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 Information					44-03-34 =	091-37-55 = -
Minnesota [27] Winona County [169]		Winona [71032]	AT E COUNTY LINE	44.059444	91.631944	
Highway agency district 6		Owner City or Municipal Highway Agency [04] Maintenance responsibility		responsibility City or Municipal	Highway Agency [04]	
Route 154 MUN 154			Toll On fr	ee road [3] Features intersed	N CHANNEL MISS RIVER	
Design - Concrete c	ontinuous [2]	Design - Concr	ete [1]	Kilometerpoint 0 km = 0.0 mi		
			Year built 1916 Year reconstructed 20		constructed 2003	
13 Arch - Deck [11]		11 Other	[UU]	Skew angle 0 Structure F	lared	
				Historical significance Bridge i	s not eligible for the NRHP. [5]	
Total length 371.9 m	n = 1220.2 ft	Length of maximum spa	21.9 m = 71.9 ft	Deck width, out-to-out 7.5 m = 24.6	ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-	curb 5.3 m = 17.4 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 5.3 m = 17.4 ft		Curb or sidewalk width - left 0 m = 0.0 ft Curb or side		Curb or sidewalk width - right	1.5 m = 4.9 ft	
Deck structure type		Concrete Cast-in-Plac	ce [1]			
Type of wearing surface Low slump Concrete		[4]				
Deck protection Not applicable (appl		plies only to structures with no deck) [N]				
Type of membrane/wearing surface						
Weight Limits						
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating		Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inventory rating	2.2 metric ton = 2.4 tons		
15.9 km = 9.9 mi Method to determine operating ratin		Load Factor(LF) [1]	Operating rating	3.6 metric ton = 4.0 tons		
Bridge posting				Design Load		

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 40 Average daily tr	uck traffi % Year 1989 Future average daily traffic 40 Year 2029							
Road classification Local (Urban) [19]	Lanes on structure 1 Approach roadway width 7.3 m = 24.0 ft							
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5] Direction of traffic One lane bridge for 2 - way traffic [3] 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 clearance 0 = N/A Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A								
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 30.48 m = 100.0 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]								
Description I Description of Discription								
Repair and Replacement Plans								
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by contract [1]							
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 4441000 Roadway improvement cost 25000							
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 372 m = 1220.5 ft Total project cost 278000							
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2011							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state							
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status Posted for Io	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]					
Condition ratings - superstructur Fair [5]		Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]					
Condition ratings - substructure Fair [5]		_ Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrrective action [3]					
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]	deck geometry						
Scour	Countermeasures have been	Countermeasures have been installed to mitigate an existing problem with scour. [7]						
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	Equal to present desirable cri	teria [8]	Status evaluation					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 27.8					
Culverts Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]								
Traffic safety features - railings								
Traffic safety features - transitions								
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail								
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends								
Inspection date April 2011 [0411] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months								
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspec	ction date April 2011 [0411]					
'	Unknown [N00]	Fracture critical in:	spection date					
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	pection date					