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 39-26-80.00 = 076-22-90.00								
Maryland [24] Baltimore County [005]		Unknown [00000] 0.29 MI SE OF JERICHO RD			39.455556	= -76.391667		
200000B-0001010 Highway agency district 4		Owner County Highway Agency [02] Maintenance responsibility		sponsibility	County Highway A	gency [02]		
Route 3925 VINEGAR HILL ROAD Toll On free road [3] Features intersected LITTLE GUNPOWDER FALLS								
Design - Aluminum, Iron [9] 1 Truss - Thr	Wrought Iron or Ca u [10]	Design - approach 0 Other	[00]	Kilometerpoint 46 Year built 1894 Skew angle 0 Historical significance	Structure Flan			
Historical significance Bridge is eligible for the NRHP. [2] Total length 23.5 m = 77.1 ft Length of maximum span 22.6 m = 74.2 ft Deck width, out-to-out 4.7 m = 15.4 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 4.3 m = 14.1 ft								
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 4.3 m = 14.1 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0 m					ft	Curb or side	walk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck structure type Wood or Timber [8]								
Type of wearing surface Not applicable (applie			s only to structures with no deck) [N]					
Deck protection Not applicable (applie		es only to structures with no deck) [N]						
Type of membrane/wearing surface Not applicable (applies only to structures with no deck) [N]								
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length 0.5 km = 0.3 mi Method to determine inventory rating Method to determine operating rating			No rating analysis or	evaluation perfor Inv	ventory rating 2	4.5 metric ton =	27.0 tons	
			No rating analysis or evaluation perfor		perating rating 3	6.3 metric ton =	39.9 tons	
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above le	egal loads [5]	De	esign Load			

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 400 Average daily tr	ruck traffi 5 % Year 1996 Future average daily traffic 1000 Year 2016							
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure 1 Approach roadway width 4.6 m = 15.1 ft							
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	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 bri	Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 0.4 m = 1.3 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]							
Bridge rehabilitation because of general structure deterioration or inadequate strength. [35]	Bridge improvement cost 12000 Roadway improvement cost 0							
deterioration of madequate strongth [50]	Length of structure improvement 23.5 m = 77.1 ft Total project cost 12000							
	Year of improvement cost estimate							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state							
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Sufficiency						
Structure status Posted for lo	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6] Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrrective action [3]			
Condition ratings - superstructur	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment				
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]			
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]	deck geometry				
Scour	Bridge foundations determin	ed to be stable for the asso	essed or calculated scour condition. [8]			
Channel and channel protection	Bank protection is in need of Banks and/or channel have		rol devices and embankment protection have a little minor damage.			
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Equal to present desirable of	riteria [8]	Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2]			
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 62.6			
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culvert. [N]					
Traffic safety features - railings	Inpected fea	ature meets currently acce	ptable standards. [1]			
Traffic safety features - transition	Inpected fea	ature meets currently acce	ptable standards. [1]			
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail Inpected fea	npected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]				
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail ends Inpected fea	npected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]				
Inspection date						
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ction date			
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical ins	spection date June 2013 [0613]			
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date			