## 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						44-46-42.13 =	124-04-16.61	
Oregon [41] Lincoln County [041]		Unknown [00000]	Unknown [00000] 2.5 MI S DEPOE BAY		44.778369	= -124.071281		
01089 009F13003	Highway agency	y district 4	Owner County Highway	Agency [02]	Maintenance responsibility	County Highway Ag	gency [02]	
Route 101	FRON	TAGE RD.(US101	Toll On fre	e road [3] Fe	atures intersected ROCKY CRE	EK		
Design - Concrete [1]			rete continuous [2]	Kilometerpoint 2092	21.5 km = 12971.3 mi			
main  1 Arch - Deck [11]		approach	/h / lul	Year built 1927	Year reconstructed 2001			
		10 String	ger/Multi-beam or girder [02]	Skew angle 0	Structure Flared			
				Historical significance	Bridge is on the NRHP. [1]			
Total length 109.7 m	= 359.9 ft Leng	gth of maximum sp	an 48.8 m = 160.1 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	To a m = 24.0 ft Bridge roady	vay width, curb-to-cu	6.1 m = 20.0 ft	
Inventory Route, Total	Horizontal Clearance	6.1 m = 20.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk wi	dth - left $0 m = 0.0 ft$	Curb or sidev	valk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft	
Deck structure type	Co	oncrete Cast-in-Pla	ce [1]					
Type of wearing surface M		Monolithic Concrete (concurrently placed with structural deck) [1]						
Deck protection Ca		Cathodic Protected [4]						
Type of membrane/wea	aring surface							
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating		Load and Resistance	Factor Rating (L Inve	ntory rating 16.5 metric ton =	18.2 tons			
0.6 km = 0.4 mi	Method to determi	ne operating rating	Load and Resistance	e Factor Rating (L Ope	rating rating 21.4 metric ton =	23.5 tons		
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above le	egal loads [5]	Desi	ign Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]			

Functional Details	
Average Daily Traffic 8800 Average daily t	ruck traffi 6 % Year 2014 Future average daily traffic 11200 Year 2033
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 6.1 m = 20.0 ft
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2]  Bridge median
Parallel structure designation No parallel structu	re 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 br	idge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 30.48 m = 100.0 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
	Bridge improvement cost Roadway improvement cost
	Length of structure improvement Total project cost 0
	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 restriction [A]		Appraisal ratings - structural	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]			
Condition ratings - superstructure Good [7]		Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present minimum cr	iteria [6]		
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]			
Condition ratings - deck Satisfactory [6]		deck geometry				
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	ed to be stable for assesse	ed or calculated scour condition.	[5]		
Channel and channel protection	Banks are protected or well v required or are in a stable con	egetated. River control de ndition. [8]	evices such as spur dikes and e	mbankment protection are not		
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	y N/A [N]	N/A [N]		Functionally obsolete [2]		
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating	50.5		
	f structure is not a culvert. [N]					
Traffic safety features - railings						
Traffic safety features - transition  Traffic safety features - approach						
Traffic safety features - approach						
Inspection date October 2016		ection frequency 24	Months			
	Unknown [N00]	Underwater inspec				
Fracture critical inspection	Unknown [N00]	Fracture critical ins	spection date			