

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]	Lane County [039]	Unknown [00000]	02.8 MI N HWY 018 JCT	43-59-52.84 = 43.998011	122-54-22.86 = -122.906350				
04117A222 00520	Highway agency district	5	Owner	State Highway Agency [01]	Maintenance responsibility	State Highway Agency [01]			
Route	222	HWY 222	Toll	On free road [3]	Features intersected	WILLAMETTE RIVER			
Design - main	Steel [3]	Design - approach	Concrete continuous [2]	Kilometerpoint	836.9 km = 518.9 mi				
2	Truss - Thru [10]	7	Tee beam [04]	Year built	1952	Year reconstructed	N/A [0000]		
				Skew angle	0	Structure Flared	Yes, flared [1]		
				Historical significance	Bridge is eligible for the NRHP. [2]				
Total length	227.7 m = 747.1 ft		Length of maximum span	61 m = 200.1 ft		Deck width, out-to-out	9.1 m = 29.9 ft	Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb	7.9 m = 25.9 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearanc	7.9 m = 25.9 ft		Curb or sidewalk width - left	0 m = 0.0 ft		Curb or sidewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft		
Deck structure type	Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]								
Type of wearing surface	Latex Concrete or similar additive [3]								
Deck protection									
Type of membrane/wearing surface									

Weight Limits

Bypass, detour length	Method to determine inventory rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inventory rating	20 metric ton = 22.0 tons
0.6 km = 0.4 mi	Method to determine operating rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Operating rating	33.6 metric ton = 37.0 tons
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above legal loads [5]	Design Load	MS 13.5 / HS 15 [3]

Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	2800	Average daily truck traffi	10	%	Year	2014	Future average daily traffic	4700	Year	2033
Road classification	Minor Arterial (Rural) [06]		Lanes on structure	2		Approach roadway width	7.9 m = 25.9 ft			
Type of service on bridge	Highway [1]		Direction of traffic	2 - way traffic [2]		Bridge median				
Parallel structure designatio	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	5.41 m = 17.8 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	2392000	Roadway improvement cost	239000						
	Length of structure improvement	228 m = 748.1 ft		Total project cost	3827000					
	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	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrective action [3]
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]		

Scour
Bridge is scour critical; bridge foundations determined to be unstable. [3]

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	Navigation protection not required [1]	Sufficiency rating	46.2
-----------------------------	--	--------------------	------

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	April 2016 [0416]	Designated inspection frequency	24	Months
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspection date	September 2014 [0914]	
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical inspection date	April 2016 [0416]	
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date		