

Johnson's Island Road Commission

Minutes of Quarterly Meeting

Johnson Island Clubhouse (Moved to Klugman Residence Due to Cold Weather)

Saturday, November 9, 2013

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| Attendance: | Dave Klugman | Present |
| | Mike Kelty | Present |
| | Glenn Beachy | Present |
| | Lou Cardinale | Present |
| | Jim Erickson | Absent |
| | Kevin Kirkpatrick | Present |
| | Rick Schulz | Present |

The meeting was called to order by the president, Mr. Klugman.

Regular Business:

1. Dave opened the meeting with a discussion of the recent Causeway Bridge Inspection Report and related documents. Richland Engineering Limited performed the inspection on August 22, 2013, and the results have been transmitted to us in documents dated September 4, 2013 and October 17, 2013. These reports will be posted on the JIRC website.
2. The Richland report dated September 4 rates the condition of each of the 5 bridges as shown in the following table. These bridges were also rated in the previous Inspection reports, also performed by Richland, in 2008. While a copy of that report was not available at the meeting, those ratings are included below for comparison:

| | <u>2013 Report</u> | <u>2008 Report</u> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Bridge 1 (south- near island) | Satisfactory | Satisfactory |
| Bridge 2 | Fair | Fair |
| Bridge 3 (high bridge) | Satisfactory | Satisfactory |
| Bridge 4 | Good | Satisfactory |
| Bridge 5 (north- near gate) | Good | Satisfactory |

3. Each rating is a composite based on a number of factors, including the condition of the abutments, main beams, road surface, rip- rap protecting the foundations, etc. None of the ratings have decreased from 5 years ago; In fact the ratings of the two northern bridges have improved slightly.
4. However, the photographs in the report, and the comments, call specific attention to issues on one beam on each of the bridges 1 and 2:

On Bridge 1, the east side beam has a longitudinal crack in the bottom of the beam. Moisture is weeping from this crack, indicating that moisture may be entering the beam. While this crack does not indicate that the reinforcing steel in the beam has been compromised, and is not at this point sufficient to cause a downgrade in the condition of this span, it will require remedial action to stop water intrusion.

On Bridge 2, the east side beam has surface spalling, which seems to originate where a

guard rail post was bolted to the beam. While this condition is not at this point sufficient to lower the previous rating of this span, it is the lowest rated span. A drip rail was added to keep water from running down the side of the beam, but deterioration has continued.

5. It should be noted that each bridge span is made up of 6 box beams, each 4 feet wide, for a total bridge width of 24 feet. There are 3 spans on the high bridge, and one span on each of the low bridges, for a total of 7 spans. This means there are a total of 42 individual box beams on the bridges, with issues identified for 2 box beams. No issues were noted with any of the other 40 box beams.
6. These reports have forced us to recognize that, in the future (possibly 5 to 10 years, but it is not possible to predict with certainty) one or more of the box beams on several bridges may require replacement.
7. We requested Richland to investigate what replacement of a single side beam would involve on these two bridges. In a Report dated October 17, 2013, they provided an estimate. The estimated cost is approximately \$200,000, for two side beams, on separate bridges, done in sequence with the same equipment.
8. We will be requesting a follow- up meeting or conference call with Richland to make sure we understand their ratings, and the recommended actions. Our intention is to take the steps necessary to maximize the remaining life of the bridges.
9. These steps will likely include replacement of the waterproof membranes to keep water from penetrating to the beams or the abutments, resurfacing the bridges to cover the membrane and better integrate the drip rails, and protecting the abutment foundations.
10. The first priority of the JIRC per our charter is to maintain the integrity of the bridges and the causeway. Therefore, by unanimous agreement of the JIRC members, plans for all other non- maintenance expenditures have been halted. Work in 2014 will be focused on the bridges and causeway.
11. The gate report was presented by Lou. Through Oct 25, receipts were \$12,936. This is slightly more than was collected in 2012. A copy is posted on the web site.
12. The Treasurer's report was presented. The reserve fund for the causeway is \$80,000, and total JIRC funds (including this reserve) are expected to be approximately \$240,000 at the end of the year. This is due to no major road upgrade work being performed in 2013, and should insure that adequate funds are available for bridge and causeway work in 2014. A copy of the treasurer's report is posted on the web site.

There being no other business, Dave Klugman moved to end the meeting. All agreed.

Respectfully,
Glenn Beachy
Secretary, JIRC