method to record his responses.</p>	
11.1.4	<p>HR – what about using MS Forms or shared excel sheet? HR/KH to discuss possibilities and trial a process.</p> <p>KH noted he is worried that NH is too focussed on their own needs on these docs and not other users. CF concurred – noted they are very England centric.</p>	KH, HR
11.1.5	<p>JH – what's happening with BD 97? KD – One of the factors they were proposing was nonsense – NH have taken 18 months to deal with this issue.</p>	
<b>11.2</b>	<b>Errors in DMRB</b>	
11.2.1	<p>KH – what do we do when we find errors in DMRB/MCHW? How do we share this info?</p>	
11.2.2	<p>HR – BOF website? CWr – Ask NH to have a representative at NBB? JH – should we not be building bridges with NH rather than annoying them by creating a website highlighting their errors?</p>	

	<p>KD – What about Keiron Dodds as a conduit for these changes? SGr to pick this up with him.          JH – Please can we not have other authorities invited to the whole session?</p>	SGr
<b>11.3</b>	<b>Updates to Eurocodes</b>	
11.3.1	<p>CP – Are there planned updates to Eurocodes?          KH – Yes, but unlikely to be quick. Check this website for updates: <a href="#">EC Updates</a>          CWr – Thinks its expected around 2025 but that won't be final publication date.</p>	
<b>12.</b>	<b>Past/Upcoming Conferences and Events</b>	
<b>12.1</b>	<b>NCE Bridges conference</b>	
	<p>Took place on 28<sup>th</sup> June. CWo attended and reported that it was useful. If anyone is interested in more detail they should contact CWo.</p>	ALL
<b>12.2</b>	<b>Concrete Bridge Development Group</b>	
	<p>Nobody here attended.</p>	
<b>12.3</b>	<b>Bridges 2023</b>	
	<p>Feedback to Richard Fish or KH to help develop Bridges 2024.          13-14/03/2024 Dates for Bridges 2024.          CP asked if slides were shared for Bridges 2023? Email to be forwarded to CP.          KD – Can we ask them to live stream the main event? Cost concerns for the organisers. KD to raise with Jose.          CJ – We need to expand participants, should be open to academics and students.</p>	ALL KH KD
<b>13.</b>	<b>Future meetings, online or in-person.</b>	
13.1	<p>Do we stay online only? Hybrid meetings occasionally? Hybrid meetings all the time?</p>	
13.2	<p>Votes:          Always online = 8, Once a year in person = 8, No decision reached          HR to trial MS Form for this</p>	HR
13.3	<p>KH – ADEPT happy for Consultant to sponsor our meetings and provide venue and sandwiches.</p>	
<b>14.</b>	<b>Minutes Of Meeting Held On 2 March 2023</b>	
<b>14.1</b>	<b>Accuracy</b>	
14.1.1	<p>Minutes agreed.</p>	
<b>14.2</b>	<b>Actions/Matters Arising</b>	
14.2.1	<p>Action log reviewed, remaining actions to be circulated with new actions arising from this meeting.</p>	
14.2.2	<p>Key action remaining – volunteers/nominations for Vice Chair of this group</p>	ALL
<b>15.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
15.1	<p>National Utilities Asset Register – do we want to hear more about it here?          Can we get them to come and talk at the next meeting? Who is leading, is it mandatory? KH to organise</p>	KH
15.2	<p>RACF questionnaire – what should they be asking?          KD – WSP keen to get involved.          MW – Issue with FOI team not allowing responses due to issue with data collation and opinion based questions.          KD – Talk to FOI at Devon about what is considered opinion.          KH – Item for next agenda – discuss questions.</p>	KD

	Bridges Board have asked to be able to influence questions. KH will be circulating current questions to them for feedback.	KH
15.3	CP – ICE had a competition to give away Bridges for Schools kits – did anyone get one? Can we find out who got one? HR – Rochester Bridge Trust have one of their own (an improved design apparently) and they are happy to let others use it.	
15.4	CRi – BICS Scheme from Yorkshire and Humberside – can we have a slot next time please. General update, any new ones coming along, how we determine competency.	HR, KH, CRi
15.5	CRi – Struggling to get Yorkshire and Humberside attendance to reasonable levels despite attempts to make it engaging. Has anyone else has similar problem? Mixed response. Concerns around smaller authorities not attending and lack of qualified staff to attend. KH – Can we ask ADEPT to pressure their members to attend? JH – Should we have a question on the RACF survey on the number of qualified staff? Debate at next session on RACF questionnaire.	KH
15.6	KD – Parapet height protocol update. Review note circulated with minutes of last meeting. Update came out in Jan 2023. Some of the parapet height increases were required purely for NR upgrades e.g. overhead electrification. Guidance says authorities have to meet their own costs so if it isn't required for our part then we don't have costs.	
15.7	KD – Bridge Inspection Manual is being updated by WSP for National Highways. KD is part of that review, due to take place in Autumn. Publication at end of the year.	
<b>16.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
16.1	20 <sup>th</sup> September 2023. Future meeting dates depend on Bridges Board dates which have not been set yet beyond September.	