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.

Basic Info	ormation									42-40-10 =	084-55-33 = -
Michigan [26] Eaton County [045]		Chester	Chester [15260] 9.5 M		NW OF CHARLOTTE			42.669444	84.925833		
23123052	2000B020	Highway age	ency district 6	Owner	Owner State Highway Agency [01]			Maintenance	enance responsibility State High		ency [01]
Route 50 M-50			60		Toll On fre	e road [3]		Features interse	cted THORNAP	PLE RIVER	
Design - main Steel [3] Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [0]		Design - approach D2] 0 Ot	Other [00]		Kilometerpoint 1601.5 km = 992.9 mi Year built 1931 Year reconstructed 1967 Skew angle 0 Structure Flared Historical significance Bridge is not eligible for the NRHP. [5]						
Total length 16.7 m = 54.8 ft Length of maximum span 16.7 m = 54.8 ft Deck width, out-to-out 14.1 m = 46.3 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 12.2 m = 40.0 ft Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 13.1 m = 43.0 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0.4 m = 1.3 ft Curb or sidewalk width - right 0.4 m = 1.3 ft											
Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place			Place [1]								
Type of wearing surface Bituminous [6]											
Deck prote	ection										
Type of membrane/wearing surface Preformed Fabric [2]			[2]								
Weight Li	mits										
Bypass, detour length 0.6 km = 0.4 mi		Method to determine inventory rating Method to determine operating rating			Allowable Stress(AS) [2] Load Factor(LF) [1]			Inventory rating Operating rating	31.5 metric ton 52.6 metric ton		
Bridge posting			Equal to or above legal loads [5]				Design Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]				

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 2443 Average daily to	uck traffi 16 % Year 2007 Future average daily traffic	3460 Year 2018					
Road classification Minor Arterial (Rural) [06]	Lanes on structure 2	Approach roadway width 13.1 m = 43.0 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 clearance 0 = N/A Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A							
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bri	dge Minimum vertical clears	ance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft					
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature F	eature 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 fea	ature Feature not a highway or railroad [N]					
Appraisal ratings - underclearances N/A [N]							
Repair and Replacement Plans							
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by contract [1]						
Bridge deck replacement with only incidental widening. [37]	Bridge improvement cost 26000 Roadway imp	provement cost 3000					
	Length of structure improvement 16.8 m = 55.1 ft	otal project cost 31000					
	Year of improvement cost estimate						
	Border bridge - state Border	order 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	Fair [5]	deck geometry						
Scour	Bridge is scour criti	Bridge is scour critical; bridge foundations determined to be unstable. [3]						
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning to slump. River control devices and embankment protection have widespread minor damage. There is minor stream bed movement evident. Debris is restricting the channel slightly. [6]						
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Somewhat better to in place as is [5]	han minimum adequacy to tolerate b	being left Status evaluation					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 92					
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culvert.	[N]						
Traffic safety features - railings	In	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - transition	In _I	pected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]					
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail In	pected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]					
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail ends In	pected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]					
Inspection date June 2009 [0	Design	nated inspection frequency 24	Months					
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ection date					
•	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical ins						
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	pection date					