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 Information | | 39-45-57 = 075-56-31 = - | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Pennsylvania [42] Chester County [029] | East Nottingham [21624] E.NOTTINGHAM TWP. 52A05 | 39.765833 75.941944 | | | |
| 157015030802810 Highway agency district 6 | Owner County Highway Agency [02] Maintenance responsibility | County Highway Agency [02] | | | |
| Route 0 LITTLE ELK CRK RD Toll On free road [3] Features intersected LITTLE ELK CREEK | | | | | |
| Design - main Concrete continuous [2] Design - approach Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [02] 0 | Kilometerpoint 0 km = 0.0 mi Year built 1919 Year reconstructed N/A ther [00] Skew angle 30 Structure Flared Historical significance Historical significance is r | [0000] not determinable at this time. [4] | | | |
| Total length 10.1 m = 33.1 ft Length of maximum span 7.3 m = 24.0 ft Deck width, out-to-out 6.1 m = 20.0 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 4.9 m = 16.1 ft | | | | | |
| Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 4.9 m = 16.1 | ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0 m = 0.0 ft Curb or side | ewalk width - right 0 m = 0.0 ft | | | |
| Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place [1] | | | | | |
| Type of wearing surface Bituminous [6] | Bituminous [6] | | | | |
| Deck protection | | | | | |
| Type of membrane/wearing surface | | | | | |
| Weight Limits | | | | | |
| Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory ra | ting Load Testing [4] Inventory rating 22.7 metric ton = | = 25.0 tons | | | |
| 0.3 km = 0.2 mi Method to determine operating r | ting Load Testing [4] Operating rating 59.9 metric ton = | = 65.9 tons | | | |
| Bridge posting Equal to or about | ve legal loads [5] Design Load | | | | |

| Functional Details | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Average Daily Traffic 459 Average daily tr | uck traffi 8 % Year 2009 Future average daily traffic 250 Year 2008 | | | | |
| Road classification Local (Rural) [09] | Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 4.9 m = 16.1 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 brid | Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 10 m = 32.8 ft | | | | |
| Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Feature not a highway or railroad [N] | | | | | |
| Minimum lateral underclearance on right 0 = N/A 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] | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Repair and Replacement Plans | | | | | |
| Type of work to be performed | Work done by | | | | |
| | Bridge improvement cost 0 Roadway improvement cost 0 | | | | |
| | Length of structure improvement 0 m = 0.0 ft Total project cost 0 | | | | |
| | Year of improvement cost estimate | | | | |
| | Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state | | | | |
| | Border bridge - structure number | | | | |

| Inspection and Sufficiency | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Structure status Posted for lo | us Posted for load [P] | | Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5] | | | |
| Condition ratings - superstructur | Fair [5] | Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment | Equal to present desirable criteria [8] | | | |
| Condition ratings - substructure | Fair [5] | Appraisal ratings - Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2] | | | | |
| Condition ratings - deck | Satisfactory [6] | deck geometry | | | | |
| Scour | Bridge is scour critical; | Bridge is scour critical; bridge foundations determined to be unstable. [3] | | | | |
| Channel and channel protection | Bank and embankment protection is severely undermined. River control devices have severe damage. Large deposits of debris are in the channel. [4] | | | | | |
| Appraisal ratings - water adequac | Better than present mir | Better than present minimum criteria [7] Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2] | | | | |
| Pier or abutment protection | | Sufficiency rating 60.1 | | | | |
| Culverts Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N] | | | | | | |
| Traffic safety features - railings | | | | | | |
| Traffic safety features - transitions Inpected features | | ed feature meets currently acce | eptable standards. [1] | | | |
| Traffic safety features - approach guardrail Inpected featur | | ed feature meets currently acce | eptable standards. [1] | | | |
| Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1] | | | | | | |
| Inspection date June 2009 [0609] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months | | | | | | |
| Underwater inspection Every two years [Y24] | | Underwater inspe | ection date June 2005 [0605] | | | |
| Fracture critical inspection Unknown [N00] | | Fracture critical in | nspection date | | | |
| Other special inspection | | | | | | |