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 Informa	ation										22 20 17 52	002.07.25.7/
Louisiana [22] Ouachita Parish [073]			Monroe	Monroe [51410] 1.6 MI WEST OF			340-6		32-30-17.53 = 32.504869	092-07-35.76 = -92.126600		
53700010918151 High		Highway	ghway agency district: 5		Owner	Owner State Highway Agency [01]			Maintenance	Maintenance responsibility State Highway Agency [01]		
Route 80 US0080)	Toll On free road [3]			F	Features intersected OUACHITA RIVER-LOUISVILL				
Design - Stee				Concrete [1]				2900.5 km = 1798.3 mi				
1 Mov	vable - Bas	ble - Bascule [16]			Mixed types [20)]	Year built Skew angle	1936 e 0	Year re Structure F	constructed N/A	. [0000]	
					Historical			Bridge	is eligible for the	: NRHP. [2]		
Total length 3	356.6 m =	1170.0 ft	Leng	th of maxim	um span 48.8 n	n = 160.1 ft	Deck wid	th, out-to-o	ut 16.5 m = 54.	.1 ft Bridge roa	idway width, curb-to-ci	urb 12.2 m = 40.0 ft
Inventory Rout	Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 12.2 m = 40.0 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 1.8 m						1.8 m = 5.	9 ft	Curb or sid	ewalk width - right	1.8 m = 5.9 ft	
Deck structure	e type		Ор	en Grating [3]							
Type of wearin	Type of wearing surface Monolithic Concrete (con					oncurrently placed with structural deck) [1]						
Deck protection	on											
Type of membr	orane/wear	ing surface										
Weight Limits	S											
31	pass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating			rating Lo	Load Factor(LF) [1]			Inventory rating 20 metric ton = 22.0 tons				
0.5 km = 0.3 r	.5 km = 0.3 mi Method to determine operating rating				rating Lo	Load Factor(LF) [1]			erating rating	32.7 metric ton	= 36.0 tons	
Bridge posting 10.0 - 19.9 % below [3]						De	Design Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]					

Functional Details										
Average Daily Traffic 30200 Average daily tr	uck traffi 9 % Year 2016 Future average daily traffic 17580 Year 2036									
Road classification Other Principal Arterial (Urban)	[14] Lanes on structure 4 Approach roadway width 12.5 m = 41.0 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 Navigation control on waterway (bridge permit required). [1]									
Navigation vertical clearanc 11.6 m = 38.1 ft	Navigation horizontal clearance 39.9 m = 130.9 ft									
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift brid	dge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft									
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Fe	eature 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 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 improvement cost 3042000 Roadway improvement cost									
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 356.6 m = 1170.0 ft Total project cost 4563000									
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2016									
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state									
	Border bridge - structure number									

Inspection and Sufficier	ency									
Structure status Pos	sted for load [P]]		Appraisal ratings - structural		Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]				
Condition ratings - super	ondition ratings - superstructure Satisfactory [6]			Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment		Equal to present desirable criteria [8]				
Condition ratings - substi	Condition ratings - substructure Satis			Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]					
Condition ratings - deck	Condition ratings - deck Satis		C	deck geometry						
Scour		Bridge foundation	ons determined to	be stable for the asse	essed or cald	culated scour condition	n. [8]			
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning to slump. River control devices and embankment protection have widespread minor damage. There is minor stream bed movement evident. Debris is restricting the channel slightly. [6]								
Appraisal ratings - water adequacy		Better than pres	than present minimum criteria [7]			Status evaluation	Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2]			
Pier or abutment protection		In place but in a	deteriorated cond	dition [3]		Sufficiency rating	46.9			
Culverts Not applicable	le. Used if stru	cture is not a culv	ert. [N]							
Traffic safety features -	Traffic safety features - railings Inpected features				re meets currently acceptable standards. [1]					
Traffic safety features -	- transitions									
Traffic safety features -	approach guar	rdrail								
Traffic safety features -	approach guar	rdrail ends								
Inspection date May	signated inspection	r frequency 24	V	Months						
Underwater inspection	Unkn	own [Y60]		Underwater inspec	ction date	June 2018 [0618]				
		year [Y12]		Fracture critical ins	•		May 2018 [0518]			
Other special inspection Every		year [Y12]		Other special inspe	ection date	April 2017 [0417	April 2017 [0417]			