90 Inspection Date - 6/28/2016 Inspector - KSHUGAR (364)

Unknown (NBI) - Primary Inspection Type

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

Structure Description: 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

2 District: 09 3 County: Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ 7 Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

Milepoint: 0.090 7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD

**6A Feature Intersected:** TRIPLETT CREEK

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

Overlay Thickness:

**Overlay Date:** 

NBI	Χ
Element	
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	Χ

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS							
<b>5</b> 8	Deck:	6	61 Channel:	5				
<b>59</b>	Superstructure:	6	62 Culvert:	N				
60	60 Substructure: 4 Sufficiency Rating: 6							

	DESIGN					
Subs	tandard:	Weight				
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete				
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab				
45	Number of Spans Main:	2				
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)				
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)				
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				
Overl	ay Y/N:	No				
Overl	ay Type:	None				

in

	APPRAISAL				
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards			
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard			
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard			
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard			
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(5) Above Tolerable			
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum			
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No			
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No			
113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action			
Recommended Scour Critical:		(4) Stable, Needs Attention			

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type IV:	9 tons
···ac	we duputed type iv.	0.000

GEOMETRIC DATA					
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft			
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft			
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft			
33	Median:	(0) No Median			
34	Skew:	10°			
35	Flare:	No Flare			
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft			
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft			
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft			
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft			
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft			

	ADMINISTRATIVE				
27	Year Built:	1969			
106	Year Reconstructed:	0			
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway			
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway			
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible			
21	21 Maintenance Responsibility: (02) County Hwy Agency				
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency			
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists			

	CLEARANCES					
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft				
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft				
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft				
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft				
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft				

POSTINGS				
41 Posting Status:	(P) Posted For Load			
Signs Posted Cardinal:	Yes			
Signs Posted Non-Cardinal:	Yes			
Field Postings Gross:	9 tons			
Field Postings Type I:	tons			
Field Postings Type II:	tons			
Field Postings Type III:	tons			
Field Postings Type IV:	tons			

:									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
			%		%		%		%

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

#### **INSPECTION NOTES**

This is a special NBI inspection to only verify that the proper posting signs are in place and to change item (41) to P posted for load. Both ends of the bridge are posted as recommended. Inspection by A. Greiner & W. K. Shugars

	WORK
Action:	

**90 Inspection Date -** 5/16/2016 **Inspector -** AGREINER (154)

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2 District:** 09 **3 County:** Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ **7 Longitude:** 83°21′02.00″

7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD Milepoint: 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS							
58	Deck:	6	61 Channel:	5				
59	Superstructure:	6	62 Culvert:	N				
60	Substructure:	4	Sufficiency Rating: 6	3				

**DESIGN** 

	DEG	1011
Subs	tandard:	Weight
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab
45	Number of Spans Main:	2
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)
46	Number of Approach Spans	s: 0
107	Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place
108A	Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
108B	Membrane:	(0) None
108C	Deck Protection:	(0) None

107 Deck Type.	(1) Concrete-Cast-III-Flace
108A Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
108B Membrane:	(0) None
108C Deck Protection:	(0) None
Overlay Y/N:	No
Overlay Type:	None
Overlay Thickness:	in
Overlay Date:	

	APPRAISAL						
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards					
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard					
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard					
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard					
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(5) Above Tolerable					
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum					
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No					
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No					
113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action					
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, Needs Attention					

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA						
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft					
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft					
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft					
33	Median:	(0) No Median					
34	Skew:	10°					
35	Flare:	No Flare					
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft					
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft					
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft					
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft					
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft					

	ADMINISTRATIVE						
27	Year Built:	1969					
106	Year Reconstructed:	0					
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway					
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway					
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible					
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency					
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency					
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists					

	CLEARANCES							
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft						
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft						
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft						
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft						
<b>56</b>	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft						

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

**90 Inspection Date -** 5/16/2016 **Inspector -** AGREINER (154)

#### **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	879.84	805.84	92%	70	8%	4	0%	0	0%

A moderate intensity of minor sized cracking is present in the wearing surface over the pier. Minor sized longitudinal cracking is present in the downstream wearing surface near the north and south abutments. The underside of the slab in the south span has a moderate sized spall with exposed steel near the center third at the downstream end and a moderate spall adjacent to the downstream end of the south abutment. Moderate spalls are present in the upstream slab face at rail posts 4 and 5 from the south. See photos.

1080: De	1080: Delamination/Spall/Patched Area								
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	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

See element 38.

1130: C	racking (RC and	Other)							
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	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

See element 38.

210: Re	Conc Pier Wall								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	18	90%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of minor cracking with some minor shallow spalling.

Scour is present at the downstream end of the structure. Please see the notes under element 215.

90 Inspection Date - 5/16/2016 Inspector - AGREINER (154)

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

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	72	45	62%	15	21%	12	17%	0	0%

The downstream end of the south abutment has some large cracking and spalling with exposed steel. The steel that is exposed is rusty and heavily corroded. The width of the spall/crack varies, but, it measures ~ 4.5" -5" wide near mid-height. The cracking/ spalling is approximately 3" deep, but, with a smaller instrument you could go further back into the smaller crevice. This deterioration actually begins as moderate cracking in the footing and extends up through the abutment (becoming a larger area of cracking and spalling) to the top of the downstream south wingwall. 1.5" of cracking/separation was measured at this location, the top of the the downstream south wingwall (this appears to have increased from 1.25" during the last inspection). There is also 3/16 in. of lateral displacement (slight rotation of the wingwall toward the stream). Moderate cracking in the floor/wingwall footing interface at the downstream end of the south abutment measures ~ 1/2 in. wide. This deterioration appears to be due to settlement that is due to significant scour at the outlet of the structure. The downstream south and north wingwalls have minor diagonal cracking that extends from the footing to the top of the wall. The upstream end of the north abutment has a couple of minor diagonal cracks that extend from the floor to the ceiling. See photos.

Significant scour is present for the entire length of the structure at the outlet end. A concrete protection apron is in place below the structure's concrete floor. The protection apron extends the length of the structure and is  $\sim 7.5$ ' wide. The vertical fall off the floor onto this protection apron is  $\sim 18$ ". The vertical fall off the protection apron is  $\sim 3.5$ ' and it is vertically undermined 2'- 2.5'. The apron is horizontally undermined 7.5'- 8' at the south end and  $\sim 6$ ' -7' along the north end. Below this apron are large cyclopean stone and ruins of an old concrete structure (scour countermeasures). Continued in Additional Notes 1 (896).

896: Ad	ditional Notes 1								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	1	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Continued from element 215. Several of the stones below the apron have washed out since the last inspection. The scour hole below these stones and ruins was  $\sim$  3' -4' deep during this inspection. There is a substantial elevation difference between the streambed at the inlet of the structure and the streambed below the structure and its countermeasures. Scour is also present along the inlet of the south span. The vertical rise (elevation difference from the streambed to the top of the floor) is  $\sim$  3'. The floor is horizontally undermined 12" -18" for a length of  $\sim$  10'. The streambed at this location is mostly solid rock and the vertical undermining is minimal. It is assumed that some water is seeping/flowing underneath of the structure.

4000: S	ettlement								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

See element 215.

6000: Scour									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

See element 215.

330: Me	etal Bridge Railing	g							
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	88	76	86%	12	14%	0	0%	0	0%

The inlet rail has moderate impact damage along the top near mid-length. The coating is dull with areas of surface rust throughout. See photos.

515: Steel Protective Coating										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
FT	134.11	0	0%	134.11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	

See element 330.

856: Ch	an Drift								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

A moderate sized drift pile is present at the inlet of the south span. Minor sized piles of drift are present at the inlet end of the pier and scattered along the large stones just downstream of the structure.

90 Inspection Date - 5/16/2016 Inspector - AGREINER (154)

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

857: Embankment Erosion										
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%	

Moderate erosion is present behind the downstream north wingwall. The roadway shoulder is beginning to break up and should be repaired.

860: Erd	osion Ctrl/Prt								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

The downstream south embankment is lined with large Class III rock covered with a concrete slurry. This has some minor undermining but is in satisfactory condition. The downstream north bank has some large stones in place that are beginning to slip around the wingwall, but overall they are performing well. See photos.

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

#### **INSPECTION NOTES**

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). Bridge Inspection by A.Greiner & K.Shugars.

	WORK
Action:	

**90 Inspection Date -** 4/6/2015 Inspector - BJONES (302)

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

Structure Description: 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

2 District: 09 3 County: Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ 7 Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD Milepoint: 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected:** TRIPLETT CREEK

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

NBI	
Element	
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	Χ

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS						
58	Deck:	Ν	61 Channel:	5			
<b>59</b>	Superstructure:	Ν	62 Culvert:	5			
<b>60</b>	Substructure: N Sufficiency Rating: 44.6						

	DESIGN				
Subs	tandard:	Weight			
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete			
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab			
45	Number of Spans Main:	2			
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)			
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)			
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			
Overl	Overlay Y/N:				

Deck Type.	(1) Concrete Cast III I lace
108A Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
108B Membrane:	(0) None
108C Deck Protection:	(0) None
Overlay Y/N:	No
Overlay Type:	None
Overlay Thickness:	in
Overlay Date:	

36A Bridge Railings: (1) Meets Standards 36B Transitions (0) Substandard 36C Approach Guardrail: (0) Substandard 36D Approach Guardrail Ends: (0) Substandard 71 Waterway Adequacy: (8) Equal Desirable 72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum 92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No 92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action Recommended Scour Critical: (4) Stable, Needs Attention		APPRAISAL				
36C Approach Guardrail: (0) Substandard 36D Approach Guardrail Ends: (0) Substandard 71 Waterway Adequacy: (8) Equal Desirable 72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum 92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No 92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards			
36D Approach Guardrail Ends: (0) Substandard 71 Waterway Adequacy: (8) Equal Desirable 72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum 92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No 92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard			
71 Waterway Adequacy: (8) Equal Desirable 72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum 92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No 92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard			
72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum  92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No  92B Under Water Inspection: No  113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard			
92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No 92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable			
92B Under Water Inspection: No 113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	72	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum			
113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action	92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No			
(1) (1000)	92B	Under Water Inspection:	No			
Recommended Scour Critical: (4) Stable, Needs Attention	113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action			
	Reco	<b>Recommended Scour Critical:</b> (4) Stable, Needs Attention				

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

GEOMETRIC DATA					
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft			
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft			
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft			
33	Median:	(0) No Median			
34	Skew:	10°			
35	Flare:	No Flare			
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft			
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft			
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft			
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft			
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft			

	ADMINISTRATIVE				
27	Year Built:	1969			
106	Year Reconstructed:	0			
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway			
	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway			
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible			
21	Maintenance Responsibility: (02) County Hwy Agency				
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency			
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists			

	CLEARANCES					
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft				
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft				
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft				
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft				
<b>56</b>	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft				

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

:									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
			%		%		%		%
	1								

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

#### **INSPECTION NOTES**

This Special-Other inspection was performed due a recent high-water-event. There appears to be no advancement of scour or undermining from the previous inspection. It does not appear that the bridge was overtopped during the high-water-event. There is a minor accumulation of drift/debris present on the upstream pier noise. Inspection by B.Jones.

	WORK
Action:	-

**90 Inspection Date -** 5/14/2014 **Inspector -** BCOMBS (217)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2** District: 09 **3** County: Rowan **16** Latitude: 38°14′29.00″ **7** Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

**7 Facility Carried** LITTLE PERRY RD **Milepoint:** 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

Overlay Date:

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Jnderwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS							
58	Deck:	N	61 Channel:	5				
59	Superstructure:	N	62 Culvert:	5				
60	Substructure:	N	Sufficiency Rating:	44.6				

**DESIGN** 

	220.	-/··			
Subs	tandard:	Weight			
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete			
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab			
45	Number of Spans Main:	2			
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)			
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)			
46	<b>Number of Approach Spans:</b>	0			
107	Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place			
108A	Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete			
108B	Membrane:	(0) None			
108C	Deck Protection:	(0) None			
Overl	ay Y/N:	No			
Overl	ay Type:	None			
Overl	ay Thickness:	in			

	APPRAISAL						
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards					
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard					
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard					
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard					
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable					
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum					
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No					
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No					
113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action					
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, Needs Attention					

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA							
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft						
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft						
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft						
33	Median:	(0) No Median						
34	Skew:	10°						
35	Flare:	No Flare						
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft						
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft						
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft						
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft						
52	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft						

	ADMINISTRATIVE						
27	Year Built:	1969					
106	Year Reconstructed:	0					
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway					
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway					
<b>37</b>	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible					
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency					
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency					
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists					

	CLEARANCES							
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft						
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft						
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft						
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft						
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft						

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

90 Inspection Date - 5/14/2014 Inspector - BCOMBS (217)

#### **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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%

Random cracking is present in the at grade wearing surface in the north end of the deck near the downstream end. Minor transverse cracking is also present over the center pier. Otherwise, the deck is in satisfactory condition. See photos.

210: Re Conc Pier Wall									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

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	72	67	93%	2	3%	3	4%	0	0%

The south exterior wall near the outlet of the culvert has heavy vertical cracking with exposed steel. The steel that is exposed is rusty and corroded. The width of the spall/crack varies, but, it measures 4.5 in. wide at 44 in. off the floor and has not changed since the previous inspection. It is approximately 3 in. deep, but, with a smaller instrument you could go further back into the smaller crevice. The spall extends down approximately 40 in. from the ceiling while the cracking extends on down to the floor. This spalling also extends along the ceiling with steel exposed at the ceiling interface. 3.25 in. of separation cracking/spalling was measured between the bottom of the ceiling and the south downstream wingwall. This separation crack is 1.25 in. wide at the top of the wingwall and there is 3/16 in. of lateral displacement (slight rotation of the wingwall toward the stream). Moderate cracking is also present in the floor/wingwall footing interface at the downstream end of the south abutment. One of these cracks is approximately 1/2 in. wide. The downstream south wingwall has light diagonal cracking that extends from the upstream footing to the top of the wall near mid-length. The outlet south wingwall have minor diagonal cracking for the full height of the wingwall. The north exterior wall has minor diagonal cracking that extends from the floor to the ceiling of the culvert. See photos.

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	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Rail is in good condition at this time. See photos.

515: Steel Protective Coating									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

856: Ch	an Drift								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

Minor drift at upstream nose of pier wall needs to be removed. See photos.

860: Erd	osion Ctrl/Prt								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

The downstream south embankment is lined in Class III rock with concrete slurry. Embankment erosion is in good condition with only minor undermining. Since the previous inspection, large cyclopean stone has been placed along the downstream north embankment. See photos.

7360: D	O NOT USE Settl	ement							
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

4.5 in. of max of separation cracking/spalling was measured between the bottom of the slab and the south downstream wingwall. This separation crack is 1.25 in. wide at the top of the wingwall and there is 3/16 in. of lateral displacement (slight rotation of the wingwall toward the stream).

90 Inspection Date - 5/14/2014 Inspector - BCOMBS (217)

Bridge Inspection by B.Combs.

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

7361: D	O NOT USE Scor	ur							
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%

Approximately 3 ft. of vertical scour is present at the upstream end of the floor in the south span. This was measured from the top of the floor to the bottom of the streambed and extends for a length of approximately 8 ft. from the pier wall. Horizontal undermining is up 1.5 ft. at this location. During the last inspection the 2nd ft.step down ft. or the protection apron at the downstream outlet end had 8 ft.+ of horizontal undermining for the full width of the culvert and that was still the case during this inspection. The protection apron is approximately 7 ft. wide so the possibility of the structure having undermining is high. It is also very likely that water is beginning to seep under the structure since there is undermining of the floor at the upstream and downstream ends. There is a significant elevation difference between the height of the streambed upstream and downstream of the structure. A large deep ~6 ft. scour hole is present just downstream of the protection apron. See photos.

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

	WORK
Action:	-

**INSPECTION NOTES** 

**90 Inspection Date -** 4/23/2013 **Inspector -** AGREINER (154)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

Structure Description: 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2 District:** 09 **3 County:** Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ **7 Longitude:** 83°21′02.00″

**7 Facility Carried** LITTLE PERRY RD **Milepoint:** 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected:** TRIPLETT CREEK

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

Overlay Date:

NBI	
Element	Х
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	Х

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS					
58	Deck:	Ν	61 Channel:	5		
<b>59</b>	Superstructure:	Ν	62 Culvert:	5		
<b>60</b>	Substructure:	N	Sufficiency Rating:	44.6		

**DESIGN** 

tandard:	Weight
Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
Main Span Design:	(01) Slab
Number of Spans Main:	2
Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)
Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)
<b>Number of Approach Spans:</b>	0
Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place
Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
Membrane:	(0) None
Deck Protection:	(0) None
ay Y/N:	No
ау Туре:	None
ay Thickness:	in
	Main Span Material: Main Span Design: Number of Spans Main: Approach Span Material: Approach Span Design: Number of Approach Spans: Deck Type: Wearing Surface: Membrane: Deck Protection: ay Y/N: ay Type:

	APPRAISAL						
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards					
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard					
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard					
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard					
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable					
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum					
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No					
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No					
113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action					
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, Needs Attention					

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA						
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft					
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft					
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft					
33	Median:	(0) No Median					
34	Skew:	10°					
35	Flare:	No Flare					
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft					
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft					
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft					
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft					
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft					

	ADMINISTRATIVE									
27	Year Built:	1969								
106	Year Reconstructed:	0								
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway								
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway								
<b>37</b>	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible								
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency								
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency								
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists								

	CLEARANCES									
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft								
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft								
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR								
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft								
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR								
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft								
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft								

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

90 Inspection Date - 4/23/2013 Inspector - AGREINER (154)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

38: Re C	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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%

The wearing surface has minor transverse cracking mostly over the center pier cap. Otherwise the at grade wearing surface is in good condition at this time. See photos.

210: Re Conc Pier Wall									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

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	72	67	93%	2	3%	3	4%	0	0%

The south abutment has moderate cracking and heavy spalling at the downstream end near the downstream wingwall connection. Steel is exposed and it is rusty and corroded. The width of the spall/crack varies, but, it measures 4.5 in. wide at 44 in. off the floor. It is approximately 3 in. deep, but, with a smaller instrument you could go further back into the smaller crevice. The spall extends down approximately 40 in. from the ceiling while the cracking extends on down to the floor. This spalling also extends along the ceiling with steel exposed at the ceiling interface. 3.25 in. of separation cracking/spalling was measured between the bottom of the slab and the south downstream wingwall. This separation crack is 1.25 in. wide at the top of the wingwall and there is 3/16 in. of lateral displacement (slight rotation of the wingwall toward the stream). Moderate cracking is also present in the floor/wingwall footing interface at the downstream end of the south abutment. One of these cracks is approximately 1/2 in. wide. The downstream south wingwall has light diagonal cracking that extends from the upstream footing to the top of the wall near mid-length. Both upstream exterior walls of the south barrel and the north barrel have minor vertical and diagonal cracking. See photos.

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	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

Rail is in good condition at this time. See photos.

515: Steel Protective Coating											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

856: Chan Drift										
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	

Minor drift at upstream nose of pier wall needs to be removed. See photos.

860: Erd	osion Ctrl/Prt								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

The downstream south embankment is lined in Class III rock with concrete slurry. Embankment erosion is in good condition with only minor undermining. See photos.

7360: DO NOT USE Settlement											
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%		

3.25 in. of separation cracking/spalling was measured between the bottom of the slab and the south downstream wingwall. This separation crack is 1.25 in. wide at the top of the wingwall and there is 3/16 in. of lateral displacement (slight rotation of the wingwall toward the stream).

7361: D	OO NOT USE Scor	ur							
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%

Approximately 3 ft. of vertical scour is present at the upstream end of the floor in the south span. This was measured from the top of the floor to the bottom of the streambed and extends for a length of approximately 8 ft. from the pier wall. Horizontal undermining is up 1 ft. at this location. During the last inspection the 2nd ft.step down ft. or the protection apron at the downstream outlet end had 8 ft.+ of horizontal undermining for the full width of the culvert. During this inspection only the the southern most end was accessed (due to the water flow) and up to 5 ft. of horizontal undermining was probed. The protection apron is approximately 7 ft. wide so the possibility of the structure having undermining is high. It is also very likely that water is beginning to seep under the structure since there is undermining of the floor at the upstream and downstream ends. There is a significant elevation difference between the height of the streambed upstream and downstream of the structure. A large deep scour hole is present just downstream of the protection apron. See photos.

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

#### **INSPECTION NOTES**

This is a special inspection to monitor the scour, undermining, and the progression of settlement at the downstream south end of the structure. Element inspection notes were only updated to reflect these particular issues. Inspected by A.Greiner.

	WORK
Action:	-

90 Inspection Date - 5/7/2012 Inspector - BCOMBS (217)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2 District:** 09 **3 County:** Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ **7 Longitude:** 83°21′02.00″

**7 Facility Carried** LITTLE PERRY RD **Milepoint:** 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

Overlay Date:

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Jnderwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS						
<b>5</b> 8	Deck:	Ν	61 Channel:	5			
59	Superstructure:	N	62 Culvert:	5			
<b>60</b>	Substructure:	N	Sufficiency Rating:	44.6			

**DESIGN** 

Subs	tandard:	Weight
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab
45	Number of Spans Main:	2
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)
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
Overl	ay Y/N:	No
Overl	ay Type:	None
Overl	ay Thickness:	in

	APPRAISAL					
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards				
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard				
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard				
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard				
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable				
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum				
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No				
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No				
113	Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, needs action				
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, Needs Attention				

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA						
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft					
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft					
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft					
33	Median:	(0) No Median					
34	Skew:	10°					
35	Flare:	No Flare					
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft					
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft					
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft					
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft					
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft					

	ADMINISTRATIVE						
27	Year Built:	1969					
106	Year Reconstructed:	0					
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway					
	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway					
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible					
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency					
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency					
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists					

	CLEARANCES						
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft					
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft					
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR					
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft					
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR					
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft					
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft					

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

90 Inspection Date - 5/7/2012 Inspector - BCOMBS (217)

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

38: Re 0	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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%

The wearing surface has minor transverse cracking mostly over the center pier cap. Otherwise the at grade wearing surface is in good condition at this time. See photos.

210: Re Conc Pier Wall									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

215: Re	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	72	70	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%

The south barrel has a 3 in.dx5 in.w crack/spall with exposed steel near the outlet on the exterior wall. The 5 in.w spall extends down 40 in. from the ceiling while the crack extends on down to the floor. Both upstream exterior walls of the south barrel and the north barrel have minor vertical and diagonal cracking. See photos.

330: Me	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	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

Rail is in good condition at this time. See photos.

515: Ste	515: Steel Protective Coating										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

856: Ch	856: Chan Drift										
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%		

Minor drift at upstream nose of pier wall needs to be removed. See photos.

860: Erd	osion Ctrl/Prt								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

The downstream south embankment is lined in Class III rock with concrete slurry. Embankment erosion is in good condition with only minor undermining. See photos.

7361: D	7361: DO NOT USE Scour								
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%

Approximately 3.5 ft. of scour is present at the inlet end of the south barrel. The inlet of the south barrel also has up to 1 ft. of undermining which starts at the center pier and extends to the center of the south barrel. The 2nd ft.step down ft. at the outlet has 8 ft.+ of undermining for the full width of the culvert. The 1st step down (1.5 ft.) is approximately 7 ft. wide so the possibility of the culvert having undermining is high. Its also highly possible that water is beginning to seep under the culvert due to undermining at both the inlet and outlet ends of the culvert. See photos.

Inspected by A.Greiner and B.Combs.

#### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

WORK	
Action: -	

**INSPECTION NOTES** 

90 Inspection Date - 5/10/2010 Inspector - BGILES (187)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

2 District: 09 3 County: Rowan 16 Latitude: 38°14′29.00″ 7 Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD Milepoint: 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Jnderwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS								
58	Deck:	6	61 Channel:	5					
59	Superstructure:	6	62 Culvert:	N					
<b>60</b>	Substructure:	5	Sufficiency Rating:	44.6					

DECICN

	DES	SIGN
Subs	standard:	Weight
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab
45	Number of Spans Main:	2
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)

46	Number of Approach Spar	ns: 0
407	Dark Torri	(4)

**107 Deck Type:** (1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place **108A Wearing Surface:** (1) Monolithic Concrete

108B Membrane:(0) None108C Deck Protection:(0) NoneOverlay Y/N:NoOverlay Type:None

Overlay Thickness:
Overlay Date:

Λ	D	D	D	٨	19	٨	П

in

36A Bridge Railings: (1) Meets Standards
36B Transitions (0) Substandard
36C Approach Guardrail: (0) Substandard
36D Approach Guardrail Ends: (0) Substandard
71 Waterway Adequacy: (8) Equal Desirable
72 Approach Alignment: (7) Above Minimum

92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No92B Under Water Inspection: No

113 Scour Critical: (4) Stable, needs action
Recommended Scour Critical: (4) Stable, Needs Attention

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truc	k Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA									
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft								
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft								
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft								
33	Median:	(0) No Median								
34	Skew:	10°								
35	Flare:	No Flare								
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft								
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft								
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft								
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft								
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft								

	ADMINISTRATIVE								
27	Year Built:	1969							
106	Year Reconstructed:	0							
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway							
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway							
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible							
21	Maintenance Responsibility	:(02) County Hwy Agency							
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency							
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists							

	CLEARANCES									
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft								
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft								
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR								
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft								
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR								
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft								
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft								

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

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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%	

Concrete slab has minor cracking throughout.

Same comment By Bobby Giles May 10,2010

210: Re Conc Pier Wall											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

Same comment By Bobby Giles May 10,2010(see photo)

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	72	70	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%		

< none >

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	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

< none >

90 Inspection Date - 5/10/2010 Inspector - BGILES (187)

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

515: Steel Protective Coating											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

856: Chan Drift										
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	

Drift at upstream nose of pier wall needs to be removed. See photo.

Heavy Drift Accumalated at Upstream Wall needs to be removed (see photo)

7361: DO NOT USE Scour										
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%	

Scour at inlet and outlet ends. Scour is significant enough to warrant analysis. See photos for details.

Same comment By Bobby Giles May 10,2010 ( See Photo)

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

INSPECTION NOTES

	WORK			
Action:	-			

Structure Description: 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2** District: 09 **3** County: Rowan **16** Latitude: 38°14′29.00″ **7** Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

**7 Facility Carried** LITTLE PERRY RD **Milepoint:** 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

**Overlay Date:** 

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Jnderwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS						
58	<b>58 Deck:</b> 6 <b>61 Channel:</b> 5						
59	Superstructure:	6	62 Culvert: N				
60	Substructure:	5	Sufficiency Rating: 44.6				

**DESIGN** 

DEGION					
tandard:	Weight				
Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete				
Main Span Design:	(01) Slab				
Number of Spans Main:	2				
Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)				
Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)				
Number of Approach Spans: 0					
Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place				
Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete				
Membrane:	(0) None				
Deck Protection:	(0) None				
ay Y/N:	No				
ау Туре:	None				
ay Thickness:	in				
	tandard: Main Span Material: Main Span Design: Number of Spans Main: Approach Span Material: Approach Span Design: Number of Approach Spans: Deck Type: Wearing Surface: Membrane: Deck Protection: ay Y/N: ay Type:				

	APPRAISAL					
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards				
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard				
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard				
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard				
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable				
72	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum				
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No				
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No				
113	Scour Critical:	(U) Unknown Scour				
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(4) Stable, Needs Attention				

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck Capacity Type IV:		9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA					
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft				
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft				
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft				
33	Median:	(0) No Median				
34	Skew:	10°				
35	Flare:	No Flare				
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft				
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft				
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft				
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft				
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft				

	ADMINISTRATIVE					
27	27 Year Built: 1969					
106	Year Reconstructed:	0				
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway				
	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway				
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible				
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency				
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency				
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists				

	CLEARANCES					
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft				
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft				
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft				
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft				
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft				

POSTINGS						
<b>41 Posting Status:</b> (A) Open, No Restriction						
Signs Posted Cardinal:	Unknown					
Signs Posted Non-Cardinal:	Unknown					
Field Postings Gross:	tons					
Field Postings Type I:	tons					
Field Postings Type II:	tons					
Field Postings Type III:	tons					
Field Postings Type IV:	tons					

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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%

Concrete slab has minor cracking throughout.

210: Re	Conc Pier Wall								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

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	72	70	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%

< none >

330: Me	etal Bridge Railing	g							
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

< none >

515: Ste	515: Steel Protective Coating								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

103C00007N - 8 Bridge ID Standard -Primary Inspection Type

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

856: Ch	an Drift								
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%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

Drift at upstream nose of pier wall needs to be removed. See photo.

7361: D	O NOT USE Scor	ur							
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%

Scour at inlet and outlet ends. Scour is significant enough to warrant analysis. See photos for details.

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

INSPECTION NOTES	

	WORK
Action:	

**90 Inspection Date -** 5/17/2006 **Inspector -** RROGERS (35)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

**2 District:** 09 **3 County:** Rowan **16 Latitude:** 38°14′29.00″ **7 Longitude:** 83°21′02.00″

7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD Milepoint: 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected: TRIPLETT CREEK** 

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

**Overlay Date:** 

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS					
<b>5</b> 8	Deck:	6	61 Channel: 5			
59	Superstructure:	6	62 Culvert: N			
60	Substructure:	5	Sufficiency Rating: 44.6			

**DESIGN** 

Subs	tandard:	Weight
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab
45	Number of Spans Main:	2
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)
46	<b>Number of Approach Spans:</b>	0
107	Deck Type:	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place
108A	Wearing Surface:	(1) Monolithic Concrete
108B	Membrane:	(0) None
108C	Deck Protection:	(0) None
Overl	ay Y/N:	No
Overl	ау Туре:	None
Overl	ay Thickness:	in

	APPRA	ISAL
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards
36B	Transitions	(0) Substandard
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(0) Substandard
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(0) Substandard
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(8) Equal Desirable
72	Approach Alignment:	(7) Above Minimum
92A	Fracture Critical Inspection:	No
92B	Under Water Inspection:	No
113	Scour Critical:	(8) Stable above footing
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(6) Calcs Not Made

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA							
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft						
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft						
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft						
33	Median:	(0) No Median						
34	Skew:	10°						
35	Flare:	No Flare						
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft						
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft						
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft						
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft						
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft						

	ADMINISTRATIVE							
27	Year Built: 1969							
106	Year Reconstructed:	0						
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway						
	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway						
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible						
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency						
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency						
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists						

	CLEARANCES							
10	Vert. Clearance:	99.999 ft						
53	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft						
54A	Vert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
54B	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft						
55A	Lateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR						
55B	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft						
56	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft						

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

38: Re 0	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	879.84	835.85	95%	43.99	5%	0	0%	0	0%

Concrete slab has cracking throughout.

210: Re	Conc Pier Wall								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier wall has areas of cracking with some shallow spalling.

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	72	70	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%
				ı	I	ı	I	1.	

330: Me	tal Bridge Railing	g							
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	88	88	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
								,	

515: Ste	515: Steel Protective Coating								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

103C00007N - 8 Bridge ID Standard -Primary Inspection Type

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

7361: D	O NOT USE Sco	ur							
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%

Scour is significant enough to warrant analysis if the structure.

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

WORK	
Action: -	

**INSPECTION NOTES** 

**90 Inspection Date** - 4/1/2004 **Inspector** - RROGERS (35)

### **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

**Structure Description:** 43.96 Foot - 2 Span Concrete Culvert (includes frame culverts)

2 District: 09 3 County: Rowan 16 Latitude: 38°14′29.00″ 7 Longitude: 83°21′02.00″

7 Facility Carried LITTLE PERRY RD Milepoint: 0.090

**6A Feature Intersected:** TRIPLETT CREEK

9 Location: .2 MI N OF JCT US 60

NBI	Χ
Element	
Fracture Critical	
Jnderwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS					
<b>58</b>	Deck:	7	61 Channel:	5		
<b>59</b>	Superstructure:	7	62 Culvert:	N		
60	Substructure:	6	Sufficiency Rating:	-1		

	DESIGN						
Substandard:		Weight					
43A	Main Span Material:	(1) Concrete					
43B	Main Span Design:	(01) Slab					
45	Number of Spans Main:	2					
44A	Approach Span Material:	Not Applicable (0)					
44B	Approach Span Design:	Not Applicable (00)					
46	Number of Approach Spans	s: 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: 0.000 in

**Overlay Date:** 

	Marita Otara Irada
<b>36A</b> Bridge Railings: (1)	Meets Standards
<b>36B</b> Transitions (0)	Substandard
<b>36C</b> Approach Guardrail: (0)	Substandard
<b>36D</b> Approach Guardrail Ends: (0)	Substandard
71 Waterway Adequacy: (8)	Equal Desirable
72 Approach Alignment: (7)	Above Minimum
92A Fracture Critical Inspection: No	
92B Under Water Inspection: No	
113 Scour Critical: (4)	Stable, needs action
Recommended Scour Critical: (6)	Calcs Not Made

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
64	Operating Rating:	9.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(0) Eng Jdgmnt tons
66	Inventory Rating:	9.0 tons
Truck	Capacity Type I:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type II:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type III:	9 tons
Truck	Capacity Type IV:	9 tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA					
48	Max Length Span:	20.997 ft				
49	Structure Length:	43.963 ft				
32	Approach Roadway:	18.045 ft				
33	Median:	(0) No Median				
34	Skew:	10°				
35	Flare:	No Flare				
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	0.000 ft				
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	0.000 ft				
47	Horiz. Clearance:	19.685 ft				
51	Width Curb to Curb:	19.685 ft				
52	Width Out to Out:	20.013 ft				

	ADMINISTRATIVE				
27	Year Built:	1969			
106	Year Reconstructed:	0			
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway			
42B	Type of Service Under:	(5) Waterway			
<b>37</b>	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible			
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(02) County Hwy Agency			
22	Owner:	(02) County Hwy Agency			
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists			

	CLEARANCES					
10 V	/ert. Clearance:	99.999 ft				
53 N	Min. Vert. Clearance Over:	99.999 ft				
54A V	/ert. Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
54B N	Min. Vert. Underclearance:	0.000 ft				
55A L	_ateral Under Reference:	(N) Feature not hwy or RR				
55B N	Min. Lat. Underclearance R:	0.000 ft				
56 N	Min. Lat. Underclearance L:	0.000 ft				

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

:									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
			%		%		%		%

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

There has been confusion as how to properly code the type of design for this structure; at grade culvert or slab? Item (43B) had been coded as a slab up till the 2012 inspection and items (58), (59), and (60) were rated accordingly. During the 2012 inspection (43B) was changed to a culvert and item (62) was rated. Since plans for this structure are not available to see if it is actually a rigid type structure, this office will conservatively code this structure as a slab bridge and rate items (58), (59), and (60). ATG. 5-17-16. 06/15/16 The load rating is by engineering judgment for this concrete structure with no plans. Posting memo for 9 tons gross due to scour and the poor condition of the substructure. ALI.

<del>-</del>	
WORK	
Action: -	
Action: -	

**INSPECTION NOTES** 



North view.



View of moderate cracking, potholes, and patching along the north approach.



View along the upstream railing. Notice the moderate impact damage near mid-length.



Typical view of the wearing surface.



View of several longitudinal cracks at the downstream north end of the wearing surface.



View of several minor sized transverse cracks in the wearing surface over the pier.



View of moderate erosion at the downstream north wingwall. Notice the roadway shoulder is breaking up.



Typical view looking downstream from the south end of the structure.



Typical view from the south approach.



View of several minor sized cracks at the downstream south end of the wearing surface.



View of  $\sim 1.5$ " of separation at the top of the downstream south wingwall.



View of  $\sim 1.5$ " of separation at the top of the downstream south wingwall.



View of moderate cracking and spalling at upstream rail post 4 from the south.



View of moderate cracking and spalling at upstream rail post 5 from the south.



Upstream view.



View of a moderate drift pile at the inlet end of the south span.



View of  $\sim 12$ " of horizontal undermining under the inlet floor of the south span.



View of  $\sim 12$ " of horizontal undermining under the inlet floor of the south span.



View of  $\sim 18 \mbox{"}$  of horizontal undermining under the inlet floor of the south span.



View of  $\sim$  12" of horizontal undermining under the inlet floor in the south span.



View of moderate spalls in the upstream face of the deck at rail post 4 and 5 from the south.



View of some minor cracking at the inlet end of the north abutment.



View of some minor cracking at the outlet end of the north abutment.



View of an  $\sim$  18" vertical drop of the floor in the north span.



View of the stamp at the outlet end of the slab face.



Typical view looking through the north span.



Typical view looking through the south span.



View of the vertical rise from the bottom of the streambed to the floor at the inlet of the south span.

14/22



View of large heavy cracking and spalling with exposed steel at the downstream end of the south abutment. This cracking measures  $\sim 4.5$ "-5" wide at mid-height.



View of large heavy cracking and spalling with exposed steel at the downstream end of the south abutment. This cracking measures  $\sim 4.5$ "-5" wide at mid-height.





View of large heavy cracking and spalling with exposed steel at the top downstream end of the south abutment/slab interface.



View of large heavy cracking and spalling with exposed steel at the downstream end of the south abutment. This cracking measures  $\sim 4.5$ "-5" wide at mid-height. Notice the cracking extends from the bottom of the footing to the top of the wingwall.



View of large heavy cracking and spalling with exposed steel at the downstream end of the south abutment. This cracking measures  $\sim 4.5$ "-5" wide at mid-height. Notice the cracking extends up through the top of the wingwall.



View of full depth cracking in the footing of the downstream south wingwall.



View of a minor sized full height diagonal crack in the downstream south wingwall.



View of the ~ width of the downstream protection apron.



View of the  $\sim$  vertical drop off the protection apron.



View of  $\sim 7.5'-8'$  of horizontal undermining at the south end of the protection apron.



View of  $\sim$  6' of horizontal undermining near the center of the protection apron.



View of  $\sim 6.5$ ' of horizontal undermining at the north end of the protection apron.



View of  $\sim$  3' deep scour hole below the protection apron.



View of  $\sim$  2'-2.5' of vertical undermining of the protection apron.



Downstream view.