HistoricBridges.org - National Bridge Inventory Data Sheet

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 In	formation							43-10-09.76 =	090-11-32.78
Wisconsin [55]		Richland County [103]		Buena Vista [10950] 0.4M N JCT STH 133 TO S			43.169378	= -90.192439	
B52085600000000 Highway a		y agency district: 5	ency district: 5 Owner State Highway		Agency [01] Maintenance responsibility		State Highway Agency [01]		
Route	130	North [1]	STH 130-STH 133	Toll On fi	ree road [3] Fear	tures interse	cted WISCONSIN	I RIVER 05	
Design - main	Steel [3] Truss - Thru	ıı [10]	Design - approach 0 Other	[00]	Kilometerpoint 0 km Year built 1932	= 0.0 mi Year re	constructed 1989		
•	11433 11111	u [10]		[00]	Skew angle 0 Historical significance	Structure F Bridge	lared s not eligible for th	e NRHP. [5]	
Total len	gth 168.7 m	= 553.5 ft	Length of maximum spa	42.1 m = 138.1 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	6.4 m = 21.0	ft Bridge road	way width, curb-to-cu	arb 6.1 m = 20.0 ft
Inventory	y Route, Total	Horizontal Cle	earance 8.5 m = 27.9 ft	Curb or sidewalk	width - left $0 \text{ m} = 0.0 \text{ ft}$		Curb or side	walk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck stru	ucture type		Concrete Cast-in-Plac	e [1]					
Type of wearing surface Monolithic Concrete (c			Monolithic Concrete (oncurrently placed with structural deck) [1]					
Deck protection Epoxy Coated Reinford			Epoxy Coated Reinfo	cing [1]					
Type of membrane/wearing surface Unknown [8]			Unknown [8]						
Weight I	Limits								
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory			determine inventory rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inven	tory rating	19.4 metric ton =	21.3 tons	
5.1 km =	= 3.2 mi	Method to	determine operating rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Opera	ating rating	34.3 metric ton =	: 37.7 tons	
Bridge posting Equal to or above lega			sting Equal to or above le	gal loads [5]	Desig	n Load			

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 2200 Average daily tr	ck traffi 4 % Year 2016 Future average daily traffic 2900	Year 2037						
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2	pproach roadway width 8.5 m = 27.9 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2]	Bridge median						
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	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 navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge 0 m = 0.0 ft Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 4.44 m = 14.6 ft							
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Fe	ature 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 F	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 owner's forces [2]							
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 1841000 Roadway improvem	nent cost 184000						
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 173.1 m = 567.9 ft Total pro	oject cost 2762000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2018							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge	idge - percent responsibility of other state						
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status Posted for loa	Appraisal ratings - structural	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrrective action [3]						
Condition ratings - superstructure	Serious [3]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]					
Condition ratings - substructure	Poor [4]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically into	igh priority of replacement [2]				
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]							
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	d to be stable for the asso	essed or calcula	ited scour condition	n. [8]			
Channel and channel protection		Banks are protected or well vegetated. River control devices such as spur dikes and embankment protection are not required or are in a stable condition. [8]						
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	y Equal to present desirable cri	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]			Structurally deficient [1]			
Pier or abutment protection			Sı	ufficiency rating	7			
Culverts Not applicable. Used i	f structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings								
Traffic safety features - transition	S							
Traffic safety features - approach	guardrail							
Traffic safety features - approach	guardrail ends							
Inspection date								
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspec	September 2015 [0915]		5 [0915]			
	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical ins	•	June 2018 [061	8]			
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date					