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 Informat	tion									42-38-18 =	084-52-55 = -
Michigan [26]	Michigan [26] Eaton County [045]			Chester	Chester [15260] 6.4 MI NW OF CHA			IARLOTTE		42.638333	84.881944
23123052000B010 Highway agency district 6			Owner	Owner State Highway Agency [01] Maintenance responsibility			State Highway Ag	jency [01]			
Route 50 M-50				Toll On free road [3] Features intersected LITTLE THO				ORNAPPLE RIVER			
Design - main Steel [3] Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [0]		Design - approach	Other [00]		Year built	Kilometerpoint 2101.5 km = 1302.9 mi Year built 1931 Year reconstructed N/A [0000] Skew angle 38 Structure Flared Historical significance Bridge is not eligible for the NRHP. [5]					
Total length 10.6 m = 34.8 ft Length of maximum span 10.6 m = 34.8 ft Deck width, out-to-out 14.1 m = 46.3 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 12.2 m = 40.0 ft Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 13.1 m = 43.0 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0.4 m = 1.3 ft Curb or sidewalk width - right 0.4 m = 1.3 ft											
Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place			n-Place [1]								
Type of wearing surface Bituminous [6			Bituminous [6]								
Deck protection											
Type of membrane/wearing surface Preformed Fabric [2]			ic [2]								
Weight Limits											
3.	Bypass, detour length 0.5 km = 0.3 mi Method to dete			Ü	Load Factor(LF) [1] Load Factor(LF) [1]			Inventory rating Operating rating	30.3 metric ton 50.6 metric ton		
Bridge posting			Equal to or above legal loads [5]			Design Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]					

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 2443 Average daily tr	ruck traffi 16 % Year 2007 Future average daily traffic 3460 Year 2018							
Road classification Minor Arterial (Rural) [06]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 13.1 m = 43.0 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 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 99.9 = Unlimited 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 deck replacement with only incidental widening. [37]	Bridge improvement cost 20000 Roadway improvement cost 2000							
widerinig. [57]	Length of structure improvement 10.7 m = 35.1 ft Total project cost 23000							
	Year of improvement cost estimate							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state							
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Sufficiency									
Structure status Open, no res	striction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]						
Condition ratings - superstructur	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]						
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]						
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]	deck geometry							
Scour	Bridge with "unknown	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 adequate	Somewhat better in place as is [5]	than minimum adequacy to tolerate b	being left Status evaluation						
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 92.4						
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culver	t. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings	Ir	npected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - transition	ns II	npected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail Ir	npected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail ends	npected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Inspection date June 2009 [0	0609] Desig	nated inspection frequency 24	Months						
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ection date						
Fracture critical inspection	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical ins	spection date						
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	eded [N] Other special inspection date							