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							43-42-46.18 =	083-22-17.66
Michigan [26]	Huron County [063]		Sebewaing [72200]	SEC. 13-24 SEBEW	AING TWP.		43.712828	= -83.371572
3651	Highway agency	y district: 4	Owner County Highwa	y Agency [02]	Maintenance	responsibility	County Highway Ag	gency [02]
Route 0	RESCI	UE ROAD	Toll On fr	ee road [3]	Features intersec	ted COLUMBIA	A DRAIN	
Design - Steel [3] main	ulti-beam or girder [02]	Design - approach	ner [00]	Kilometerpoint 5 Year built 1927	14.2 km = 318.8 r Year red	ni constructed		
Stilliger/w	uiti-beam or girder [02]	U Our	lei [00]	Skew angle 0 Historical significance	Structure F e Bridge is	lared s not eligible for	the NRHP. [5]	
Total length 9.1 m =	= 29.9 ft Lenç	gth of maximum :	span 8.5 m = 27.9 ft	Deck width, out-to-	out 7.5 m = 24.6	ft Bridge roa	dway width, curb-to-cu	urb 7.3 m = 24.0 ft
Inventory Route, Tota	al Horizontal Clearance	7.2 m = 23.6 ft	Curb or sidewalk v	vidth - left $0 \text{ m} = 0.0$) ft	Curb or sid	ewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck structure type	Co	oncrete Cast-in-P	Place [1]					
Type of wearing surfa	ace Mo	onolithic Concret	e (concurrently placed with st	ructural deck) [1]				
Deck protection								
Type of membrane/w	earing surface							
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour lengt	Method to determi	ne inventory ratir	ng Load Factor(LF) [1]	Ir	nventory rating	27.9 metric ton	= 30.7 tons	
1.4 km = 0.9 mi	Method to determi	ne operating ratio	ng Load Factor(LF) [1]	C	perating rating	46.6 metric ton	= 51.3 tons	
	Bridge posting (00.1 - 09.9 % be	elow [4]	D	esign Load M 1	3.5 / H 15 [2]		

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 110 Average daily to	truck traffi 3 % Year 2009 Future average daily traffic 200 Year 2029						
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 9.1 m	n = 29.9 ft					
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2] Bridge median						
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure							
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 F	eature not a highway or railroad [N]						
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 99.9 = Unli	imited 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						
	Bridge improvement cost Roadway improvement cost						
	Length of structure improvement Total project cost	_					
	Year of improvement cost estimate						
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of oth	ner state					
	Border bridge - structure number						

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status Posted for load [P]		Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]					
Condition ratings - superstructure Good [7]		Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]					
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as					
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]	deck geometry	is [5]					
Scour	Bridge with "unknown" founda	Bridge with "unknown" foundation that has not been evaluated for scour. [U]						
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 adequac	Equal to present desirable cr	iteria [8]	Status evaluation					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 83.3					
	f structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings								
Traffic safety features - transition Traffic safety features - approach								
Traffic safety features - approach								
Inspection date October 2017 [1017] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months								
Underwater inspection Not needed [N]		Underwater inspec	ection date					
Fracture critical inspection	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical ins	nspection date					
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	ded [N] Other special inspection date						