



**Email from FHWA to NTSB investigators dated April 20, 2023**

**Pittsburgh, PA**

**HWY22MH003**

**(3 pages)**

**Subject:** FW: Definition of Performance Year

**From:** Buck, Jonathan (FHWA) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2023 9:37 AM  
**To:** Walsh Daniel [REDACTED]; O'Shea, Dennis (FHWA) [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Ocel, Justin (FHWA) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Definition of Performance Year

[CAUTION] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Dan,

I need to resolve some errors in the previous information I provided. This status was provided earlier on in the year and we were able to consolidate the data and make compliance determinations more accurately by December. I can confirm the Fern Hollow Bridge was not in any samples for PY23 (or earlier years that I could find).

- *Current year (PY23 review):*
  - *PA was assessed as compliant for Metric 12. This is because they successfully completed their PY22 Metric 12 PCA, completing all identified activities to address the PY22 Metric 12 findings. No further findings were made on our field reviews that were different from those that led to the PCA (and were therefore already being addressed by the PCA).*
    - *Our process is to assess compliance once the PCA is successfully completed.*
    - *This is because there is always a lag in our data and review. Changes made to the program in CY2022 (PY2023) will not be evident on our field reviews until CY2023 (PY2024). We select bridges for field review that were inspected during the previous calendar year.*
    - *We will then perform a follow-up Intermediate-level assessment in PY24 to confirm the success of the PCA. If any further findings are made at this point, we would develop a new PCA to address.*
  - *PY23 was the first year we began to assess element data. While we had some observations in the element-level data, these were not outside of the element tolerance.*
  - *PA had a fatal error in their submission of the NBI data this March of this year, preventing acceptance of the data set initially. While the error was corrected in a timely manner, the metric language indicates they will be no better than Substantially Compliant for Metric 22 this year.*
    - *After processing our findings we determined they fell within the Compliant threshold for Metric 22 field review data.*
    - *We determined they were Substantially Compliant in December for the preliminary compliance determination due to the fatal error on NBI submittal, and executed an Improvement Plan with an end date of 3/15/2023. The Improvement Plan activities were targeted towards ensuring that the submitted NBI data would be checked sufficiently to rule out any fatal errors.*

- *The Improvement Plan was successfully completed and they successfully submitted their NBI data by the deadline of 3/15. We therefore assessed they were Compliant with Metric 22 for PY23 on the 3/31 final determination.*
- *Similarly to Metric 12, we will perform a follow-up Intermediate-level assessment in PY24 to confirm the success of the IP.*

I am working on printing the PY23 Final Summaries and will upload those to Kiteworks as soon as I have them.

Thanks, -Jon