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							43-37-44.09 =	072-31-05.86
Vermont [50]	Vindsor County [0	27]	Woodstock [85900]	0.3 MI N JCT. U.S.4			43.628914	= -72.518294
200241001514242	Highway age	ncy district: 4	Owner Town or Towns	hip Highway Agency [03] Maintenance	responsibility	Town or Township	Highway Agency [03]
Route 12	VT	00012 ML	Toll On fre	ee road [3]	Features intersect	ted OTTAUQUI	ECHEE RIVER	
Design - Steel [3] main Stringer/Multi	-beam or girder [0	Design - approach 2] 0 Other	[00]	Kilometerpoint C Year built 1980 Skew angle 0	Vear rec	onstructed #Nu	m!	
				Historical significand	ce Bridge is	not eligible for t	he NRHP. [5]	
Total length $34.1 \text{ m} = 1$	111.9 ft L	ength of maximum spa	n 33.5 m = 109.9 ft	Deck width, out-to	-out $7.9 \text{ m} = 25.9 \text{ f}$	ft Bridge road	dway width, curb-to-cu	7.7 m = 25.3 ft
Inventory Route, Total H	Iorizontal Clearan	7.7 m = 25.3 ft	Curb or sidewalk w	ridth - left 1.2 m =	3.9 ft	Curb or side	ewalk width - right	1.2 m = 3.9 ft
Deck structure type		Concrete Cast-in-Plac	e [1]					
Type of wearing surface		Bituminous [6]						
Deck protection								
Type of membrane/wear	ring surface	Preformed Fabric [2]						
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length	Method to deter	mine inventory rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]		nventory rating	72 metric ton =	79.2 tons	
2.9 km = 1.8 mi	Method to deter	mine operating rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	(Operating rating	89.1 metric ton	= 98.0 tons	
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above le	gal loads [5]		Design Load MS	22.5 / HS 25 or (greater [9]	

Functional Details									
Average Daily Traffic 4300 Average daily to	ruck traffi 6 % Year 1998 Future average daily traffic 6020 Year 2018								
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 9.1 m = 29.9 ft								
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5]	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 clearance 0 = N/A Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A									
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge 0 m = 0.0 ft 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 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 \$1,019,000 Roadway improvement cost \$50,000								
deterioration of madequate strength. [55]	Length of structure improvement 34.1 m = 111.9 ft Total project cost \$1,069,000								
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2018								
	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	Better than present minimum criteria [7]					
Condition ratings - superstructure	ition ratings - superstructure Good [7]		Equal to present minir					
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]					
Condition ratings - deck	Very Good [8]							
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	ed to be stable for the asse	essed or calculated scour	r condition. [8]				
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 adequac	Equal to present desirable cr	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]		luation Functionally obsolete [2]				
Pier or abutment protection				rating 73.5				
	if structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings	<u> </u>	nture meets currently acce						
Traffic safety features - transition	'	iture meets currently acce						
		nture meets currently acce						
Traffic safety features - approach								
Inspection date August 2017		. , _	Months					
Underwater inspection Not needed [N] Not needed [N]		Underwater inspection date						
·	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical inspection date Other special inspection date						
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other Special Inspe	ection date					