

The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportation 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

Oregon [41]	Sherman County [055]	Unknown [00000]	IN BIGGS	45-40-15.42 = 45.670950	120-49-49.48 = -120.830411
02133 002F10475	Highway agency district 9	Owner State Highway Agency [01]	Maintenance responsibility	State Highway Agency [01]	
Route 84	I-84 (HWY 002) FR	Toll On free road [3]	Features intersected SPANISH HOLLOW CREEK		
Design - main Concrete continuous [2]	Design - approach	Kilometerpoint 16857.9 km = 10451.9 mi	Year built 1936	Year reconstructed N/A [0000]	
7	Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [02]	0	Other [00]	Skew angle 0	Structure Flared
		Historical significance Historical significance is not determinable at this time. [4]			
Total length 123.1 m = 403.9 ft	Length of maximum span 21.3 m = 69.9 ft	Deck width, out-to-out 10.8 m = 35.4 ft	Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 7.9 m = 25.9 ft		
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 7.9 m = 25.9 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left 1.1 m = 3.6 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - right 1.1 m = 3.6 ft			
Deck structure type	Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]				
Type of wearing surface	Monolithic Concrete (concurrently placed with structural deck) [1]				
Deck protection					
Type of membrane/wearing surface					

Weight Limits

Bypass, detour length 1.3 km = 0.8 mi	Method to determine inventory rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inventory rating	20.9 metric ton = 23.0 tons
	Method to determine operating rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Operating rating	35.4 metric ton = 38.9 tons
Bridge posting	Equal to or above legal loads [5]		Design Load	M 13.5 / H 15 [2]

Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	2100	Average daily truck traffi	33	%	Year	2010	Future average daily traffic	2100	Year	2030
Road classification	Minor Collector (Rural) [08]	Lanes on structure	2	Approach roadway width	10.1 m = 33.1 ft					
Type of service on bridge	Highway [1]	Direction of traffic	2 - way traffic [2]		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 clearanc	0 = N/A		Navigation horizontal clearance	0 = N/A						
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge			Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway	30.46 m = 99.9 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]								
Widening of existing bridge or other major structure without deck rehabilitation or replacement [33]	Bridge improvement cost	1294000	Roadway improvement cost	129000						
	Length of structure improvement	123 m = 403.6 ft		Total project cost	2070000					
	Year of improvement cost estimate	2011								
	Border bridge - state				Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state					
	Border bridge - structure number									

Inspection and Sufficiency

Structure status	Open, no restriction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]
Condition ratings - superstructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Better than present minimum criteria [7]
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrective action [3]
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]		

Scour	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for assessed or calculated scour conditions; field review indicates action is required. [4]
-------	--

Channel and channel protection	Banks are protected or well vegetated. River control devices such as spur dikes and embankment protection are not required or are in a stable condition. [8]
--------------------------------	--

Appraisal ratings - water adequacy	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]	Status evaluation	Functionally obsolete [2]
------------------------------------	---	-------------------	---------------------------

Pier or abutment protection	In place but re-evaluation of design suggested [4]	Sufficiency rating	61.2
-----------------------------	--	--------------------	------

Culverts	Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]
----------	---

Traffic safety features - railings	
------------------------------------	--

Traffic safety features - transitions	
---------------------------------------	--

Traffic safety features - approach guardrail	
--	--

Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends	
---	--

Inspection date	June 2012 [0612]	Designated inspection frequency	24	Months
-----------------	------------------	---------------------------------	----	--------

Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspection date	
-----------------------	----------------	----------------------------	--

Fracture critical inspection	Unknown [N00]	Fracture critical inspection date	
------------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------------	--

Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date	
--------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------	--