

The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportation 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

Arizona [04]	Coconino County [005]	Unknown [00000]	1.6 mi E of Jct SR179	34-53-07.08 = 34.885300	111-44-34.80 = -111.743000
232	Highway agency district: 85	Owner State Highway Agency [01]	Maintenance responsibility	State Highway Agency [01]	
Route 89	SR A89	Toll On free road [3]	Features intersected	Midgely/Wilson Canyon	
Design - main	Steel [3]	Design - approach	Steel continuous [4]	Kilometerpoint	60517.8 km = 37521.0 mi
1	Arch - Deck [11]	3	Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [02]	Year built	1938
				Year reconstructed	N/A [0000]
				Skew angle	0
				Structure Flared	
				Historical significance	Bridge is possibly eligible for the NRHP. [3]
Total length	114 m = 374.0 ft	Length of maximum span	73.2 m = 240.2 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	8.3 m = 27.2 ft
				Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb	7.3 m = 24.0 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance	7.3 m = 24.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left	0.2 m = 0.7 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - right	0.2 m = 0.7 ft
Deck structure type	Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]				
Type of wearing surface	Monolithic Concrete (concurrently placed with structural deck) [1]				
Deck protection					
Type of membrane/wearing surface					

Weight Limits

Bypass, detour length	Method to determine inventory rating		Inventory rating	21.8 metric ton = 24.0 tons
6.1 km = 3.8 mi	Method to determine operating rating		Operating rating	36.3 metric ton = 39.9 tons
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above legal loads [5]	Design Load	M 13.5 / H 15 [2]

Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	3858	Average daily truck traffi	9 %	Year	2016	Future average daily traffic	3525	Year	2036
Road classification	Principal Arterial - Other (Rural) [02]	Lanes on structure	2	Approach roadway width	7.3 m = 24.0 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 bridge			Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway	99.99 m = 328.1 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	Work to be done by contract [1]							
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Bridge improvement cost	1000	Roadway improvement cost	0					
	Length of structure improvement	124.7 m = 409.1 ft		Total project cost	2000				
	Year of improvement cost estimate	2017							
	Border bridge - state				Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state				
	Border bridge - structure number								

Inspection and Sufficiency

Structure status	Open, no restriction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]
Condition ratings - superstructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]		
Scour	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [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 adequacy	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]	Status evaluation	Functionally obsolete [2]
Pier or abutment protection		Sufficiency rating	50.7
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	September 2017 [0917]	Designated inspection frequency	24 Months
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspection date	
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical inspection date	September 2017 [0917]
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date	