The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportion departments to the Federal Highway Administration in coded format.

Form Interface Design: www.historicbridges.org. Data Conversion Assistance By www.bridgehunter.com. None of the involved parties make any guarantee of accuracy.

	ett County [023] Highway agency district 6 US 40 ALT Design - approach 0	Other [00]	0.82 MILE EAST OF MD 495 Ay Agency [01] Maintenance responsion free road [3] Features intersected CAS Kilometerpoint 1031.4 km = 639.5 mi Year built 1932 Year reconstructed Skew angle 41 Historical significance Bridge is eligible for the property of the propert	SSELMAN RIVER	079-08-36 = - 79.143333 gency [01]
Route 40 Design - Steel [3] main 1 Truss - Thru [10] Total length 41.8 m = 137.1 Inventory Route, Total Horizon Deck structure type	US 40 ALT Design - approach 0	Other [00]	free road [3] Features intersected CAS Kilometerpoint 1031.4 km = 639.5 mi Year built 1932 Year reconstructe Skew angle 41 Structure Flared	SSELMAN RIVER	gency [01]
Design - Steel [3] main 1 Truss - Thru [10] Total length 41.8 m = 137.1 Inventory Route, Total Horizon Deck structure type	Design - approach	Other [00]	Kilometerpoint 1031.4 km = 639.5 mi Year built 1932 Year reconstructe Skew angle 41 Structure Flared		
main 1 Truss - Thru [10] Total length 41.8 m = 137.1 Inventory Route, Total Horizon Deck structure type	approach 0	Other [00]	Year built 1932 Year reconstructed Skew angle 41 Structure Flared	ed N/A [0000]	
Inventory Route, Total Horizon Deck structure type	1 ft Length of maxin		Thistorical significance Driage is cligible i	for the NRHP. [2]	
j.			Deck width, out-to-out 12.7 m = 41.7 ft Brid	dge roadway width, curb-to- b or sidewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck protection Type of membrane/wearing si	Bituminous [6				
Weight Limits					
0.8 km = 0.5 mi	lethod to determine inventor lethod to determine operatin	, , , ,		etric ton = 24.8 tons etric ton = 40.6 tons	

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 3603 Average daily tr	uck traffi 8 % Year 2009 Future average daily traffic 4324 Year 2026						
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 9.8 m = 32.2 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2] Bridge median						
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]						
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5]	Lanes under structure 0 Navigation control						
Navigation vertical clearanc 0 = N/A	Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A						
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 4.52 m = 14.8 ft							
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Feature not a highway or railroad [N]							
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 99.9 = Unlimited Minimum lateral underclearance on left 0 = N/A							
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A Minimum vertical underclearance reference feature Feature not a highway or railroad [N]							
Appraisal ratings - underclearances N/A [N]							
Danair and Danlagement Dlang							
Repair and Replacement Plans							
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by contract [1]						
Bridge rehabilitation because of general structure deterioration or inadequate strength. [35]	Bridge improvement cost 343000 Roadway improvement cost 34000						
astonoration or intadequate strongth [50]	Length of structure improvement 41.8 m = 137.1 ft Total project cost 377000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate						
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state						
	Border bridge - structure number						

Inspection and Sufficiency					
Structure status Open, no res	striction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]		
Condition ratings - superstructur	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]		
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]		
Condition ratings - deck	Very Good [8]	deck geometry			
Scour Bridge foundations determine		ns determined to be stable for assesse	sed or calculated scour condition. [5]		
Channel and channel protection		is in need of minor repairs. River cont annel have minor amounts of drift. [7]	ntrol devices and embankment protection have a little minor damage. 7]		
Appraisal ratings - water adequacy Superior to presen		ent desirable criteria [9]	Status evaluation		
Pier or abutment protection	None present bu	ut re-evaluation suggested [5]	Sufficiency rating 83.3		
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culve	ert. [N]			
Traffic safety features - railings			ceptable standards. [1]		
Traffic safety features - transition	าร	Inpected feature meets currently acce	ceptable standards. [1]		
Traffic safety features - approach	h guardrail	Inpected feature meets currently acce	ceptable standards. [1]		
Traffic safety features - approach	h guardrail ends	Inpected feature meets currently acce	ceptable standards. [1]		
Inspection date September 2010 [0910] Designated inspection frequency 12 Months					
Underwater inspection Not needed [N] Underwate			pection date		
Fracture critical inspection Every year [Y12]		Fracture critical in:	inspection date September 2010 [0910]		
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	spection date		