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 Info	rmation											32-47-52.14 =	086-26-08.70
Alabama [01]		Chilton County [021]			Unkn	Unknown [00000] CHILTON * COOS						32.797817	= -86.435750
6225 Highwa		way agency district: 5		Owr	Owner State Highway Agency [01]			Mainten	Maintenance responsibility State Highway Agency [01]			ency [01]	
Route 22)		SR 22			Toll On fre	e road [3]		Features inte	ersected	COOSA RI	IVER	
Design - Steel continuous main Truss - Deck [09]		. ,		approach	Steel [3] Stringer/Multi-beam or girder [02]		Kilometer Year built		3029.2 km =		ni tructed N/A	\ [0000]	
	nuss - Dec	K [U7]		3	Junger/wun	i-beam of glider [02]	Skew ang Historical	le 0 significance		ure Flared dge is not		the NRHP. [5]	
Total lengtl	h 277.4 m	= 910.1 ft	Leng	gth of maxim	um span 91.	4 m = 299.9 ft	Deck wid	dth, out-to-	out 10 m = 3	32.8 ft	Bridge roa	adway width, curb-to-c	curb $7.9 \text{ m} = 25.9 \text{ ft}$
Inventory F	Route, Total	Horizontal (Clearance	7.9 m = 25	.9 ft	Curb or sidewalk wi	idth - left	0.8 m = 2	2.6 ft		Curb or sid	lewalk width - right	0.8 m = 2.6 ft
Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place			in-Place [1]										
Type of we	earing surfac	ce											
Deck prote	ection												
Type of me	embrane/we	aring surfac	e										
Weight Lir	mits												
			nine inventory rating Load Factor(LF) [1]				In	Inventory rating 20 metric ton = 22.0 tons			22.0 tons		
7.9 km = 4	4.9 mi	Method	to determin	ne operating	rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]		0	perating ratio	ng 33.	5 metric ton	= 36.9 tons	
		Bridge p	posting E	Equal to or a	bove legal loa	nds [5]		D	esign Load	M 18 / F	H 20 [4]		

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 1450 Average daily to	ruck traffi 13 % Year 2013 Future average daily traffic 1759 Year 2033						
Road classification Minor Arterial (Rural) [06]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 9.1 m = 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	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 0 m = 0.0 ft 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 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 6086000 Roadway improvement cost 609000						
William deck to habilitation of replacement [56]	Length of structure improvement 277.4 m = 910.1 ft Total project cost 6695000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2019						
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state						
	Border bridge - structure number						

Inspection and Suf	fficiency									
Structure status	Open, no res	striction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]						
Condition ratings - s	superstructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Somewhat be is [5]	petter than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as					
Condition ratings - s	substructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings -	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]						
Condition ratings - deck Satis		Satisfactory [6]	deck geometry							
Scour		Bridge foundations	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [8]							
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning t minor stream bed n	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 - v	water adequad	Equal to present do	esirable criteria [8]	Status evaluation						
Pier or abutment pr	rotection			Sı	Sufficiency rating 45.9					
Culverts Not appl	licable. Used	if structure is not a culvert.	[N]							
Traffic safety featu	ıres - railings									
Traffic safety featu	ıres - transitior	ns								
Traffic safety featu	ires - approach	n guardrail								
Traffic safety featu	ires - approach	n guardrail ends								
Inspection date	February 20	18 [0218] Design	ated inspection frequency 24	Mon	nths					
Underwater inspe	ection	Every two years [Y24]	Underwater inspec	ction date	July 2018 [0718]					
Fracture critical in	spection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical ins	spection date	February 2018 [0218]					
Other special insp	pection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date						