## 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 Info	ormation										39-37-03.50 =	086-47-12.41
Indiana [18]		Putnam County [133]			Unknov	Unknown [00000] 00.70 E of CF		CR 275 E			39.617639	= -86.786781
6700133			Highway agenc	y district: 1	Owner	County Highwa	ay Agency [0	2]	Maintenance	e responsibility	County Highway A	gency [02]
Route 1	82		CR 30	0S		Toll On fi	ree road [3]	Fe	eatures interse	cted DEER Cree	·k	
Design - main	Steel [3] Truss - Thru	ı [1 <u>0]</u>		Design - approach	Other [00]		Kilometer Year built		n = 0.0 mi Year re	constructed N/A	[0000]	
L	11055 - 11110	1 [10]		U	iller [ooj		Skew ang Historical	le 30 significance	Structure F Bridge i	Flared is not eligible for	he NRHP. [5]	
Total leng	th 26.8 m =	87.9	ft Len	gth of maximur	n span 25.6 i	n = 84.0 ft	Deck wid	dth, out-to-ou	t 7.4 m = 24.3	Bridge roa	dway width, curb-to-cu	7.4 m = 24.3 ft
Inventory	Route, Total	Horiz	ontal Clearance	7.4 m = 24.3	ft	Curb or sidewalk	width - left	0  m = 0.0  ft		Curb or sid	ewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck stru	cture type		Co	oncrete Cast-in	-Place [1]							
Type of w	earing surfac	e	Bi	tuminous [6]								
Deck prot	ection											
Type of m	nembrane/we	aring	surface									
Weight L	imits											
			mine inventory rating Allowable Stress(AS)			S) [2]	) [2] Inver		entory rating 18.1 metric ton = 19.			
0.3 km =	0.2 mi	M	lethod to determi	ne operating ra	ating A	lowable Stress(A	S) [2]	Оре	erating rating	25.4 metric ton	= 27.9 tons	
		В	ridge posting	00.1 - 09.9 %	below [4]			Des	ign Load			

Functional Details		
Average Daily Traffic 227 Average daily tr	uck traffi 5 % Year 2017 Future average daily traf	ffic 311 Year 2037
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure 2	Approach roadway width 5.5 m = 18.0 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	ol
Navigation vertical clearanc 0 = N/A	Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A	
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bri	Minimum vertical c	clearance 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 0 = N/A	Minimum lateral unde	erclearance on left 0 = N/A
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A	Minimum vertical underclearance reference	e 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 improvement cost 560000 Roadway	y improvement cost 168000
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 35.1 m = 115.2 ft	Total project cost 982000
	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 Posted for Ic	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]					
Condition ratings - superstructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]					
Condition ratings - substructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings -	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]					
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]	deck geometry						
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for assessed or calculated scour condition. [5]						
Channel and channel protection	Bank protection is being erode channel. [5]	Bank protection is being eroded. River control devices and/or embankment have major damage. Trees and rush restrict the channel. [5]						
Appraisal ratings - water adequad	Better than present minimum	criteria [7]	Status evaluation					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 55.8					
	if structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings								
Traffic safety features - transition								
Traffic safety features - approach								
Traffic safety features - approach			Martha					
Inspection date March 2017	3 1		Months					
·	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec						
·	Every two years [Y24]  Not needed [N]	Fracture critical ins  Other special inspe						
Other Special Inspection	INOL HEEDEU [IN]	Other special inspe	ection date					