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							43-40-26 =	084-23-21 = -
Michigan [26]	[26] Midland County [111]		Jerome [41760] 0.1 MI S OF SAGINAW ROAD			43.673889	84.389167	
56200060000B020 Highway agency district 4		Owner County Highway Agency [02] Maintenance responsibility		eresponsibility	County Highway Agency [02]			
Route 5651 7 MILE ROAD			Toll On free road [3] Features intersected BIG SALT F			RIVER		
Design - Concrete [1 1 1 Girder and] floorbeam system [0:	Design - approach Other	[00]	Xilometerpoint 37 Year built 1927 Skew angle 20 Historical significance	Structure F	constructed N/A		
Total length 28 m = 91.9 ft Length of maximum span 27.4 m = 89.9 ft Deck width, out-to-out 7.1 m = 23.3 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 6.7 m = 22.0 ft								
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 6.7 m = 22.0 ft Curb or sidewalk v			idth - left 0 m = 0.0	ft	Curb or side	ewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft	
Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]			ce [1] 					
Type of wearing surface Bituminous [6]								
Deck protection								
Type of membrane/we	earing surface							
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating			No rating analysis pe	erformed [5] In	ventory rating	26.7 metric ton	= 29.4 tons	
0.6 km = 0.4 mi	Method to deterr	mine operating rating	No rating analysis pe	erformed [5] O _l	perating rating	35.7 metric ton	= 39.3 tons	
Bridge posting 10.0 - 19.9 % below [3]				De	esign Load MS	3 18+Mod / HS 20)+Mod [6]	

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 4490 Average daily tr	uck traffi 10 % Year 1999 Future average daily traffic 6672 Year 2019							
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 [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 Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft								
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Fe	eature not a highway or railroad [N]							
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 99.9 = Unlimited 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]							
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 481000 Roadway improvement cost 48000							
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 37.2 m = 122.1 ft Total project cost 529000							
	Year of improvement cost estimate							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state							
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Sufficiency									
Structure status Posted for lo	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]						
Condition ratings - superstructur	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Meets minimum tolerable limits	s to be left in place as is [4]					
Condition ratings - substructure Satisfactory [6]		Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]						
condition ratings - deck Fair [5]		deck geometry							
Scour	Bridge with "unkn	Bridge with "unknown" foundation that has not been evaluated for scour. [U]							
Channel and channel protection	Bank protection is channel. [5]	Bank protection is being eroded. River control devices and/or embankment have major damage. Trees and rush restrict the channel. [5]							
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Equal to present	minimum criteria [6]	Status evaluation	Functionally obsolete [2]					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating	60.3					
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culve	rt. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings		npected feature meets currently acce	e meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - transition	IS I	npected feature meets currently acce	ure meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail I	npected feature meets currently acce	ure meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]									
Inspection date September 2	009 [0909] Desi	gnated inspection frequency 24	Months						
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	Underwater inspection date						
·	Not needed [N]		Fracture critical inspection date						
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date						