2015 ROUTINE BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT



BRIDGE # 62516 CSAH 44(SILV LK) over RICE CREEK

DISTRICT: Metro COUNTY: Ramsey CITY/TOWNSHIP: New Brighton

Date(s) of Inspection: 09/22/2015

Equipment Used:

Owner: County Highway Agency

Inspected By: Essler, Brian

Report Written By: Brian Essler

Report Reviewed By: Nicklaus Fischer

Final Report Date: 12/30/2015

MnDOT Bridge Office 3485 Hadley Avenue North Oakdale, MN 55128



Table of Contents

SECTION	<u>PAGE</u>
COVER	1
SI&A	2
ADDITIONAL ROADWAYS	3
ROUTINE INSPECTION DATA	4
PICTURES	7
THUMBNAIL PICTURES	11
CULVERT	12
CHANNEL	13
SCOUR POA	15
CHANNEL X-SECTION	16
MAINTENANCE	17
STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT REPORT - ROUTINE	18

MnDOT Structure Inventory Report

Bridge ID: 62516 CSAH 44(SILV LK) over RICE CREEK Date: 12/30/2015 INSPECTION **GENERAL ROADWAY** Bridge Match ID (TIS) 0 Userkey 102 Agency Br. No. **District** Metro Roadway O/U Key Route On Structure Unofficial Structurally Deficient N Maint. Area Crew Route Sys 04 - CSAH Number 44 Unofficial Functionally Obsolete N County 062 - Ramsey **Roadway Name or Description Unofficial Sufficiency Rating** 78.9 City **New Brighton Routine Inspection Date** 09/22/2015 CSAH 44 **Township** Level of Service 1 - MAINLINE **Routine Inspection Frequency** Desc. Loc. 0.3 MI N OF JCT CSAH 11 Inspector Name County, Ramsey Roadway Type 2 - 2-way traffic Sect., Twp., Range 18 - 030N - 23W **Status** A - Open Control Section (TH Only) **Deg** 45 **Sec** 18.32 Latitude Min 5 Reference Point 003+00.660 **NBI CONDITION RATINGS** Longitude Deg 93 **Sec** 8.16 Min 13 Deck **Detour Length** N - Not Applicable Custodian 02 - County Highway Agency **Unsound Deck %** Lanes On 4 Under 0 Owner 02 - County Highway Agency **ADT** 8167 Superstructure N - Not Applicable Year 2008 **BMU Agreement** Substructure N - Not Applicable HCADT 0 ADTT 0 Year Built 1965 Channel 6 - Bank slump; minor damage Functional Class 16 - Urban - Minor Arterial **MN Year Reconstructed** Culvert 6 - Deterioration or initial disinte **RDWY DIMENSIONS FHWA Year Reconstructed NBI APPRAISAL RATINGS** SR-WR If Divided NB-EB **MN Temporary Status** Structure Evaluation 6 Roadway Width 44.00 ft. ft. **Bridge Plan Location** 3 - COUNTY **Deck Geometry** Vertical Clearance ft **Date Opened to Traffic Underclearances** Max. Vert. Clear. ft. ft. **On-Off System** 1 - ON Water Adequacy 8 - Bridge Above Approache Horizontal Clear. ft. Legislative District 50B Approach Alignment 8 - Equal to present desirable Lateral Clearance ft. ft. **STRUCTURE SAFETY FEATURES** Appr. Surface Width 56.0 ft. Service On 5 - Highway-pedestrian **Bridge Railing** 0 - SUBSTANDARD **Bridge Roadway Width** 0.0 ft. Service Under 5 - Waterway **GR Transition** 0 - SUBSTANDARD Median Width On Bridge Main Span Type Appr. Guardrail 1 - MEETS STANDARDS MISC. BRIDGE DATA 5 - Prestress or Precast 13 - Box Culvert **GR Termini** 0 - SUBSTANDARD Structure Flared 0 - No flare Main Span Detail IN DEPTH INSP. Parallel Structure N - No parallel structure Appr. Span Type Y/N Freq Date Field Conn. ID Frac. Critical Appr. Span Detail Abutment Foundation N - N/A Underwater (Material/Type) Skew N - N/A Pinned Asblv. **Culvert Type** W106T Pier Foundation N - N/A Spec. Feat. **Barrel Length** 64 ft (Material/Type) N - N/A **WATERWAY Cantilever ID Historic Status** 5 - Not eligible Drainage Area (sq. mi.) 138.0 NUMBER OF SPANS **Waterway Opening** 180 **PAINT** APPR: 0 **MAIN:** 3 Navigation Control 0 - No nav. control on waterw TOTAL: 3 Year Painted **Pier Protection** Main Span Length 10.0 ft. **Unsound Paint %** Nav. Clr. (ft.) Vert. ft. Horiz. Structure Length 33.3 ft Painted Area sq. ft. Nav. Vert. Lift Bridge Clear. (ft.) Deck Width (Out-to-Out) 0.0 ft. **Primer Type** MN Scour Code E - CULVERT Year **Deck Material** N - Not Applicable Finish Type **CAPACITY RATINGS** 6 - Bituminous Wear Surf Type Wear Surf Install Year **Design Load** 0 - Other/Unknown **BRIDGE SIGNS** Wear Course/Fill Depth 2.30 Operating Rating 5 - NRAP 24.0 Posted Load 0 - Not Required Deck Membrane 0 - None Inventory Rating 5 - NRAP 18.0 Traffic 0 - Not Required **Deck Rebars** N - Not Applicable (no deck) Posting VEH: DBL: Horizontal 0 - Not Required **Deck Rebars Install Year** Rating Date 01/08/1985 Structure Area (Out-to-Out) sq. ft. Vertical N - Not Applicable **MnDOT Permit Codes** Roadway Area (Curb-to-Curb) sq. ft. A: N - N/A Sidewalk Width Lt 5.00 ft. Rt 5.00 ft. B: N - N/A Lt 0.58 **Curb Height** ft. Rt 0.58 ft

Rail Type

Lt 37

Rt 37

C: N - N/A

MnDOT Structure Inventory Report

Additional Roadways

 Bridge ID:
 62516
 CSAH 44(SILV LK) over RICE CREEK
 Date:
 12/30/2015

MnDOT BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

12/30/2015

Inspector: County, Ramsey

BRIDG	E 62516 C	SAH 44(SIL\	/ LK) OVE	R RICE CREE	K		ROUT	INE INSP	. DATE:	09/22/20)15
County: City: Townshi Section: Span Ty List:	New Brighto	ship: 030N R e 19 - Culvert (ir	F (ange: 23W	Route: 04 - CSAl Control Section:		1 11 003+00.660	-	dth: rea/ Pct. Un ra/ Pct. Uns W1061	and: sq. ft		
NBI Dec	ck: N Super	: N Sub:	N Chan:	6 Culv: 6	;						
				· ·	osted, Closed: /	•					
Appraisa	al Ratings - Appr	oach: 8 \	Waterway:		ur Code: E - CU	_VERT	Ur	official Stru	acturally De	eficient	N
Require	d Bridge Signs -	Load Posting:	0 - Not Requ	uired	Traffic: 0	- Not Required		official Fun	-		N
		Horizntal:	0 - Not Requ	uired	Vertical: N	 Not Applicable 	Ur	official Suf	ficiency Ra	iting	78.9
Structu	re Unit:										
ELEM NBR	ELEMEN	T NAME	ENV	REPORT TYPE	INSP. DATE	QUANTITY	QTY CS 1	QTY CS 2	QTY CS 3	QTY CS 4	QTY CS 5
241	Reinforced Con	crete Culvert	2	Routine	09/22/2015	194 LF	0	194	0	0	N/A
				Routine	09/18/2013	194 LF	0	194	0	0	N/A
		Requires	Monitorin	a	Monitore	ed					
		There is debris Tree is blockir There is minor South barrel e There is mode There is minor Spalling at eas	r amount of one of the control of th	debris in culvert #	onstruction joints construction join e west end of cul culvert #3 2005-2 2009.	: 1990-2005. vert #3 2011.	ulverts 200	07-2011.			
						4.54			•	N 1/A	21/2
361	Scour Smart Fla	ag	2	Routine	09/22/2015	1 EA 1 EA	0	1 1	0	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
		Requires	Monitorin	Routine	09/18/2013		O	'	O	IVA	IN/A
		Notes: There Minor scour ef	is moderate	erosion and slum nnel alignment. So the east side 200	me slumping & ι				2003-200	5.	
	Culvert Headwa Other End Trea		2	Routine	09/22/2015	2 EA	0	2	0	0	
										Ü	N/A
				Routine	09/18/2013	2 EA	0	2	0	0	N/A N/A
		Requires	Monitorin		09/18/2013		0	2	0		

ELEM							QTY	QTY	QTY	QTY	QTY
NBR	ELEMEN	T NAME	ENV	REPORT TYPE	INSP. DATE	QUANTITY	CS 1	CS 2	CS 3	CS 4	CS !
64	Critical Finding	Smart Flag	2	Routine	09/22/2015	1 EA	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
				Routine	09/18/2013	1 EA	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Require	s Monitorin	ıg	Monitored	I					
		Notes: < no	ne >								
981	Signing		1	Routine	09/22/2015	1 EA	1	0	0	0	0
01	Olgrinig		1	Routine	09/22/2013	1 EA	1	0	0	0	0
		Require	s Monitorir		Monitored	ı					
		•		kers in place 2013-							
		140too. Type	o object ma	Kero III piace 2010	2010						
82	Approach Guard	drail	1	Routine	09/22/2015	1 EA	1	0	0	N/A	N/A
				Routine	09/18/2013	1 EA	1	0	0	N/A	N/A
		Require	s Monitorin	ıg	Monitored	I					
		There are no	crash attenu	ment on 40 MPH roa lators at the end of send section at SE co	guardrail - not rec	quired 2009-201	12.	15			
985	Slopes & Slope	Protection	1	Routine	09/22/2015	1 EA	0	1	0	N/A	N/A
				Routine	09/18/2013	1 EA	0	1	0	N/A	N/A
		Require	s Monitorir	ıg	Monitored	I					
		Some slump Need fill & tu	ing & underm rf establishm	e erosion of banks on ining of banks at the ent at NW corner of asin in spillway has:	e west side. Mino bridge. Erosion b	or erosion of bar by wingwall at N					
						. = .					21/4
987	Roadway over (Culvert	2	Routine Routine	09/22/2015 09/18/2013	1 EA 1 EA	0	1 1	0	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
							O	'	O	IN/A	IN/A
			s Monitorir	· ·	Monitored						
		Notes: There		e cracking 2007-201	5. Minor cracking	2005.					

2015 Bridge safety inspection conducted by B. Essler and D. Bodelsonon 9/22/2015 2013 Bridge safety inspection conducted by B. Essler and D. Bodelsonon 9/18/2013. 2011 Bridge safety inspection conducted by B. Wieman and N. Fischer on 9/26/2011

2009 Safety inspection completed by B. Wieman on 6/26/2009.

Safety inspection completed by B. Wieman 7/23/2007. Bituminous overlay in 2004.

58. Deck NBI: culvert

36A. Brdg Railings NBI: No railing present 36B. Transitions NBI: No railing present

36C. Appr Guardrail NBI: Guardrail in place and meets standards

36D. Appr Guardrail Twisted end treatments on a 40 MPH roadway.

Terminal NBI:

59. Superstructure NBI: culvert

QTY CS 1	QTY CS 2	QTY CS 3	QTY CS 4	QTY CS 5	
l alignment	moderate	erosion an	d slumping	of bank	
71. Waterway Adeq NBI: Greater than 3' of freeboard					
	CS 1	CS 1 CS 2	CS 1 CS 2 CS 3		

Brian Essler Nicklaus Fischer
Inspector's Signature Reviewer's Signature



Photo 1 - Delamination west end north culvert 2013



Photo 2 - east end culverts 2013



Photo 3 - East end spillway 2013



Photo 4 - roadway northbound 2013



Photo 5 - roadway southbound 2013



Photo 6 - west end culverts 2013



Photo 7 - west end north culvert 2013



1. Delamination west end north culvert .JPG



2. east end culverts.JPG



3. Eat end spillway.JPG



4. roadway northbound.JPG



5. roadway southdound.JPG



6. west end culverts.JPG



7. west end north culvert.JPG

Culvert

				Bridge No.:	62516		
			Culver	t			
	Item	Description	Condition		Comments		
Culvert	Overall:	NBI Item 62	6	Delamination with	n exposed rebar. Moderate scaling at flow line.		
MnDOT	Scour Code:	E - CULVERT					
WIIIDOI	ocour coue.	L - COLVERT					
			Waterway Ins	pection			
Item No.	Yes, No, NA Not Visible	or	Descrip	otion			
1.	No	Is there a significant build	-up of debris?				
2.	No	Is there erosion of the em	bankment around th	e headwalls?			
3.	Yes	Is there any indication of o	cracking or settleme	nt of the culvert bar	rel or headwalls?		
4.	No	Is there shifting of the cha		rosion of the stream	banks? Also are there cracks in the soil of the		
5.	No	Do scour measurements i culvert?	ndicate that the stre	ambed is below the	bottom of the cutoff walls at the ends of the		
6.	Yes				as cracks in the pavement and sags in the fthe side slopes at or adjacent to the culvert?		
7.	No	Is there an indication of "p	piping" of water alon	g the outside of the	culvert such as cavities adjacent to the barrel?		
8.	No	Is the culvert without a bo streambed elevations?	ttom and scour mea	surements indicate	that the streambed is below the plan		
9.	No	Has the riprap or other sc	our protection been	damaged or otherw	ise made ineffective?		
10.	NA	If the culvert was designe	If the culvert was designed to be buried (fill inside the culvert), is the material still in the barrel?				
Notes:							
- Stream	bed sounding d	ata is to be documented.					
	ngs of the strea uld be done.	mbed should be done at each e	nd of the culvert. If I	tems #5 or #8 are "\	Yes", then a streambed profile of the scoured		
- If "Yes"	is the answer t	o any items on the checklist, no	tify the Program Adr	ministrator for furthe	r instructions.		
Commer		e is moderate erosion of banks o	on east side. Need fi	ll and turf establishn	nent at NW corner of bridge.		

Ву

Brian Essler

Completed On

09/18/2013

Channel

				62516			
			Channe	el			
	Item	Description	Condition	Comments			
Channel Overall:		NBI Item 61	6	moderate erosion of banks on the east side. Minor scour effecting channel alignment. moderate erosion and slumping of bank west end north side			
		E	Bank Protection	/Revetment			
	Item	Description	Condition	Comments			
Upstrea	m Bank Protection	n:					
Downst	ream Bank Protect	tion:					
Bridge F	Revetment:						
MnDOT	Scour Code:	E - CULVERT					
			Underwater In	spection			
Underw	ater Inspection By	Divers:					
No. of P	iers To Be Inspect	ted:					
		- 1	Waterway Char	acteristics			
Referen	ce Point:	High Wa	ter Elev.:	Current Water Elev.:			
Pile Tip	Elev.:	Low Wat	ter Elev.:	Current Streambed Elev.:			
		Scour H	ole Elev.:	Current Scour Hole Elev.:			
		Waterway In	spection: (Not a	applicable for culverts)			
Item No.	Yes, No, NA or Not Visible		Descript	ion			
1.		Is there a significant build-	-up of debris?				
2.		Is there a change in the ho	orizontal alignment	of the handrail or structure members such as beams?			
3.		Is there any indication of v	vertical movement o	f the superstructure?			
4.		Is there shifting of the cha banks parallel to the strea		rosion of the stream banks? Also are there cracks in the soil of the			
5.		Is there a significant change	ge in the alignment	of hte exterior bearings?			
6.		Are there cracks or other	signs of distress in t	he approach pavement?			
7.		Is the water currently on the	ne superstructure?				
8.		Are the slopes unstable?					
9.		Do scour measurements in	ndicate: (place a ch	eck by all that apply.)			
		A. that the streamed	is two or more feet	below the bottom of pier footings which are supported on piles?			
		B. scour below the b	oottom of spread foo	ntings?			
		C. scour below the b	oottom of high abutn	nent footings?			
		D. that the streambed has scoured five feet or more below the original streambed elevation at pier bents?					

10.	Have the scour countermeasures been damaged or otherwise made ineffective?
Notes:	
- Streambe	d sounding data is to be documented.
	T Bridge Inspection Manual Section 2.2.5, at bridges that require x-sections, take channel x-sections, along the upstream and/or face of the bridge.
- If "Yes" is	the answer to any items on the checklist, notify the Program Administrator for further instructions.
Comments	
Completed	On By

Scour POA

	Bridge No.:	62516
	Scour POA	
1.	Is POA on File?	
2.	Date of most recent POA:	
3.	Here is a link to MnDOT's Bridge Scour website for other resources:	
	 http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bridge/hydraulics/scour.html 	
	 The Scour POA should be kept in the bridge file and/or uploaded to SIMS using 	the "Inspection Files" tab.
Impler	mentation	
Scour P	POAs are required to be implemented by FHWA.	
1.	Is this POA being implemented?	

Channel Section

<u>Upstream</u>			<u>Downstream</u>				
Custom Label	Location	Elevation		Custom Label	Location	Elevation	

Distance Measured From: Distance Measured From:

Elev. of Ref. Pt: Elev. of Ref. Pt:

Depth to Water Surface: Depth to Water Surface:

WS Elev: WS Elev:

Vertical Datum: Vertical Datum:

Comments:

Maintenance



BRIDGE STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

PURPOSE:

This report is a structural assessment of the structure and its ability to carry loads based on conditions identified in the attached bridge inspection report. The assessment is only a cursory review intended to provide guidance as to the relative hazards for structural conditions and deficiencies identified. This report is mandatory for all fracture critical bridges and is completed by the MnDOT Bridge Office upon receipt of the 7 Day FC Report; however, it is an OPTIONAL tool for agencies to utilize at their discretion for all other inspection types.

BRIDGE NO.: 62516	BRIDGE OWNER: County Highway Agency			
DATE INSPECTED: 09/22/2015	STRUCTURE TYPE: Concrete			
FACILITY CARRIED: CSAH 44(SILV LK)	Culvert (includes frame culverts) FEATURES INTERSECTED: RICE CREEK			
TYPE OF INSPECTION: ROUTINE				
Redundancy:	Connection			
Was a critical finding identified during this is structural review?	nspection or upon			
a) If selected "Yes" above, state briefly the	finding(s):			
2. If a critical finding was identified, what is the	e current status? Pending Resolved N/A			
a) Briefly state actions taken:				
3. Does the condition of any bridge component function? Examples of bridge components winclude elements that are: frozen or immove misaligned, distorted or structurally deformed deteriorated, cracked, broken, eroded or scou	vith impaired function able, out-of-plumb or d, excessively			

	a) If selected "Yes" above, state briefly	the component(s) and condition	on(s):				
4.	4. Does the overall condition of the bridge, or any of its components ☐ Yes ☐ No mentioned in Question 3, suggest the need for detailed structural analysis and/or a revised load rating?						
	a) If selected " Yes ", state the reason for accordance with State of Minnesota F		icate a proposed ti	meframe in			
5.	5. Based on the structural assessment of the	se findings, recommendations	include:				
	☐ Repair/Maintenance ☐	☐ Monitoring Plan					
	Other	☐ Increased Inspection Freque	ency				
	Explain recommended actions:						
6.	Other comments:						

Bridge Office Reviewer