90 Inspection Date - 4/15/15
Inspector - APORTER (224)

056B00146R - **8 Bridge ID**
Standard -**Primary Inspection Type**

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

Structure Description: 71.56 Foot - Single Span Concrete Frame (except frame culverts)
2 District: 05 **3 County:** Jefferson **16 Latitude:** 38°14′31.00″ **7 Longitude:** 85°41′15.00″
7 Facility Carried ALTA VISTA RD **Milepoint:** 0.230
6A Feature Intersected: I-64 EB
9 Location: .25 MI S OF JCT US 60A
Structure Description: 71.56 Foot - Single Span Concrete Frame (except frame culverts)

NBI	X
Element	X
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	

NBI CONDITION RATINGS

58 Deck:	6	**61 Channel:**	N
59 Superstructure:	6	**62 Culvert:**	N
60 Substructure:	6	**Sufficiency Rating:**	78.8

DESIGN

Substandard:	No
Fracture Critical:	No FC Details
43A Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
43B Main Span Design:	(07) Frame
45 Number of Spans Main:	1
44A Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable
44B Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable
46 Number of Approach Spans:	0
107 Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place
108A Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
108B Membrane:	(0) None
108C Deck Protection:	(0) None
Overlay Y/N:	No
Overlay Type:	None
Overlay Thickness:	-1.000 in
Overlay Date:	

APPRAISAL

36A Bridge Railings:	(0) Substandard
36B Transitions	(0) Substandard
36C Approach Guardrail:	(1) Meets Standards
36D Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard
71 Waterway Adequacy:	(N) Not Applicable
72 Approach Alignment:	(8) Equal Desirable Crit
113 Scour Critical:	(N) Not over Waterway
Recommended Scour Critical:	(N) Not over Waterway

LOAD RATINGS

63 Operating Type:	(1) Load Factor (LF)
64 Operating Rating:	60.0 tons
65 Inventory Type:	(1) Load Factor (LF)
66 Inventory Rating:	36.0 tons
Truck Capacity Type I:	tons
Truck Capacity Type II:	tons
Truck Capacity Type III:	tons
Truck Capacity Type IV:	tons

GEOMETRIC DATA

48 Max Length Span:	64.349 ft
49 Structure Length:	71.556 ft
32 Approach Roadway:	27.900 ft
33 Median:	(0) No Median
34 Skew:	7°
35 Flare:	No Flare
50A Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.750 ft
50B Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.750 ft
47 Horiz. Clearance:	28.500 ft
51 Width Curb to Curb:	28.500 ft
52 Width Out to Out:	32.670 ft
48 Max Length Span:	64.349 ft

ADMINISTRATIVE

27 Year Built:	1970
106 Year Reconstructed:	0
42A Type of Service On:	(1) Highway
42B Type of Service Under:	(1) Highway
37 Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible
21 Maintenance Responsibility:	(01) State Hwy Agency
22 Owner:	(01) State Hwy Agency
101 Parallel Structure:	(R) Right of ll Structure
52 Width Out to Out:	32.670 ft

CLEARANCES

10 Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft
53 Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft
54A Vert. Under Reference:	(H) Hwy beneath struct.
54B Min. Vert. Underclearance:	20.499 ft
55A Lateral Under Reference:	(H) Hwy beneath struct.
55B Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	20.000 ft
56 Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	20.000 ft

POSTINGS

41 Posting Status:	(A) Open, No Restriction
Signs Posted Cardinal:	No
Signs Posted Non-Cardinal:	No
Field Postings Gross:	-1 tons
Field Postings Type I:	-1 tons
Field Postings Type II:	-1 tons
Field Postings Type III:	-1 tons
Field Postings Type IV:	-1 tons

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

38: Re Concrete Slab

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
SQ.FT	2,338	1,997	85%	334	14%	7	0%	0	0%

- About 75 percent of the top of the slab has exposed aggregate with wear.
- There is some transverse, random, and map cracking.
- A large concrete patch with some minor deterioration around the edges is located near the northeast corner and a small asphalt patch is located near the northwest corner. Both patches are failing with a total of 7 sq ft in CS3.
- Soffit has minor cracks and discoloration.
- Copings have some minor deterioration and spalling with some exposed reinforcement due to insufficient clear at time of construction.

215: Re Conc Abutment

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	66	55	83%	11	17%	0	0%	0	0%

- Minor cracks and small areas of deterioration/spalling in legs/stems of rigid frame (considered as abutments for this element level inspection).
- South abutment (A1) has a minor spall near the east end. Mostly minor popouts due to form ties.
- Stone facings have some minor deterioration and/or scaling.

301: Pourable Joint Seal

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	29	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	29	100%

Joint seal is in poor condition - the sealant is not visible due to patching and appears to be missing completely.

330: Metal Bridge Railing

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	143	143	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

- No deficiencies noted.

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

331: Re Conc Bridge Railing

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	143	128	90%	15	10%	0	0%	0	0%

- Bridge railing is composed of a concrete plinth with a stone cap and aluminum tubular railing.
- Minor cracking present.

803: Curb

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(LF)	143	128	90%	15	10%	0	0%	0	0%

Curbs have exposed aggregate, popouts and minor cracks/deterioration.

851: Transitions

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%

Asphalt approach has deterioration/settlement with an elevation difference of approximately 1 in. at the south abutment (A1).

859: Vegetation

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

Trees and brush need to be cut around abutments.

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

STRUCTURE NOTES
-Alta Vista Road runs from south to north, Maple Road to the south and Shelbyville Road/US 60 to the north (this agrees with I-64 EB going east). TK 4/10/2013 -This bridge is actually a single span rigid frame over I-64 EB. -Immediately north of it is a "structural slab" and bridge 056B00146L over I-64 WB. (Plans show the structural slab supported by the paving notches of both bridges.) TK 4/10/2013 -There is no specific element level condition state assessment of concrete rigid frame bridges. Elements utilized to best describe this rigid frame during this inspection comply with the 2012 BIRM recommendations. TK 4/10/2013

INSPECTION NOTES
Standard Inspection by A. Porter and L. Boller (DLZ).

WORK	
Action:	-