This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp





Trunk
Highway
Bridge
Improvement
Program

(Per Minn. Statute 165.14, subdivision.1-7)

January 2013



















395 John Ireland Boulevard Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-1899

Phone: 651-366-3798

Toll-Free: 1-800-657-3774

TTY, Voice or ASCII: 1-800-627-3529

www.dot.state.mn.us

To request this document in an alternative format, contact MnDOT's Affirmative Action Office at 651-366-4718 or 1-800-657-3774 (Greater Minnesota); 711 or 1-800-627-3529 (Minnesota Relay). You may also send an e-mail to ADArequest.dot@state.mn.us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report Costs	Page 2
Executive Summary	Page 3
Purpose and scope of the reportProject statusTier system	
Chapter 152 Bridge Inventory	Page 5
Scheduling	Page 8
Analysis of Requirements and Recommendations for Changes	Page 9
 Structurally deficient bridges Newer fracture critical bridges Historic fracture critical bridges Tier system Other factors considered in delivering projects 	
Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	Page 10
Prioritization of Subsequent Trunk Highway Bridge Projects	Page 11
Abbreviations and Definitions	Page 12
Minnesota Statute 165.14, Subdivisions 1-7	Page 15
Chapter 152 Bridge Inventory Report	Page 19-27
Chapter 152 Bridge Program Statewide Map	Page 29
Chapter 152 Bridge Program District Maps	Page 30-38

Report Costs

The estimated cost to prepare this report is: \$16,000

Executive Summary

Purpose and scope of the report

This Trunk Highway Bridge Improvement Program Report, the fourth since 2009, is submitted by the commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Transportation to the Minnesota Legislature in response to the requirements specified in Minn. Stat. 165.14. The Statewide Transportation Planning Report, as required in Subd. 5 of this statute, was submitted in August 2009. The information in this report is current as of November 2012.

All of the bridge projects in this report are part of a master bridge list developed on March 1, 2008 (revised on April 23, 2008) identifying 172 bridges that met the criteria established in Minnesota Laws 2008, Chapter 152. This bridge program focuses on those bridges classified as either structurally deficient or fracture critical. Of the 172 bridges identified as part of the Chapter 152 program, an estimated 120 bridges will be under contract to be replaced or rehabilitated by June 30, 2018. The remaining bridges were either under construction at the time the program was established; classified as "Tier 3" under the priority system and were not required to be funded as part of the program (although many were already programmed for work); privately owned; or have been determined to not need work beyond routine maintenance until after June 30, 2018.

Project status

The status of the 172 bridges is as follows:

- 76 bridges substantially complete (i.e., open to traffic)
- 13 bridges will be complete by the end of the 2013 construction season
- 53 bridges scheduled to be under contract for repair or replacement in 2014-2018
- 27 bridges judged to need only routine maintenance until beyond 2018
- 3 bridges are either privately owned or do not carry state trunk highway traffic

Tier system

The legislation included a tier system to prioritize bridges. All bridges inventoried have been classified as a Tier 1, 2 or 3 bridge, where Tier 1 is the highest priority tier. Unless the commissioner identifies a reason for proceeding otherwise, all bridge projects within a higher tier must to the extent feasible be selected and funded in the approved state transportation improvement program, before beginning bridge projects in a lower tier. This can occur at any stage in the project development process—during bid solicitation, contract negotiations, construction or at completion.

- A. Tier 1. Any bridge with an average daily traffic count greater than 1,000 and a sufficiency rating that is at or below 50; or is identified by the commissioner as a priority project.
- **B.** Tier 2. Any bridge that is not a Tier 1 bridge, and is classified as fracture critical, or has a sufficiency rating that is at or below 80.

C. Tier 3. Any other bridge meeting the program criteria (structurally deficient) that is not a Tier 1 or Tier 2 bridge.

The Bridge Office and the Office of Capital Programs and Performance Measures met with all MnDOT districts at the time the program was established to review their Tier 1 and Tier 2 bridge projects. Together they identified the needed improvement for each bridge (rehabilitation, redeck, minor maintenance or replacement). The outcome of those meetings provided the districts with the ability to determine project scopes, cost estimates and preliminary construction dates associated with the identified bridge improvements. Scopes and cost estimates for the bridge projects were completed in December 2008 and are updated annually. There are several major bridges included in this program for which ownership is shared with Canada, Wisconsin or North Dakota. For the purposes of this report, only Minnesota's cost share of those bridges is reported.

Chapter 152 Bridge Inventory

A bridge inventory has been included in this report with the following information:

- Bridge number
- County
- MnDOT district
- Route number
- Facility carried and feature crossed
- National Bridge Inspection Standards condition ratings (deck, superstructure, substructure)
- Bridge classification(s): structurally deficient, fracturecritical or functionally obsolete
- Sufficiency rating
- Year built
- Average daily traffic count
- Load (operating) rating


- Length
- Deck area
- Main span type
- Brief description of the work planned
- Total project costs
- Year (or range of years) in which the work is planned
- Any notes on the bridge regarding history of bridge maintenance and inspection report findings, engineering judgments about the safety or condition of the bridge, or any other factors specifically identified by the commissioner

Projects that are within the four-year State Transportation Improvement Program have a Total Project Cost Estimate associated with them. Projects planned for years beyond the STIP time frame have a Total Project Cost Estimate range identified.


In accordance with the legislative intent, MnDOT will accomplish the following by June 30, 2018:

- **Tier 1:** All 10 fracture critical bridges (as of 3/1/08) will be replaced, renovated or under construction.
- **Tier 1:** All 30 of the structurally deficient bridges that are not fracture critical (as of 3/1/08) will be replaced, renovated or under construction.
- Tier 2: Of the 61 fracture critical bridges (as of 3/1/08), it is estimated that 12 will be replaced. Of the remaining fracture critical bridges, 19 will be repaired or renovated, three are currently under study to determine if they will be replaced or rehabilitated, and three are privately owned or do not carry trunk highway traffic. The remaining Tier 2 fracture critical bridges that are not being repaired or replaced within this 10-year program have performed well and are only in need of routine maintenance at this time. Some of these bridges are planned for replacement just beyond 2018.
- Tier 2: Of the 59 structurally deficient bridges (as of 3/1/08), all will be replaced or repaired based on load posting status, maintenance history, condition and sufficiency ratings.

- **Tier 3:** Of the 11 structurally deficient bridges, replacements will be prioritized based on load posting status, maintenance history and condition ratings. *Note:* Tier 3 bridges are not required to be addressed under Minnesota Laws 2008, Chapter 152 by June 30, 2018.
- Commissioner's Priority: One load-posted bridge (neither structurally deficient nor fracture critical) was added to this program as a Commissioner's Priority.
- Additional bridges that become structurally deficient during the next decade will be programmed for replacement or repaired as needed or and as funding allows.



Revised April 23, 2008



It is MnDOT's intent to deliver the Tier 1 and Tier 2 bridges identified in the Master List dated March 1, 2008 (revised April 23, 2008), recognizing that as this program matures, additional bridges may need to be addressed.

Assumptions that may affect this program include:

- Current appropriation schedule of bond funds during the 10-year program does
 not match the current schedule of bridge improvements, which creates a
 negative balance in the program. Redistribution of bond appropriation may be
 needed to match the current bridge schedule and estimates.
- Current projection of inflation rates were used to inflate current cost estimates
 to year of construction or mid-year of construction for multi-year, large-scale
 bridges. (Large-scale bridges are bridge projects that have a construction cost
 exceeding 50 percent of the annual Area Transportation Partnership's federal
 funding target.) There were 13 large-scale bridges identified in the inventory.
 The inventory spreadsheet for these bridges is shown on next page. TH 99
 over the Minnesota River in St. Peter will be rehabilitated in-place and is no
 longer considered a large-scale bridge project.
- Schedule changes for any individual large-scale bridge may require a shift in schedule for one or more of the other large-scale bridges.
- Current bridge conditions were used to develop this program. Significant changes in bridge conditions may affect the order and magnitude of funding needed to deliver this program.
- One-time, near-term funding allocations may affect the completion schedule of the Chapter 152 Bridge Improvement Program.

As better information is provided regarding these assumptions, any negative change could adversely impact the bridge program and potentially delay MnDOT's ability to deliver this entire program by June 30, 2018.

Name/Location	County	District	Bridge No.	Status
DeSoto, in St. Cloud TH23 over Mississippi River & Riverside Dr.	Stearns	3	6748	Replacement complete
Robbin-Drayton TH11 over Red River of the North	Kittson	2	6690	Replacement complete
Hastings US61 over the Mississippi River, RR, Streets	Dakota	Metro	5895	Replacement underway
Lafayette US52 over the Mississippi River, RR & Streets	Ramsey	Metro	9800	Replacement underway
Dresbach I-90 over the Mississippi River	Winona	6	9320	Replacement underway
St. Peter TH99 over the Minnesota River	LeSueur	7	4930	Rehabilitation planned for FY 2013*
Cayuga I-35 over Cayuga Street & BNSF RR	Ramsey	Metro	6515	Replacement underway
St. Croix River Crossing in Stillwater TH36 over the St. Croix River	Washington	Metro	4654	Replacement planned for FY 2014
Winona TH43 over the Mississippi River, RR, Streets	Winona	6	5900	Rehabilitation or Replacement planned for FY 2014
Sorlie Bridge, E Grand Forks US 2B over the Red River of the North	Polk	2	4700	Rehabilitation or Replacement planned for FY 2018
TH72 over the Rainy River in Baudette	Lake of the Woods	2	9412	Rehabilitation or Replacement planned for FY 2018
Red Wing US63 over Mississippi River & CP Rail	Goodhue	6	9040	Rehabilitation or Replacement planned for FY 2018
New Ulm TH14 over the Minnesota River	Brown	7	9200	Replacement planned for FY 2018

^{*} TH 99 over the Minnesota River in St. Peter will be rehabilitated in-place and is no longer considered a large-scale bridge project.

Scheduling

Scheduling of projects will occur according to the following priorities:

- 1) Bridge projects currently programmed in the 2013-16 STIP will be delivered as planned.
- 2) Large-scale bridges will be scheduled based upon bond availability, project readiness, remaining bridge life and condition.
- 3) Other bridge projects will be scheduled in 2017-18 as follows:
 - Remaining bridges will be replaced in order of tiers. Within the tiers, projects generally were ranked in the following priority:
 - a) Load posted
 - b) History of maintenance issues or inspection findings
 - c) Condition Code Four or less for superstructure
 - d) Condition Code Four or less for substructure
 - e) Sufficiency rating less than 50
 - f) Permit restricted
 - g) Sufficiency rating less than 80

Analysis of Requirements and Recommendations for Changes

Per Minn. Stat. 165.14, subdivision 6, the commissioner is to report on the adequacy and efficacy of (1) the program requirements under subdivision 3, and (2) the prioritization requirements under subdivision 4.

The program requirements under subdivision 3 require the commissioner to develop an inventory of bridges on the trunk highway system in Minnesota that are classified as Fracture Critical or Structurally Deficient, or constitute a priority project. In determining whether a bridge is a priority project, the commissioner may consider national bridge inventory condition codes, bridge classification (such as functionally obsolete), the year in which the bridge was built, the history of bridge maintenance and inspection report findings, the average daily traffic count, and engineering judgments with respect to the safety or condition of the bridge.

Structurally deficient bridges

Prior to the enactment of this legislation, structurally deficient bridges were considered for replacement or rehabilitation as a part of programming and planning bridge projects. Prioritization occurred using the same criteria established in this legislation. For further discussion on prioritization, refer to the "Scheduling" section above.

Newer fracture critical bridges

Only certain fracture critical bridges have been considered by the commissioner to be programmed or planned for replacement within the time frame of this program. Many Fracture Critical bridges on the trunk highway system were built after the mid-1970s, when the engineering community came to know more about steel fatigue. These newer bridges were designed and fabricated with improved details for resistance to fatigue. Steel specifications in the mid-1970s required steel "toughness" properties that provide resistance to fatigue. A Fracture Control Plan published in 1978 by AASHTO also served as a guide for fabricating bridges using improved welding techniques for assembly. Many of these bridges need only regularly scheduled maintenance or minor repairs within the time frame of this program and are not recommended by the commissioner for replacement until they near the end of their usable life. For this reason, the commissioner has taken a broad interpretation of the legislation to allow specific bridges to remain in service if the reasons are documented.

Historic fracture critical bridges

MnDOT has coordinated with the Federal Highway Administration to implement this program. Per the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, addressing older fracture critical bridges eligible for the National Register of Historic Places has required an in-depth study of the feasibility to rehabilitate these bridges prior to moving forward with a replacement project. As a part of these rehabilitation feasibility

studies, MnDOT has examined the potential of retrofitting fracture critical structures in order to provide load path redundancy, which is feasible for some types of fracture critical bridges. In other cases, such as truss bridges, retrofit schemes examined have not provided designs that will yield the 75-year service life expected from such a large investment. Additionally, some of the schemes examined would provide visual impacts that render the structure ineligible for the National Register. As with the newer fracture critical bridges described above, historic fracture critical bridges are also being considered as candidates for continued service.

Tier system

Prioritization parameters under subdivision 4 require the commissioner to classify all bridges in the program into Tier 1, 2 or 3 bridges, where Tier 1 is the highest priority tier. Unless the commissioner identifies a reason for proceeding otherwise, before starting bridge projects in a lower tier, all bridge projects within a higher tier must be selected and funded in the approved State Transportation Improvement Program, at some stage in the project development process: during bid solicitation, in contract negotiation, while under construction, or through completion. The prioritizing criteria listed in the legislation for each tier is part of the criteria the commissioner has used to prioritize bridges prior to the legislation, with the exception that the commissioner has not categorized bridges in tiers. Since the Chapter 152 program has been implemented based on MnDOT's interpretation and understanding of the intent of the legislation, MnDOT has found the tier system workable and has no changes to suggest regarding its adequacy and efficacy.

Other factors considered in delivering projects

Due to MnDOT's large program and the complexities in delivering large bridge projects requiring engineering, public involvement, environmental process, right of way acquisition, permits, utilities relocation, etc., not all Tier 1 bridges will be under construction prior to addressing Tier 2 bridges. However, all are currently in some stage of project development.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

Legislation passed during the 2010 session requires all bridge projects funded under this program in fiscal year 2012 or later to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations if both sides of the bridge are located within a municipality or the bridge links a pedestrian way, shared-use path, trail or scenic bikeway. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are not required if a comprehensive assessment demonstrates that there is an absence of need or there is a reasonable alternative within one-quarter mile of the bridge project. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are being implemented in accordance with the requirements of the legislation.

Prioritization of Subsequent Trunk Highway Bridge Projects

Legislation passed during the 2010 session requires expansion of the current planning process to include risk-based criteria for project identification outside of the Chapter 152 Bridge Improvement Program. The intent of introducing risk assessments is to provide a comprehensive look at factors that affect likelihood of a service interruption and impacts of the service interruption to the traveling public. The risk assessment process considers the following factors: condition of the deck, condition of the superstructure, condition of the substructures, age, fracture criticality, scour susceptibility, geometric factors, special vulnerabilities, traffic volume, heavy commercial traffic, detour length and highway classification.

MnDOT has developed a new process called Bridge Replacement and Improvement Management to incorporate the risk assessment tool. BRIM has been developed and calibrated and is being used in the planning of bridge improvements and replacements. The BRIM process consists of three steps: identifying improvement needs, ranking each bridge based on the Bridge Planning Index, and conducting an expert review.

Improvement needs are developed based on bridge inspection and inventory data for each individual bridge using the expected deterioration of each bridge. The result is a draft list of bridge needs, including cost and schedule. The next step incorporates the BPI which applies the principles of risk assessment to the planning process that includes the factors mentioned previously. The BPI rates each individual bridge from 0 (highest priority) to 100 (lowest priority). The last step in the BRIM process is the expert review with the MnDOT district offices. This step allows those local experts, with a more intimate knowledge of their bridges, the opportunity to ensure the projects are programmed appropriately based on the local transportation needs, scope or schedule.

MnDOT's next steps are to further define the expert review process by meeting with the MnDOT districts and make final changes or improvements based on the feedback collected. The updated bridge improvement needs will be used as a basis for planning investments in state trunk highway bridges.

Abbreviations and Definitions

ADT Average daily traffic

Bridge length Length of bridge (from abutment to

abutment)

Bridge number Unique bridge number assigned to a

specific bridge

CH 152 work planned Type of work planned for bridge

Chap. 152 tier Classification created by the Legislature -

See Executive Summary

Condition (NBIS rating) National Bridge Inspection Standards

Rating given to a part of a bridge to identify

its condition

Construction year planned Estimated year construction is to begin

County County

Deck Area Total bridge deck area (square feet)

Deck Deck rating

District MnDOT construction district

Feature crossed Feature being crossed by bridge

Fracture critical (Y=Yes, N=No) A fracture-critical bridge typically has a steel

superstructure with load (tension) carrying members arranged in a manner in which, if one fails, the bridge would collapse.

Examples of fracture critical bridges are two-girder bridges or truss bridges. The classification of fracture critical does not mean the bridge is inherently unsafe.

Functionally obsolete (Y=Yes, N=No) A functionally obsolete bridge is one that

was built to standards that no longer meet

the minimum federal clearance requirements for a new bridge. These

bridges are not automatically rated as structurally deficient, nor are they inherently unsafe. Functionally obsolete bridges

include those that have sub-standard geometric features such as narrow lanes,

narrow shoulders, poor approach alignment or inadequate vertical under clearance. The classification of a bridge as functionally obsolete also indicates a priority status for federal funding eligibility.

Load (operating) rating

Load ratings based on the operating rating level generally describe the maximum permissible live load to which the structure may be subjected. Allowing unlimited numbers of vehicles to use the bridge at operating level may shorten the life of the bridge.

Main span type Type of main span superstructure

Notes Notes on a specific bridge

OL Overlay

PT Paint

RDK Re-deck

Rehab Rehabilitation

RE-OL Re-overlay

Route Number Trunk Highway, US Highway or Interstate

on which project is located

RPL Replace

Structurally deficient (Y=Yes, N=No) Bridges are classified as structurally

deficient if they have a general condition

rating of 4 or less for the deck,

superstructure, substructure or culvert, or if the road approaches regularly take on water due to flooding. The fact that a bridge is structurally deficient does not imply that it is unsafe. For bridge owners, the classification is a reminder that the bridge may need further analysis that may result in load posting, maintenance, rehabilitation,

replacement or closure. If unsafe conditions are identified during a physical inspection, the structure will be closed. Structurally deficient is a term used to indicate a priority

for federal funding eligibility.

SUB Substructure rating

Sufficiency rating

Sufficiency rating is a computed numerical value that is used to determine eligibility for federal funding. The sufficiency rating formula result varies from 0 to 100. The formula includes factors for structural condition, bridge geometry and traffic considerations. The sufficiency rating formula is contained in the December 1995 edition of the "Recording and Coding Guide for the Structure Inventory and Appraisal of the Nation's Bridges." A bridge that is structurally deficient or functionally obsolete with a sufficiency rating of 80 or less is eligible for federal rehabilitation funding. Of those, a bridge with a sufficiency rating of less than 50 is eligible for federal replacement funding.

SUP

Total project cost estimate

Year built

Superstructure rating

All project costs associated with the construction, engineering and right of way acquisition (including inflation out to the mid-year of construction and contingency)

The year the bridge was constructed

Minnesota Statute 165.14, Subdivisions 1-7

Subdivision1. **Definition**

For purposes of this section, "program" means the trunk highway bridge improvement program established under this section.

Subd. 2. Program created

The commissioner shall develop a trunk highway bridge improvement program for accelerating repair and replacement of trunk highway bridges throughout the state. The program receives funding for bridge projects as specified by law.

Subd. 3. Program requirements

- (a) The commissioner shall develop an inventory of bridges included in the program. The inventory must include all bridges on the trunk highway system in Minnesota that are classified as fracture-critical or structurally deficient, or constitute a priority project, as identified by the commissioner. In determining whether a bridge is a priority project, the commissioner may consider national bridge inventory (NBI) condition codes, bridge classification as functionally obsolete, the year in which the bridge was built, the history of bridge maintenance and inspection report findings, the average daily traffic count, engineering judgments with respect to the safety or condition of the bridge, and any other factors specifically identified by the commissioner.
- (b) For each bridge included in the inventory, the commissioner must provide the following information: a summary of the bridge, including but not limited to, county and department district, route number, feature crossed, the year in which the bridge was built, average daily traffic count, load rating, bridge length and deck area, and main span type; the condition ratings for the deck, superstructure, and substructure; identification of whether the bridge is structurally deficient, functionally obsolete, or fracture-critical; the sufficiency rating; a brief description of the work planned for the bridge, including work type needed; an estimate of total costs related to the bridge, which may include general and planning cost estimates; and, the year or range of years in which the work is planned.

Subd. 4. Prioritization of bridge projects

- (a) The commissioner shall classify all bridges in the program into tier 1, 2, or 3 bridges, where tier 1 is the highest tier. Unless the commissioner identifies a reason for proceeding otherwise, before commencing bridge projects in a lower tier, all bridge projects within a higher tier must to the extent feasible be selected and funded in the approved state transportation improvement program, at any stage in the project development process, solicited for bids, in contract negotiation, under construction, or completed.
 - (b) The classification of each tier is as follows:
- (1) tier 1 consists of any bridge in the program that (i) has an average daily traffic count that is above 1,000 and has a sufficiency rating that is at or below 50, or (ii) is identified by the commissioner as a priority project;
- (2) tier 2 consists of any bridge that is not a tier 1 bridge, and (i) is classified as fracture-critical, or (ii) has a sufficiency rating that is at or below 80; and
- (3) tier 3 consists of any other bridge in the program that is not a tier 1 or tier 2 bridge.

- (c) By June 30, 2018, all tier 1 and tier 2 bridges originally included in the program must be under contract for repair or replacement with a new bridge that contains a load-path-redundant design, except that a specific bridge may remain in continued service if the reasons are documented in the report required under subdivision 5. Bridges that are not originally included in the program and additional bridges identified for contract after the trunk highway bridge improvement program concludes on June 30, 2018, must be prioritized according to subdivision 7.
- (d) All bridge projects funded under this section in fiscal year 2012 or later must include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations if both sides of the bridge are located in a city or the bridge links a pedestrian way, shared-use path, trail, or scenic bikeway.

Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations would not be required if:

- a comprehensive assessment demonstrates that there is an absence of need for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for the life of the bridge; or
- (2) there is a reasonable alternative bicycle and pedestrian crossing within one-quarter mile of the bridge project.

All bicycle and pedestrian accommodations should enable a connection to any existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in close proximity to the bridge. All pedestrian facilities must meet or exceed federal accessibility requirements as outlined in Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, codified in United States Code, title 42, chapter 126, subchapter II, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, codified in United States Code, title 29, section 794.

(e) The commissioner shall establish criteria for determining the priority of bridge projects within each tier, and must include safety considerations as a criterion.

Subd. 5. Statewide transportation planning report

In conjunction with each update to the Minnesota statewide transportation plan, or at least every six years, the commissioner shall submit a report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the House of Representatives and senate committees with jurisdiction over transportation finance. The report must include:

- (1) an explanation of the criteria and decision-making processes used to prioritize bridge projects;
- (2) a historical and projected analysis of the extent to which all trunk highway bridges meet bridge performance targets;
- (3) a summary of bridge projects (i) completed in the previous six years or since the last update to the Minnesota statewide transportation plan, and (ii) currently in progress under the program;
- (4) a summary of bridge projects scheduled in the next four fiscal years and included in the state transportation improvement program;
 - (5) a projection of annual needs over the next 20 years;
- (6) a calculation funding necessary to meet the completion date under subdivision 4, paragraph (c), compared to the total amount of bridge-related funding available; and
- (7) for any tier 1 fracture-critical bridge that is repaired but not replaced, an explanation of the reasons for repair instead of replacement.

Subd. 6. Annual report

Annually by January 15, the commissioner shall submit a report on the program to the chairs and ranking minority members of the House of Representatives and senate committees with jurisdiction over transportation finance. The report must include the inventory information required under subdivision 3, and an analysis, including any recommendations for changes, of the adequacy and efficacy of

- (1) the program requirements under subdivision 3, and
- (2) the prioritization requirements under subdivision 4.

Subd. 7. **Prioritization of subsequent trunk highway bridge projects.**The trunk highway bridge improvement program described in subdivisions 1 through 6

concludes on June 30, 2018, and applies to bridge projects identified at the inception of the program. Additional bridges that did not qualify for the initial trunk highway bridge improvement program under the tiered classification system that may subsequently need repair or replacement must be prioritized as follows:

- (1) the commissioner shall develop a prioritization method for scheduling bridge repairs and replacements that will include consideration of the risk of service interruption resulting in temporary road closures or restrictions of existing bridges;
- (2) the prioritization system must consider factors including but not limited to bridge condition, age, load capacity, type of bridge, susceptibility to flood damage, fracture-critical design features, traffic volume, detour length, and functional classification of highway route;
- (3) the prioritization system must be utilized in conjunction with department knowledge of the bridge infrastructure to establish the repair and replacement program; and
- (4) the commissioner shall establish a risk-based prioritization system no later than February 1, 2011.

History: 2008 c 152 art 6 s 5; 2010 c 205 s 1,2; 2010 c 351 s 13,14

		1			ī		1	1			1	ignway bii	_		IS RATI		1	-				ı		
			₂₀						S F	S	- W	_		(IAB	IJ KAII	NG)	В			_	m	_		i I
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
1	6496	2	Hwy. 1	6901-27	HWY. 1 OVER FLINT CREEK	ST LOUIS	1952	\$976,370	2009	YES	2009	RPL	500	4	5	6	113		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 28.3	Y	N	N	76.6
	Notes:	ı			HWY. 2 OVER ST	1					1									1				
1	69100 Notes:	2	Hwy. 2	6937.69100D	LOUIS RIVER, HWY. 35. & RR	ST LOUIS	1982	\$29,541,046	2015	NO		OL & PT	19,400	5	7	7	8,320		STEEL TIED ARCH	HS 40.6	N	N	Υ	80.6 (79.5)
1	69101	2	Hwy. 2	6937.69100D	HWY. 2 WB OFF RAMP OVER HWY. 35 RAMP, RR. LAKE	ST LOUIS	1983		2015	NO			4,500	7	7	7	1,426		CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 45.2	N	N	Υ	97.7
	Notes: Cost	included wi	h Bridge 69	1 Project.	JHWY. 2 EB ON RAMP				•															
1	69102	2	Hwy. 2			ST LOUIS	1983		2015	NO			4,500	7	6	8 (7)	2,642		CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 37.1	N	N	Υ	97.7
	Notes: Costs				HWY. 23 OVER BNSF														STEEL BEAM	HS 24.9				54.2
1	5470 Notes:	2	Hwy. 23	0901-67	RR	CARLTON	1936	\$6,305,870	2015	NO		RPL	730 (710)	4	4	5	201		SPAN	(HS 19.4)	Y	N	N	(45.0) (45.3)
1	5554	3	Hwy. 23	0901-75	HWY. 23 OVER N FORK NEMADJI RIVER	CARLTON	1940	\$1,836,699	2015	NO		RPL	550 (610)	4	7	6	107	3,620	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 27.0	Y	N	N	83.3 (83.2)
	Notes: Tier 3	Bridge - co	st not inclu	ded in Chapter	152 Program.	1		1			1						1 1			1				
1	9782	2	Hwy. 23	5880-179	HWY. 23 OVER I 35	PINE	1959	\$1,990,409	2010	YES	2010	RPL	4,550	4	5	7	206		CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 43.5	Y	N	N	67.0
1	Notes: 69831 Notes:	2	I 35	6982-290	I 35 SB OVER DM&IR RY & BNSF RR	ST LOUIS	1967	\$88,582,087	2011	YES	2011	RPL	21,500 (24,000)	6 (5)	6 (5)	6 (5)	1,105		CSTL DECK GIRD	HS 30.4	N	N	Υ	82.2 (81.6) (69.1)
1	69832	2	I 35	6982-290	I 35 NB OVER DM&IR RY & BNSF RR	ST LOUIS	1967		2010	YES	2010	RPL	21,500 (24,000)	6	5	6 (5)	1,171		CSTL DECK	HS 31.4	N	N	Υ	71.1 (70.9)
	Notes: Cost	included wi	th Bridge 69	831 project.	1	1					1									1				
1	69847	3	I 35	6982-285	I 35 SB OVER HWY. 2 EB	ST LOUIS	1964	\$6,587,553	2009	YES	2009	RPL	14,500	4	6	6	134		CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 37.0	Y	N	N	91.8
	Notes: Tier 3	Bridge - co	st not inclu	ded in Chapter															COTI DEAM					
1	69848	3	I 35	6982-285	I 35 NB OVER HWY. 2 EB	ST LOUIS	1964		2009	YES	2009	RPL	14,500	4	7	6	132		CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 37.8	Υ	N	N	91.8
	Notes: Tier 3	Bridge - co	st not inclu	ded in Chapter	152 Program. Part of Br	idge 69847 pı	roject.				1									1		· .		
1	69880	2	135	6982-290	I 35 OVER RECYCLE WAY & ONETA ST.	ST LOUIS	1968		2010	YES	2011	RPL	44,000	4	5	7	1,163		SPAN	HS 44.0	Υ	N	Υ	86.4 (74.8)
1	Notes: Part of	2	Hwy. 39		HWY. 39; RR OVER ST LOUIS RIVER	ST LOUIS	1916					None - Privately	1,900 (2,150)	8	6	6	1,889		STEEL MOVEABLE	HS 33.0	N	Υ	Y	69.6 (69.3)
<u> </u>	Notes: RR o	wned. Reha	b in 29		1							Owned												l J
1	69004	2	Hwy. 53	6918-80???	HWY. 135 OVER HWY. 53 NB, SB ON RAMP	ST LOUIS	1961		2015	NO		RPL	8,300	4	6	6	140	6,905	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 39.0 (HS 29.5)	Y	N	N	62.9 (90.3) (88.2)
	Notes: Bridge	e 694 will b	e abandone	d/removed in 2	215+/- as part of the US53	realignment	project.					- <u></u> -						<u> </u>		1				_ _
1	69029 Notes:	2	Hwy. 53	6916-103	HWY. 33 NB OVER HWY. 53 SB	ST LOUIS	1966	\$2,537,858	2012	YES	2012	RPL	1,450	4	5	6	126	3,228	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 42.1	Υ	N	N	79.9
1	90249	2	Hwy. 53		HWY. 53 SB OVER RAINY RIVER	OOCHICHIN	1912					None - Privately Owned	1,575 (3724)	6	5	5	941	31,560	STEEL HIGH FRUSS	HS 50.0 (HS 11.0)	N (Y)	Y (N)	Υ	62.8 (62.6) (36.9)
	Notes: Privat	tely owned.										Omicu						-						
1	5721	1	Hwy. 65	3609-39C	HWY. 65 OVER LITTLE FORK RIVER	OOCHICHIN	1877	\$829,913	2009	YES	2009	Has been RPL	6,804	5	4	5	378		RON HIGH FRUSS	HS 16.2	Υ	N	Υ	20.2
	Notes:																							

_	1		•	7	1	T		re Critical and Si			T	· · ·								•			1	
														(NB	IS RATI	NG)								
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
1	6736	2	Hwy. 65	3110-12	HWY. 65 OVER SWAN RIVER	ITASCA	1950	\$1,518,662	2009	YES	2009	RPL	880	3	5	5	128	4,416	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 29.7	Υ	N	N	77.7
	Notes:			1	1	1	1			1	1				1									
1	6767 Notes:	2	Hwy. 65	3609-34	HWY. 65 OVER HAY CREEK	OOCHICHIN	1951	\$1,047,298	2013	NO		RPL	90 (115)	6	6	4	27	810	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.1	Υ	N	N	64.9 (63.9)
1	5718	2	Hwy. 123	5802-5718A	HWY. 123 OVER KETTLE RIVER & ST	PINE	1948	\$2,426,242	2013	NO		OL & PT	2,050	6	5	7 (6)	403	15,951	CSTL DECK TRUSS	HS 20.4	N	N	Υ	78.6 (62.3)
	Notes: Since	e SR = 62.3	and truss h	as performed v	well, bridge will continue to	function safe	ely with o	continued maintenand	e. Planned	OL & pair	nt will raise SI	R above 8. B	ridge 5718 is	HISTO	RIC and o	n the 'Pre	eservatio	n Agreen	nent' list (Notes).					
1	69003	2	Hwy. 169	6934-113	HWY. 169 OVER BN RR (ABAN) & TRAIL	ST LOUIS	1961	\$3,403,817	2009	YES	2009		14,400 (15,100)	6	4	6	198	13,312	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 31.2	Υ	N	Z	59.1 (58.8)
	Notes: Remo	oved, not re	placed	1	1							1	1 1							1		1		77.6
1	69839	2	Hwy. 194	6933-	NB MICHIGAN ST OVER HWY. 194 SB	ST LOUIS	1969	2-2.5 million	2015-2018	NO		RPR & Retrofit	4,200 (5,500)	5	7 (6) (5)	6 (7)	318	10,700	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 46.8	N	Y	Y	(76.4) (65.3)
			to pier cap		which will be modified to HWY. 194 NB OVER		as part o			1		RPR &		7		8			CSTL BEAM					78.1
1	69840	2 ently FC due	Hwy. 194	6933-	SUPERIOR ST which will be modified to	ST LOUIS	1968		2015-2018	NO		Retrofit	9,250	(6)	6	(7) (6)	300	10,093	SPAN	HS 38.1	N	Y	Y	(80.1)
1	09001	2	Hwy. 210	0916-11	HWY. 210 OVER ST LOUIS RIVER	CARLTON	1961	\$3,265,179	2012	YES	2012	RPR & Retrofit	1,350 (1,300)	5 (4)	5	6 (5) (6)	223	7,850	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 23.0 (HS 13.0)	N (Y)	N	Y	51.7 (48.7) (39.6)
	Notes:			I		1	ı	1			1													
1	9030	2	I 535	6981-9030E	I 535 OVER ST LOUIS R; RR,STREET (Blatnik)	ST LOUIS	1961	\$11,311,829	2012	NO		Deck Seal & Paint	28,000	8 (6)	6 (5) (4)	7 (6)	7,980	594,187	CSTL HIGH TRUSS	HS 21.6	N (Y)	Y (N)	Y	72.3 (53.8) (42.8)
	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi	th Wisconsi	n. Good condi	tion, rehabilitated in 1993. Il 535 SB ON RAMP	With planne	d paint,	and hanger cable rep	airs , replac	ement not	needed for 2	years.	1	1				-		1				
1	69824	2	1 535		OVER I 535 NB & I 35 NB	ST LOUIS	1969		2019-2027	NO		RPL	5,625	6 (7)	7 (6)	6	1,430	36,754	CSTL DECK GIRD	HS 25.9	N	Y (N)	Υ	86.6
1	69825	2	I 535	rogram a serie	I 535 NB OFF RAMP OVER BNSF RAILROAD	ST LOUIS	1969	nge, this bridge is inc	2019-2027	NO	ement is bey	RPL	5,625	5 (6)	7 (6)	7 projec	et. 877	22,534	CSTL DECK	HS 23.7	N	N	Y	84.4 (85.4)
	Notes: FC bi	ridge, distric	t plans to p	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca	an of Worms"	intercha	nge, this bridge is inc	luded. Plar	ned replac	ement is bey	ond 221. Re	pair work dor			31 projec	t.							(/
1	69801A	3	I 535		I 535 SB OFF RAMP OVER FILL	ST LOUIS	1969		2019-2027	NO		RPL	2,200	4 (7)	7	8	229	6,106	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 23.2 (HS 28) (HS 30.2)	Y (N)	N	N	85.0 (97.1)
	Notes: FC b	ridge, distric	t plans to p	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca II 535 SB ON RAMP	an of Worms"	intercha	nge, this bridge is inc	luded. Plar	ned replac	ement is bey	ond 221. Re	pair work dor	ne with E	Bridge 698	31 projec	t.		<u>-</u>	1			-	89.4
1	69801C	2	I 535		OVER RAILROAD & FILL	ST LOUIS	1969		2019-2027	NO		RPL	3,300	(6) (7)	7 (6)	6 (5)	666	17,108	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.7	N	N	Υ	(78.4) (78.3)
1	Notes: FC bi	ridge, distric	I 535	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca I 535 SB SEG 1 OVER I 35 & RAMP TO I 35 SB	ST LOUIS	1969	nge, this bridge is inc	2019-2027	NO	cement is bey	ond 221. Re RPL	pair work dor 6,625	ne with E	3ridge 698 7 (6)	31 projec 5 (6)	st. 576	21,139	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 22.9	N	N	Υ	63.9 (64.9)
Ц	Notes: FC h	ridae distric	t plans to n	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca	an of Worms"	intercha	nge this bridge is inc	luded Plan	ned replac	ement is hew	nnd 221 Re	nair work dor	ne with F			rt		J. 701	l				(75.0)
1	69801J	2	1 535	ogram a sene	I 535 NB SEG 1 OVER I 35 NB & SB OFF RAMP	ST LOUIS	1969	ingo, una bridge la IIIO	2019-2027	NO	Schiencia Dey	RPL	6,625	(6)	7	6	489	12,562	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.0	N	N	Y	87.2
	Notes: FC bi	ridge, distric	t plans to p	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca	n of Worms"	intercha	nge, this bridge is inc	luded. Plar	ned replac	ement is bey	ond 221. Re	pair work dor	ne with E	Bridge 698	31 projec	t.			1				
1	69801K	2	I 535		I 535 NB OFF RAMP OVER I 35 SB	ST LOUIS	1969		2019-2027	NO		RPL	3,300	6 (7)	6	7 (6)	597	15,343	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 26.7	N	N	Υ	88.6 (89.6)
	Notes: FC b	ridge, distric	t plans to p	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca	n of Worms"	intercha	nge, this bridge is inc	luded. Plar	ned replac	ement is bey	ond 221. Re	pair work dor	ne with E	Bridge 698	31 projec	t.			,				-
1	69801N	2	I 535		I 535 NB SEG 3 OVER CP RAIL	ST LOUIS	1969		2019-2027	NO		RPL	4,400 (7,750)	7	7 (6)	7	296	7,607	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.0	N	N	Υ	88.4 (88.1)
	Notes: FC b	ridge, distric	t plans to p	rogram a serie	s of bridges within the "Ca	an of Worms"	intercha	nge, this bridge is inc	luded. Plan	ned replac	ement is bey	ond 221. Re	pair work dor	ne with E	Bridge 698	31 projec	t.			I				1
2	04001	2	Hwy. 1	0401-08	HWY. 1 OVER OVERFLOW CHANNEL	BELTRAMI	1962	\$2,611,091	2014-2016	NO		RPL	55 (45)	5	4	6	217	7,566	PRECST CHAN SPAN	HS 50.0 (HS 31.5)	Υ	N	N	71.7 (71.0)

Notes: Project letting date is pending as per contracting and right of way discussions with the Red Lake Tribe.

_												ignway bri												
									_ <u>P</u>					(NB	IS RATI	NG)								
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
2	4561	2	Hwy. 1	0401-11	HWY. 1 OVER DITCH	BELTRAMI	1926	\$2,936,879	2009	YES	2009	RPL W/ CULVERT	55	5	4	4	25	692	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 19.0	Υ	N	N	54.4
	Notes:	1			I	1		1			1	1			1			-						
2	5581 Notes:	1	Hwy. 1	1501-12	HWY. 1 OVER SANDY RIVER	LEARWATE	1936	\$985,006	2010	YES	2010	RPL	3,000 (2,900)	4	5	5	49	1,470	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 28.2 (HS 29.6)	Y	N	N	46.1 (48.9)
2	9100	2	Hwy. 1	4509-05	HWY. 1 OVER RED RIVER OF THE NORTH	MARSHALL	1959	\$10,618,246	2014	NO		(REHAB or)	1,400	7	5	6	792	25,905	STEEL HIGH	HS 27.1	N	N	Y	55.6
			-		(Oslo)	WARSHALL	1909	\$10,010,240	2014	NO		RPL	(1,350)	,	3	U	192	25,905	TRUSS	110 27.1	IN	IN	'	(54.8)
	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi	th North Dal	kota.	HWY. 2 OVER RED	1		Т			1	T	l				1	1		1				73.2
2	9090	2	Hwy. 2	6018-02	RIVER & CITY ST (Kennedv)	POLK	1963	\$12.8 - \$17.4	2016	NO	MaDOT :- 1	Redeck & Paint	21,500 (20,740)	6 (7)	7 (6)	5	1,261	81,965	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 26.8	N	N	Υ	(61.2) (63.4)
	Notes: Borde	er briage wi	th North Dar	kota. Study wi	•	LAKE OF	can be	renabilitiated or if repi	acement is	necessary	. MINDOT IS I	ead agency fo	r this border	briage p	roject.									40.4
2	5557 Notes:	2	Hwy. 11	3902-21	HWY. 11 OVER RAPID RIVER	THE WOODS	1950	\$3,414,358	2009	YES	2010	RPL	760 (784)	5	4	6	216	8,942	CONC ARCH	HS 18.0	Y	N	N	49.1 (48.8)
2	6690	1	Hwy. 11	3501-13	HWY. 11 OVER RED RIVER OF THE NORTH (ROBBIN)	KITTSON	1954	\$16,477,611	2009	YES	2010	RPL	1,400 (1,451)	5 (4)	5 (4)	7 (6)	1,058	31740	CSTL HIGH TRUSS	HS 20.6	N (Y)	N	Υ	48.5 (32.9)
	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi	th North Dal	kota.	THE COURT																			
2	9412	1	Hwy. 72	3905-09	HWY. 72 OVER RAINY RIVER	THE WOODS	1959	\$59.8 - \$79.7	2018	NO		REHAB or RPL	2,100 (1,950)	5	5	5	1,285	34,053	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 22.5	N	Y (N)	Υ	40.3 (48.8)
	Notes: Borde	er Bridge wi	th Ontario, (Canada. Stud	y will be done by end of 21	3 to see if rel	habilitatio	on is feasible.				I RPL						-						
2	6730 Natara	1	Hwy. 75	5409-26	HWY. 75 OVER DITCH	NORMAN	1949	\$1,424,455	2010	YES	2010	W/CULVER T	1,050	4	4	7	22	941	CONC SLAB SPAN	HS 23.2	Y	N	N	40.4
2	Notes: 6731	1	Hwy. 75	5409-26	HWY. 75 OVER DITCH	NORMAN	1949	see note	2010	YES	2010	RPL W/CULVER T	1,050	4	4	6	22	941	CONC SLAB SPAN	HS 23.5	Υ	N	N	40.4
	Notes: Cost	incl w/ Br 6	73 project.		ı	l.							l .		1		I	l l		l				l .
2	6734	3	Hwy .75	5409-28	HWY. 75 OVER MARSH RIVER	NORMAN	1951	\$1,600,000	2010	YES	2010	RPL	1,050	4	6	6	225	7,695	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.6	Υ	N	N	83.3 (82.1)
	Notes: Tier 3	3 Bridge - co	ost not inclu	ded in Chapter	r 152 Program.						1		1		1		1			1		1		1
2	35007	2	Hwy. 171	NA	HWY. 171 OVER RED RIVER OF THE NORTH	KITTSON	1982	\$903,972	2009	YES	2009	RPR	800 (701)	6	7	4 (8)	2,080	115,024	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 34.0 (HS 29.9)	Y (N)	N	N	68.3 (96.7)
	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi	ui North Dal		HWY. 200 FRNT RD	1		I				1				6			STEEL LOW					
2	6522 Notes:	2	Hwy. 200	5407-28	OVER MARSH RIVER	NORMAN	1924	\$344,334	2014	NO		RPL	4	6	5	(5)	41	826	TRUSS	HS 20.7	N	N	Y	70.6
2	5872	2	Hwy. 317	4514-03	HWY. 317 OVER RED RIVER OF THE NORTH (Grafton)	MARSHALL	1939	\$1,335,262	2013	NO		Repair & PNT	320 (285)	7	5	7 (5)	412	10,712	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 20.7	N	N	Υ	52.7 (52.9) (51.9)
	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi	th North Dal	ota. OL in 25	; paint and repairs needed [HWY. 2B (BUSINESS)	to maintain o	condition	, which should be ade	equate for the	ne next 2 ye	ears with low	ADT.						- '						
2	4700	2	Hwy. 2B	6015-07	OVER RED RIVER (Sorlie)	POLK	1929	\$45.5 - \$61.5	2018	NO		REHAB or RPL	12,700	6	5	6	603	24,887	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 23.2	N	N (Y)	Υ	50.6 (48.4) (50.4)
3	Notes: Borde	er bridge wi 1	th North Dal Hwy. 12	kota. Because 8602-40	HWY. 12 OVER S FK CROW RIVER	WRIGHT	y will be 1922	\$20,427,413	gate rehabi 2008	litation. No YES	orth Dakota D 2008	OT is lead ag	ency for this 15,500	border b	oridge pro	ect. 4	178	6,568	CONC DECK	HS 28.2	Y	N	N	43.4
	Notes: LET	I ON 1/25/8 F	OR \$15.427	7.536		I	1				i .	I]		1		1			1]
3	6748	1	Hwy. 23	0503-78	HWY. 23 OVER MISS R & RIVERSIDE DR (DESOTO)	STEARNS	1957	\$38,966,194	2008	YES	2009	RPL	31,000	7	4	5	890	62,710	CSTL DECK TRUSS		Υ	N	Υ	66.4
	Notes: SP 5	3-79 (LEAD	REMOVAL	CONTRACT)	ON 5/2/8 FOR APPROX \$	34,; SP 53-73	314A (BF	RIDGE STEEL) LET C	N 6/6/8 FC	R \$7,277,5	545; SP 53-8°	1 (BLDG DEM	O) LET ON	6/27/8 F	OR \$296,;	SP 53-7	8 (MAIN	PROJ.) L	ET ON 7/225/8 FO	OR \$12,225,5	82			
3	9086	2	Hwy. 23	7306-93	HWY. 23 OVER 10TH AVE	STEARNS	1958	\$16,995,237	2009	YES	2009	RPL	29,000	4	4	4	189		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 54.9	Y	N	N	55.0

Notes: SP 736-93A (SIGNAL SYS.) \$267,17; SP 736-93 (MAIN PROJ.) 1/23/9 FOR \$13,49,49

_		1	, ,				1	1	, ,			1												
					1				٥٦	"				(NB	IS RATI	NG)	_							
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
3	5790	1	Hwy. 71	7318-36	HWY. 71 OVER N FK CROW RIVER	STEARNS	1937	\$706,555	2009	YES	2009	RPL	2,100	6	6	4	55	1,832	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 18.5	Y	N	N	29.7
	Notes:				II 04 WB OVER								1											
3	86813	3	I 94	8680-142	I 94 WB OVER COUNTY ROAD 75 & RR	WRIGHT	1971	\$11,105,834	2009	YES	2010	RPL	25,500	4	5	7	480	21,443	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 32.0	Y	N	N	81.3
	Notes: Tier 3	3 Bridge - co	st not inclu	ded in Chapter	r 152 Program.	1									1		1	1						
3	86814	3	I 94	8680-142	I 94 EB OVER COUNTY ROAD 75 & RR	WRIGHT	1972		2009	YES	2010	RPL	25,500	4	5	6	493	22,019	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 33.7	Y	N	N	81.7
	Notes: Cost	included vv.	Br 86813 p	•	Bridge - cost not included i	n Chapter 15	2 Progra	im.							1			I	CONO BOY					
3	91049 Notes:	2	Hwy. 169	0115-41	HWY. 169 OVER RIPPLE RIVER	AITKIN	1964	\$980,655	2009	YES	2009	RPL	3,950	N	N	N	27	0	CONC BOX CULV	HS 24.0	Y	N	N	58.1
3	91050	2	Hwy. 169	0115-41	HWY. 169 OVER RIPPLE RIVER	AITKIN	1964		2009	YES	2009	RPL	3,950	N	N	N	27	0	CONC BOX	HS 24.0	Y	N	N	58.1
	Notes: Cost	incl w/ Br 9	149 project.														1			1				
4	6456	2	Hwy. 12	0602-24	HWY. 12 OVER MINNESOTA RIVER	BIG STONE	1953	\$1,672,758	2012	YES	2012	RPL	4,300 (4200)	4	7	7	63	2,539	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 28.3 (HS 25.4)	Υ	N	N	76.3 (73.0) (72.9)
	Notes:																							40.0
4	3067	1	Hwy. 29	6105-25	HWY. 29 OVER OUTLET CREEK	POPE	1920	\$1,073,858	2012	YES	2012	RPL	3,900 (3,344)	4	5	6	28	1,098	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 20.8	Y	N	N	49.3 (49.0) (49.8)
	Notes:	1			1										1						1			54.1
4	6552	2	Hwy. 29	7607-29	HWY. 29 OVER DITCH	SWIFT	1948	M (\$2.89M is Chapt	2015	NO		RPL	1,200 (1,299)	7	7	7	92	3,220	CONC SLAB SPAN	HS 20.6	Y	N	N	(53.1) (52.9)
	Notes:				HWY 75 OVED								1 200				П		CTEEL DEAM					52.2
4	5186	2	Hwy. 75	8408-44	HWY. 75 OVER WHISKEY CREEK	WILKIN	1932	\$1,091,978	2016	NO		RPL	1,300 (1,150)	5	5	6	42	1,429	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 17.9	Υ	N	N	53.3 (54.3)
4	21805	3	I 94	152 Program.	I 94 WB OVER LATOKA LAKE	DOUGLAS	1967	\$1,500,000	2018	NO		RPL	7,900 (7,750)	4	6	6	126	5,179	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 31.8	Y	N	N	88.2 (88.4)
L	Notes: Tier 3	Bridge - co	st not includ	ded in Chapter	r 152 Program.	I	1				[1			1	1	<u> </u>			I	l			, , ,
4	21813	2	I 94	2102-58	HWY. 29 SB OVER I 94	DOUGLAS	1965	\$0	2015-2016	NO		RPL	10,400	4	5	5	235	10,099	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 44.1	Υ	N	N	79.0 (78.0)
	Notes: Cost	included in	Br 21814 pr	oject								1												
4	21814	2	I 94	2102-58	HWY. 29 NB OVER I 94	DOUGLAS	1965	\$17,956,506	2015-2016	NO		RPL	10,400	4	6	5	235	8,404	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 44.1 (HS 34.2)	Υ	N	N	66.7
	Notes: Cost	includes Br	s 21813 & 2	1814.																				
6	5337	1	Hwy. 3	6612-95	HWY. 3 OVER UP RR	RICE	1940	\$3,883,406	2008	YES	2008	RPL	7,300	5	4	5	296	9,956	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 26.5	Υ	N	N	30.7
	Notes:	1			LIMAY A OVER	1									1 1			ı	CONO DEOK	1				1
6	6842	1	Hwy. 3	6612-95	HWY. 3 OVER CANNON RIVER	RICE	1955		2008	YES	2008	RPL	7,300	4	4	3	176	5,635	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 35.0	Υ	N	N	25.9
6	Notes: Costs 5234	2	Hwy. 14	8501-62	HWY. 14 OVER STREAM	WINONA	1932	\$2.01 - \$2.27	2023-2028	NO		RPL	4,500 (4459)	6	6	6	46	1,840	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 68.6 (HS 30.8)	Υ	N	N	55.0 (56.0)
L	Notes: Norm	nal maintena	ince planned	d for the progr	am years. Replacement w	/ill be needed	beyond	2018.				<u> </u>			1		1			1	ı			(96.6)
6		1			HWY. 14 OVER				2012	YES	2012	RPL	7,400	N1	N	N1	22		CONC BOX	HS 24.0	Y	N	N	47.1
	6036 Notes:	1	Hwy. 14	2001+34	STREAM	DODGE	1930	\$1.61 - \$1.82	2012	159	2012	KPL	(7,750)	N	IN	N	22		CULV	(HS 21.6)	Ť	IN	IN	(37.8)
6	74820	2	Hwy. 14	7401-34	HWY. 14 EB OVER I 35	STEELE	1965	\$2.23 - \$2.52	2010	YES	2010	RPL	6,050	4	5	5	202	5,191	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 35.7	Y	N	N	74.4

Notes: Bridge replacement is small portion of overall project costs. Construction underway.

								re Critical and S		, 2011010		.9												
			_						~ ₽					(NB	IS RATI	NG)	_							1
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
6	5968	1	Hwy. 42	7901-43	HWY. 42 OVER N FORK WHITEWATER RIVER	WABASHA	1941	\$2,154,534	2012	YES	2012	RPL	3,000 (3,200)	6	4	4	96		CONC DECK GIRD	HS 30.0 (HS 24.7)	Υ	N	N	45.0 (41.6) (41.4)
6	Notes: 5900	1	Hwy. 43	8503-46	HWY. 43 OVER MISS RVR, RR, STREETS (WINONA)	WINONA	1941	\$158,580,000	2014	NO		(REHAB or) RPL	11,900	6 (5)	5 (4)	6	2,289		CSTL HIGH TRUSS	HS 21.6	N (Y)	N	Υ	49.8 (23.7) (26.3)
6	Notes: 23004	2	Hwy. 43	2306-22	HWY. 43 OVER S FORK ROOT RIVER	FILLMORE	1931	\$2,958,530	2012	YES	2012	RPL	540 (484)	6 (5)	5 (3) (4)	6 (5)	78		STEEL LOW TRUSS	HS 20.0	N (Y)	N	Υ	65.5 (31.3) (45.3)
	Notes:	1	1		LIMAN, 44 OVED	1			l	1	1	RPL	0.000		1		1 1		OONO BOY	110.04.0				66.9
6	4148	2	Hwy. 44	2308-26	HWY. 44 OVER STREAM	FILLMORE	1923	\$3,982,282	2013	NO		W/CULVER T	2,300 (1,745)	N	N	N	23		CONC BOX CULV	HS 24.0 (HS 21.6)	Υ	N	N	(60.4) (59.4)
	Notes: Bridg	ge (Culvert)	costs only.			1			I	· I		RPL						1			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			67.2
6	4150 Notes:	2	Hwy. 44	2308-26	HWY. 44 OVER STREAM	FILLMORE	1923	\$833,574	2013	NO		W/CULVER T	2,100 (1,844)	N	N	N	23	0	CONC BOX CULV	HS 24.0 (HS 21.6)	Υ	N	N	(60.2) (59.2)
6	4151	2	Hwy. 44	2308-26	HWY. 44 OVER STREAM	FILLMORE	1923	\$238,680	2013	NO		RPL W/CULVER T	2,100 (1,844)	N	N	N	23	0	CONC BOX CULV	HS 24.0 (HS 21.6)	Y	N	N	67.2 (60.2) (59.2)
6	Notes: 5713	1	Hwy. 56	2006-25	HWY. 56 OVER MID FORK ZUMBRO RIVER	DODGE	1937	\$1,351,101	2011	YES	2012	RPL	1,500 (1,712)	5	5	4 (5)	65		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 31.3 (HS 29.5)	Y (N)	N	N	45.8 (61.4)
	Notes:	1	1		HWY. 56 FARM ENT	1	1		1	1		1					1 1	1						
6	5905 Notes:	2	Hwy. 56	5005-58	OVER N BR UPPER IOWA RIVER	MOWER	1940	\$1.06 - \$1.20	2015	NO		RPL	5	7	6	4	38		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 25.4 (HS 30.9)	Y	N	N	66.3 (68.9)
6	5188	1	Hwy. 58	2510-37	HWY. 58 OVER N FORK ZUMBRO RIVER	GOODHUE	1932	\$2,553,831	2010	YES	2010	RPL	6,700 (6,600)	4	4	5	113		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 18.5	Υ	N	N	18.4
6	Notes: 5370	1	Hwy. 60	6607-42	HWY. 60 OVER STRAIGHT R.RR.STREET	RICE	1937	\$10,800,000	2009	YES	2009	REHAB	10,500	5 (8)	4 (7)	4 (7)	951	42,795	CONC ARCH	HS 24.9	Y (N)	N	N	49.4 (77.2)
	Notes: Histo	oric bridge.	With major r	ehabilitation,	deficiencies were addresse	ed.			ı	1	1	1	ı									1		
6	5397 Notes:	2	Hwy. 60	7903-45	HWY. 60 OVER TROUT BROOK	WABASHA	1935	\$2.30 - \$2.60	2014	NO		RPL	630	7	6	6 (7)	67		STEEL THRU GIRD	HS 19.0	N	N	Υ	73.0 (72.0)
6	6770	1	Hwy. 60	6606-34	HWY. 60 OVER CANNON RIVER	RICE	1952	\$1,797,266	2009	YES	2009	RPL	5,050	4	3	7	95		CONC DECK GIRD	HS 30.6	Υ	N	N	18.7
6	Notes: 6771	1	Hwy. 60	6606-34	HWY. 60 OVER CANNON RIVER	RICE	1952	\$606,302	2009	YES	2009	RPL	6,300	5	4	4	115		CONC DECK GIRD	HS 31.1	Y	N	N	37.8
	Notes:	1				1			1									!				l		
6	9798 Notes:	2	Hwy. 60	7903-41	HWY. 60 OVER STREAM	WABASHA	1961	\$1,996,439	2011	YES	2012	RPL	630	5	4 (3)	5	94		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 27.0 (HS 26.6)	Υ	N	N	70.1 (47.7)
6	79000	2	Hwy. 60		HWY. 60 OVER MISS R, RR, & STS	WABASHA	1987					Only Normal Maintenanc	4,750	7	7	7	2,462		STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 39.2	N	N	Υ	73.5
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	1987. All	NBIS condition	n ratings are good. Only n	ormal mainte	nance pl	anned during prograr	m years. Pa	int and ove	erlay will be n	eeded beyond	218. See 6	ndnote 1			· ·							
6	6773 Notes:	1	Hwy. 61	2513-70	HWY. 61 OVER GILBERT CREEK	GOODHUE	1954	\$4,989,983	2011	YES	2012	RPL	7,500 (8,800)	5	4	5	114		CONC DECK GIRD	HS 32.0 (HS 22.4)	Y	N	N	37.6 (27.1)
6	9450	1	Hwy. 61	2513-86	HWY. 61 OVER NYMPHARA LANE	GOODHUE	1962	\$5.48 - \$6.20	2013	NO		RPL	8,000	4	4	5	100		PRESTR VD SLAB SPAN	HS 64.0 (HS 39.2)	Υ	N	N	36.0
		•			•		•		•	•	•	•			•							-		

Notes:

		1		ı		1				1													-	
			l _						은					(NB	IS RATI	NG)	_							
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	DECK	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
6	9040	1	Hwy. 63	2515-21	HWY. 63 OVER MISS RIVER & CP RAIL (RED WING)	GOODHUE	1958	\$182,500,000	2018	NO		REHAB or RPL	11,500 (11,400)	6 (5)	6	5	1,631		STL HIGH RUSS	HS 34.0	N	N	Υ	44.8 (43.8)
	Notes:	ı		ı	k	1		1							1		- 1					1		
6	6808 Notes: Bridg	2	190	5080-153	I 90 EB OVER TWP RD & TURTLE CRK	MOWER	1959	\$3,945,382	2009	YES	2010	RPL	7,700	5	4	5	243	10,741 S	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 33.0	Υ	N	N	65.5
	_	jes or wowe			I 90 OVER DOBBINS														CONC BOX					
6	8929	1	1 90	5080-150	CREEK	MOWER	1957	\$4,542,515	2009	YES	2010	RPL	18,800	N	N	N	31		CULV	HS 24.0	Υ	N	N	41.3
	Notes: Bridg	ges of Mowe	er County - C	Combined	II 00 OVER																- 1			77.0
6	9320 Natas:	2	I 90	8580-149	II 90 OVER MISSISSIPPI RIVER (DRESBACH)	WINONA	1967	\$190,500,000	2012	NO		RPL	26,000	5	6 (5)	6	2,490	175,894 C	STL DECK SIRD	HS 33.0	N	N	Υ	77.0 (66.0) (65.0)
	Notes:		1		I 90 WB OVER TWP			1									1	l _o	PRESTR VD	1		1		
6	85807	2	190	8580-157	323	WINONA	1963	\$5,012,266	2009	YES	2009	RPL	10,600	4	4	6	119		SLAB SPAN	HS 44.0	Υ	N	N	63.7
	Notes: Thes	e 4 Bridges	are Let und	ler one project				I																
6	85808	2	1 90	8580-157	I 90 EB OVER TWP 323	WINONA	1963	\$1,862,967	2010	YES	2010	RPL	10,600	4	4 (5)	6	119		PRESTR VD SLAB SPAN	HS 44.0	Υ	N	N	63.7
	Notes:	1		1		<u> </u>				-							- 1							
6	85809	2	I 90	8580-157	1 90 WB OVER TWP 312	WINONA	1963	\$1,680,872	2009	YES	2009	RPL	10,600	4	4	5	95		PRESTR VD SLAB SPAN	HS 46.0	Υ	N	N	61.6
	Notes:							1							4	5	- 1	lo	PRESTR VD					
6	85810	2	1 90	8580-157	I 90 EB OVER TWP 312	WINONA	1963	\$1,774,254	2010	YES	2010	RPL	10,600	4	(5)	(6)	95		SLAB SPAN	HS 46.0	Υ	N	N	61.6
	Notes:			I	•																ı	,		
6	4867	СР	Hwy. 105	5007-25	HWY. 105 OVER WOODBURY CREEK	MOWER	1931	\$1,994,952	2010	YES	2010	RPL	275	5	5	5	53		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 18.4	N	N	N	53.6
	Notes: Bridg	ge included i	in Chapter 1	52 as a "Comr	missioner Priority" (CP) pro	ject, due to b	ridge be	ing load posted.									П	I_	TEEL 111011	1	ı	ı		57.5
6	6975	2	Hwy. 250	2319-16	HWY. 250 OVER S BR ROOT RIVER	FILLMORE	1931	\$11,000,000	2016	NO		RPL	840 (787)	7	7	6 (5) (6)	104	2,808 T	RUSS	HS 17.0	N	Υ	Υ	(57.6)
	Notes:	L	L	<u> </u>		l				<u> </u>	1					, (5)				I		<u> </u>		(47.1)
6	6977	2	Hwy. 250	2319-16	HWY. 250 OVER N BR ROOT RIVER	FILLMORE	1924		2016	NO		RPL	380 (413)	7 (6)	6	6	144		STEEL HIGH RUSS	HS 15.0 (HS 22.5)	N	Υ	Υ	50.6 (47.0)
L	Notes: Cost	incl w/ Br 6	975 project.		OITWEN	l .								(0)		(5)			500	(110 22.0)				(65.1)
7	6749	2	Hwy. 4	0801-31	HWY. 4 OVER LITTLE COTTONWOOD RIVER	BROWN	1951	\$2,324,929	2011	YES	2011	RPL	1,250 (1,400)	7	4	5	98		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 32.0 (HS 32.7)	Υ	N	N	66.4 (60.9)
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in	28 with an	inflation rate o	f 1.125. Inflated cost in 21	1 \$\$.		l				1									I			
7	6762	3	Hwy. 4	8302-33	HWY. 4 OVER WATONWAN RIVER	WATONWAN	1951	\$2,972,439	2012	YES	2012	RPL	970 (880)	4	5	5	56	1,932 S	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 34.0 (HS 46.5)	Υ	N	N	82.6 (82.7)
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in	29 with an	inflation rate o	of 1.1576. Inflated cost in 2	12 \$\$.					· ·	· ·					-				.,	-		
7	9200	1	Hwy. 14	0804-81	HWY. 14 OVER MINNESOTA RIVER	BROWN	1963	\$44.1-\$51.4	2018	NO		RPL	8,600 (8,700)	5	6 (5)	4 (5)	566		PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 70.0 (HS 35.8)	Y (N)	N	N	38.0 (54.6)
					of 1.4648. Inflated cost in 2 HWY. 22 OVER			1					1,200						CONC BOX	1				
7	4014	2	Hwy. 22	5205-31	ROBARTS CREEK	NICOLLET	1923	\$998,716	2013	NO		RPL	(939)	N	N	N	23		CULV	HS 24.0	Y	N	N	68.2
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in	29 with an	inflation rate o	of 1.239. Inflated cost in 21	3 \$\$.		1				1					- 1	I.				Г		
7	5834	2	Hwy. 30	1702-10	HWY. 30 OVER BR OF WATONWAN R	OTTONWOO	1939	\$1,019,930	2011	YES	2011	RPL	740 (850)	4	5	5	32		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 30.0 (HS 30.6)	Υ	N	N	79.1 (74.5)
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in	29 with an	intlation rate o	of 1.125. Inflated cost in 21	1 \$\$.		ı	-				0.455				П	I.	2010 0501	110 00 0		1		45.7
7	5513	1	Hwy. 68	0710-30	HWY. 68 OVER UP RR	BLUE EARTH	1936	\$1,394,114	2013	NO		RPL	3,150 (2,699)	4	3	5	115		CONC DECK SIRD	HS 30.6 (HS 21.9)	Υ	N	N	(34.8)

Notes: Column J cost in 29 with an inflation rate of 1.239. Inflated cost in 213 \$\$.

								re Critical and St		, 20.10101		.gay Di												
	_								₽]		(NB	IS RAT	ING)	1 ₋ T	Ţ						
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	DECK	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
7	6889	2	Hwy. 71	1705-11	HWY. 71 OVER DES	OTTONWOO	1956	\$3,210,447	2010	YES	2010	RPL	2,350	4	4	4	143	4,919	STEEL BEAM	HS 48.0	Y	N	N	58.2
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in		inflation rate o	MOINES RIVER f 1.5. Inflated cost in 21 \$\$	<u> </u> 5.													SPAN					
7	6245	2	Hwy. 75	6704-19	HWY. 75 OVER POPLAR CREEK	ROCK	1932	\$853,080	2013	NO		RPL	9,500 (6,900)	N	N	N	23	0	CONC BOX	HS 24.0	Υ	N	N	52.8 (53.2)
Ь	Notes: Colur	nn J cost in	29 with an	inflation rate o	f 1.239. Inflated cost in 21	1 3 \$\$.							(0,000)											(00.2)
7	4930	2	Hwy. 99	4008-25	HWY. 99 OVER MINNESOTA RIVER (ST. PETER)	LE SUEUR	1931	\$3,457,175	2014	NO		REHAB	7,000 (5,077)	5	5	5 (6)	402	12,512	CSTL HIGH TRUSS	HS 23.6	N	N (Y)	Υ	56.0 (48.5) (50.5)
	Notes: Histo	ric bridge.	Currently stu	ıdying rehabili	tation. Decision was made	to rehab brid	lge. Colu	mn J cost in 21 with a	an inflation r	ate of 1.68	. Inflated cos	t in 213 \$\$.			1							UN		(30.3)
7	6535	2	Hwy. 258	0809-12	HWY. 258 OVER COTTONWOOD RIVER	BROWN	1949	\$3,381,311	2012	Yes	2012	RPL	700 (470)	4	5	4	163	4,564	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 22.7	Y	N	Υ	45.2 (45.6)
	Notes: Colur	mn J cost in	29 with an	inflation rate o	f 1.1576. Inflated cost in 2	12 \$\$.	1								1									
7	6821	2	Hwy. 270	6706-13	HWY. 270 OVER MUD CREEK	ROCK	1953	\$1,369,237	2011	YES	2011	RPL	740 (840)	4	5	5	38	1,251	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 29.1	Y	N	N	78.6 (74.6)
	Notes: Colur		29 with an	inflation rate o	f 1.125. Inflated cost in 21						1	1	1.050		-			1	OTEEL MOU	UC 04 4	, I			63.7
8	9114	2	Hwy. 7	1201-32	HWY. 7 OVER CHIPPEWA RIVER	CHIPPEWA	1932	\$5,500,000	2014	NO		RPL	1,850 (2,200)	5	5 (4)	5	182	5,951	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 24.1 (HS 22.0)	N (Y)	N	Υ	(43.6) (43.8)
	Notes:	1			Luany 40 Access ==	1	1					Only							OTEEL 1":0::					
8	4667	2	Hwy. 19		HWY. 19 ACCESS RD OVER SULPHER L	REDWOOD	1927				N/A	Normal Maintenanc	50 (5)	4	4 (3)	4 (3)	122	3,416	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 17.2	Υ	N	Υ	44.0 (33.0)
		normal mair		anned to main	tain condition. Low ADT -		ry Trunk	Highway traffic - will l	oad post wh	en needed	. Closed to t				1				STEEL LOW					
8	5388	1	Hwy. 24	4711-20	HWY. 24 OVER N FK CROW RIVER	MEEKER	1935		2009	YES	2009	RPL	1,650	4	5	5	105	2,919	STEEL LOW TRUSS	HS 16.2	Y	N	Y	47.0
	Notes: New	bridge in pla	ace, Historic	Bridge to be r	moved to Lake Louise Stat	e Park. Ch.	152 fund	s not used on this pro	oject.		1	1			1			1	OTEEL MOU					20.0
8	5380	2	Hwy. 40	1209-22	HWY. 40 OVER LAC QUI PARLE L	CHIPPEWA	1938	\$2,500,000	2014	NO		REHAB	610 (540)	4	4	5	221	6,284	STEEL HIGH TRUSS	HS 18.0	Υ	N	Υ	38.9 (39.3)
	Notes: Revis	sed TPCE b	ased on Rel	hab rather tha	n replacement.		1	I								1		1	STEEL BEAM					
8	6962	2	Hwy. 68	6407-28	HWY. 68 OVER DITCH	REDWOOD	1900	\$400,525	2009	YES	2009	RPL	1,350	5	5	4	26		STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 24.1	Y	N	N	48.5
8	Notes: 87005	2	Hwy. 274		HWY. 274 OVER YELLOW MEDICINE RIVER	YELLOW MEDICINE	1968				N/A	Only Normal	920 (1,042)	8 (7)	8	5	187	8,186	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 45.4	Y (N)	N	N	66.9 (83.0) (88.1)
	Notes: No w	ork needed.	Condition	ratings were re	e-evaluated - bridge no lor	ger structura	lly deficie	ent.			1	Maintenanc												(00.1)
8	6816	2	Hwy. 277	1213-12	HWY. 277 OVER CO DITCH # 22	CHIPPEWA	1952	\$1,300,000	2017	NO		RPL	310 (365)	6	6	4	29	1,015	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 30.3	Y	N	N	67.9 (70.8)
	Notes:	1			Luny 5 01/22	1	1				1	1	40						00110 D=011					
М	6654	1	Hwy. 5		HWY. 5 OVER RECREATION TRAIL	CARVER	1952	\$9,010,101	2012	YES	2012	RPL	16,000 (19,200)	4	5	5	160	6,136	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 28.5	Y	N	N	49.1
	Notes:				HWY. 5 WEST 7TH ST		1	I					56,000		5	1		1	CSTL DECK					67.0
М	9300	2	Hwy. 5	6201-86	OVER MISSISSIPPI RIVER	RAMSEY	1961	\$10,533,797	2013	NO		RDK	(28,500)	5	(4) (5)	5	1,199	87,850	GIRD	HS 37.0	N	N	Υ	(66.0)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built in	1961, remo	odeled in 1986	. NBIS condition ratings a HWY. 7 (COUNTY	re fair. Norm	al maint	enance planned for th	ne program y	ears. Rep	lacement will	be needed b	eyond 218		1				CONO DECI					
М	5462	2	Hwy. 7	2734-33	ROAD 25) OVER HWY. 100	HENNEPIN	1939		2015	NO		RPL	36,000	4	5	5	190	15,080	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 38.5	Y	N	N	71.2
	Notes: Cost				HWY. 10 (PRESCOTT)			ı					13,500					ſ	STEEL					
М	82010	2	Hwy. 105	8216-XX	OVER ST CROIX RIVÉR	VASHINGTO	1990	\$1,077,327	2017-2022	NO		OL	(15,700)	6	7	6	684	35131	MOVEABLE	HS 50.0	N	N	Y	61.9
					a redundant system for F									7	7	7			CSTL DECK					75.9
М	82815	2	Hwy. 35	NA	HWY 8 WB OVER I 35	VASHINGTO	1967		2017-2022	NO		RPL	10,500	(5)	(6)	(6)	356	12,706	GIRD	HS 26.6	N	N	Υ	(74.9)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built in	1967. All N	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	planne	for the program year	rs. Replace	ment will b	e needed bey	yond 218.							0.7551					
М	4654	1	Hwy. 36	8221-01	HWY. 36 OVER ST CROIX RIVER	VASHINGTO	1930	\$361,739,213	2013-2016	NO		RPL	18,000	8	6 (4)	5	1,053	25,272	STEEL MOVEABLE	HS 20.0	Y	N	Υ	32.8 (17.8)
	Notes:																							

Notes:

								re Critical and S																
									P P					(NB	IS RATI	NG)	1 T							
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	DECK	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
М	5723	2	Hwy. 36	6212-148	HWY. 36 OVER LEXINGTON AVE(COUNTY ROAD	RAMSEY	1938	\$16,100,000	2015	NO		RPL	85,000	4	4	5	64	10,115	CONC RIGID FRAME	HS 55.0 (HS 40.0)	Υ	N	N	61.0
	Notes:	I			HWY. 36 EB OVER				1					3	3						Υ	N		28.3
М	9115 Notes: Cost	1 incl w/ Br 4	Hwy. 36 654 (St. Cro	NA pix) project.	HWY. 95	VASHINGTO	1959		2013-2016	NO		RPL	9,750	(6)	(5)	5	401	14,957	CONC BOX GIRD	HS 59.1	(N)	(Y)	N	(66.8)
М	9800	4		6244-30	HWY. 52(LAFAYETTE)	RAMSEY	1968	\$213,913,984	2010	No		RPL	81,000	5	4	7	3,366	254,251	CSTL DECK	HS 31.7	Y	N	Y	49.5 (47.5)
		1	Hwy. 52	0244-30	OVER MISS R, RR & STREETS	RAIVISET	1900	\$213,913,964	2010	INO		RPL	61,000	(4)	4	(6)	3,300	254,251	GIRD	по эт./	Ţ	IN	ī	(50.3)
М	Notes: 62026	2	Hwy. 52	6244-62026	LAFAYETTE (HWY. 52) OVER UP RR & EATON	RAMSEY	1965	\$7,725,836	2011	NO		RDK	74,000	6 (5)	4	5	580	59,017	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 34.8 (HS 31.2)	Y	N	N	59.1 (56.9) (57.0)
	Notes:	1		I	151	1					1	1								1				
М	94277 Notes:	2	Hwy. 55	2751-XX	HWY. 55 OVER BASSETT CREEK	HENNEPIN	1939	\$2,026,276	2015-2018	NO		RPL	27,500 (20,500)	N	N	N	20	0	CONC BOX CULV	HS 18.0	Y (N)	N	N	36.9 (38.4) (55.1)
М	5895	1	Hwy. 61	1913-64	HWY. 61 OVER MISS RIVER, RR, STREET (HASTINGS)	DAKOTA	1950	\$215,152,000	2010	NO		RPL	32,500	5 (4)	4	5	1,857	74,292	CSTL HIGH TRUSS	HS 24.6 (HS 32.2)	Υ	N	Y	38.1 (43.4) (41.1)
	Notes:	1		I.	1	1					1	1	1							1				1
М	6688	1	Hwy. 61	6222-160	HWY. 61 OVER BNSF RR	RAMSEY	1952	\$6,745,095	2010	YES	2010	RPL	24,500	4	4	5	180	11,934	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 38.1	Υ	N	N	42.3 (43.7)
	Notes:	I			HWY. 77 SB COLL RD														CSTL BEAM					95.6
М	27046	2 vridge built in	Hwy. 77	2758-XX	OVER KILLEBREW DRIVE ratings are satisfactory to	HENNEPIN	1988	\$823,068	2017-2022	NO dnote 1		RE-OL	5,000	6	7	7	505	23,170	SPAN	HS 62.0	N	N	Y	(96.6) (97.6)
М	27048	2	Hwy. 77	2758-XX	HWY. 77 SB OFF RAMP OVER 81ST STREET	HENNEPIN	1988	y will be fleeded by 2	2028-2034	NO		RE-OL & Paint	3,450	7	7	7	526	24,170	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 94.0	N	N	Υ	94.7 (95.7)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	1988. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	planned	for the program year	rs. Paint an	d overlay	will be needed	beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.						1				
М	27052C	2	Hwy. 77	2758-XX	HWY. 77 NB COLL RD OVER 79TH ST & EB 494/5 RAMPS	HENNEPIN	1989		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	10,000	7	7	7	603	25,253	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 46.0	N	N (Y)	Υ	96.2 (97.2)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	n 1989. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal HWY. 77 NB OVER	maintenance	planned	d for the program yea	rs. Paint an	d overlay	will be needed	d beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.	1									
М	9600N	2	Hwy. 77	1925-52	MINNESOTA R & BLACK DOG	HENNEPIN	1978	\$2,405,000	2017-2022	NO		RE-OL	47,000	6	6	7 (6)	5,159	308,514	STEEL TIED ARCH	HS 34.0 (HS 35.6)	N	N	Y	91.5
М	9600S	2	Hwy. 77	1925-52	n ratings are satisfactory to HWY. 77 SB OVER MINNESOTA R &	HENNEPIN	1978	See above	2017-2022	NO		RE-OL	47,000	6	6	7 (6)	5,185	310,045	STEEL TIED ARCH	HS 34.0 (HS 35.6)	N	N	Y	91.5
<u> </u>	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	1978. All I	NBIS condition	BLACK DOG ratings are satisfactory to	good. Overla	ay will be	needed by 215-18.	See endnote	e 1. (Cost	incl w Br 96N)												
М	27728	2	I 94	2781-452	OVER GLENWOOD AVE & RR	HENNEPIN	1978	\$275,000	2017	NO		RE-OL	7,100	6 (5)	6	6	1,475	64,614	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 42.5	N	N	Y	98.5 (99.5) (98.5)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	n 1978. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are satisfactory. N	Normal mainte	enance p	planned for the progra	am years. Pa	aint and ov	erlay will be r	needed beyon	d 218. See	endnote	1.		1		000110 = 517					04.5
М	27842 Notes:	2	I 94	2781-XX	I 94 WB ON RAMP OVER I 94 & HWY. 65	HENNEPIN	1966	\$44,182,462	2018	NO		RPL	20,000	4	4	6	534	13,566	CCONC BOX GIRD	HS 36.0 (HS 28.0)	Υ	N	N	64.8 (64.4)
М	27861	2	I 94	2781-27861	I 94 WB OFF RAMP OVER CP RAIL & CITY ST	HENNEPIN	1968	\$930,936	2010	YES	2010	RDK	11,000	4	5	4	268	6,888	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 31.6	Υ	N	N	65.0
	Notes: Econ	nomic stimul	lus (ARRA) f	funding used to	o advance project																			
М	27726B	2	1 94	2781-XX	I 94 SB OFF RAMP OVER LYNDALE AVE N & RR	HENNEPIN	1979	\$536,514	2017-2022	NO		RE-OL	10,900	6	6	7	1,100	28,919	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 44.0	N	Υ	Υ	93.3 (94.3)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	1979. All	NBIS condition	n ratings are satisfactory to	good. Overl	lay will be	e needed by 218. Se	ee endnote 1		1	1	1				1		DDEOTD DE (::	110 40 6				94.4
М	27727B	2	I 94	2781-XX	OVER GLENWOOD AVE & RR'S	HENNEPIN	1978	\$1,148,528	2017-2022	NO		RE-OL	8,000	6	6 (5)	6 (5)	1,896	54,542	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 40.0 (HS 33.8)	N	Y	Y	(95.4) (86.3)

Notes: FC bridge built in 1978. All NBIS condition ratings are satisfactory. Overlay will be needed by 218. See endnote 1.


							Traota	re Critical and Si	ii aotai aii j	Donoic	iic ii diiicii	igiiiiay Dii	agoo ao o		, _00									
									Ы					(NB	IS RATI	NG)								
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
М	27799R	2	I 94	NA	I 94 EB ON RAMP OVER LYNDALE AVENUE SB	HENNEPIN	1969		2028-2034	NO		RDK	25,400	6	7	7	784	29,470	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 42.0 (HS 41.0)	N	N	Υ	85.8
	Notes: FC bi	ridge built ir	1989, remo	odeled in 1987	. NBIS condition ratings a	re satisfactor	y. Norm	al maintenance planr	ned for the p	rogram yea	ars. Paint an	d re-deck will	be needed b	eyond 2	18.			-		1				
М	5598	2	Hwy. 100	2734-33	MINNETONKA BLVD OVER HWY. 100 atisfactory Hw 1 bridge	HENNEPIN	1939	\$83,884,993	2015	NO		REHAB	19,100	4	4	5	164	12,794	CONC DECK GIRD	HS 40.1 (HS 40.2)	Y	N	N	63.0
		IIICI W/ BI 3	402 project.	Condition is sa	HWY. 100 SB CD											7			CSTL BEAM					90.0
M	27789 Notes: FC bi	2 ridge built ir	Hwy. 100 1 1989. All I	NA NBIS condition	OVER SB CD RP & FRNT RD ratings are fair to good.	HENNEPIN Normal mainte	1989 enance p	planned for the progra	2019-2027 am years. Pa	NO aint and ov	erlay will be r	RE-OL needed beyon	2,000 d 218. See	6 endnote	1.	(6)	967	38,228	SPAN	HS 70.0	N	N	Y	(91.0)
М	27791	2	Hwy. 100	NA	HWY. 100 SB ON RAMP OVER GLENWOOD AVE TO	HENNEPIN			2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	2,000	7	7	7	495	13,910	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 55.0	N	N	Υ	97.0 (98.0)
	Notes: FC bi	ridge built ir	1989. All N	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	e planne	d for the program yea	rs. Paint an	nd overlay v	vill be needed	d beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.										
М	62090	2	Hwy. 149	6223-20	HWY. 149 (SMITH AVE) OVER MISSISSIPPI R &	RAMSEY	1986	\$15,210,915	2017	NO		RDK	18,000	6 (5)	7 (6)	7	2,770	150,395	CSTL TIED ARCH	HS 42.0	N	N	Υ	85.1 (91.1) (90.7)
	Notes: Built i	in 1986 (see	e endnote 1) and built with	a redundant system for F	C tie girder. I	ligh brid	ge	1	1	1									1				
М	6347	2	Hwy. 243	1311-6347A	HWY. 243 (OSCEOLA) OVER ST CROIX RIVER	CHISAGO	1953	\$909,311	2010	YES	2010	OL & PT	7,600 (6,985)	7 (6)	6	7 (6)	674	23,051	STEEL DECK TRUSS	HS 19.5 (HS 26.2)	N	N	Υ	65.6 (72.4)
	Notes: Borde	er briage wi	tn wisconsii	n. with planne	ed repairs of deck overlay,	paint and ste	eei repair	s, bridge will perform	sately for ne	ext 2 years					1			1	CONC SLAD					
M	6630 Notes:	1	Hwy. 280	6241-87	HENNEPIN AVENUE OVER MT RAIL	RAMSEY	1954	\$2,122,057	2009	YES	2009	RPL	16,000	4	4	5	97	6,388	CONC SLAB SPAN	HS 26.6	Y	N	N	36.8
					LARPENTEUR(COUNT														CONC DECK					
М	6738	1	Hwy. 280	6241-87	Y ROAD30) OVER HWY, 280	RAMSEY	1954	\$2,526,258	2009	YES	2009	RPL	13,500	4	4	4	150	10,259	GIRD	HS 41.0	Υ	N	N	49.0
	Notes: Cost	incl w/ Br 6	63 project.																					
М	27753	2	I 394		I 394R RAMP OVER NB HWY. 100 TO 394 HOV EB	HENNEPIN	1989		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	7,600	7	7	7	520	13,572	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 48.0	N	N	Υ	97.0 (98.0)
	Notes: FC bi	ridge built ir	1988. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal II 394 EB ON RAMP	maintenance	e planned	d for the program yea	rs. Paint an	id overlay v	vill be needed	beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.				-		1				
М	27788	2	1 394		OVER HWY. 100 NB ON RAMP	HENNEPIN	1989		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	4,500	7	7	7	289	7,590	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 56.0	N	N (Y)	Υ	94.0 (95.0)
М	27753A	ridge built in 2	1 1989. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal I 394R RAMP OVER 394 HOV WB TO NB	HENNEPIN	1989	d for the program yea	2028-2034	NO NO	vill be needed	RE-OL	See endno	te 1. 7	7	7	360	9,404	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 48.0	N	N	Υ	97.0 (98.0)
Ь	Notes: FC br	ridae built ir	1989. All N	NBIS condition	HWY, 100 ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	e planne	d for the program vea	rs. Paint an	l id overlav v	vill be needed	bevond 218.	See endno	te 1.			li							()
М	27776A	2	I 394		I 394R OVER I 394 WB, DUNWOODY BLVD	HENNEPIN	1987	, , , ,	2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	7,600	7	7 (6)	7	2,738	154,403	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 43.0	N	N (Y)	Υ	93.8 (94.8)
	Notes: FC bi	ridge built ir	1987. All I	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	e planne	d for the program yea	rs. Paint an	d overlay	vill be needed	beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.										
М	27776B	2	I 394		I 394R EB OVER I 394 & DOWNTOWN RAMPS	HENNEPIN	1987		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	2,175	7	7	7	538	25,078	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 43.0	N	N	Υ	94.7 (95.7)
	Notes: FC bi	ridge built ir	n 1987. All N	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	e planned	d for the program yea	rs. Paint an	id overlay v	vill be needed	beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.	-	_	, ı	1	OOT! DE:::					00.0
M	27789A	2	1 394	IDIO III	OVER SB HWY. 100	HENNEPIN	1989		2019-2027	NO		RE-OL	6,000	7	7 (6)	7 (6)	162	1,877	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 70.0	N	N	Υ	99.0 (100.0)
	Notes: FC bi	riage built ir	1 1987. All I		ratings are good. Normal		e pianne	u for the program yea		overiay v	viii be needed	RPL w/	See endno	te 1.				1	DDECTD DEAL					
M	9197 Notes:	2	I 694	6280-304	I 694 WB OVER BNSF RR	RAMSEY	1960		2007	YES	2009	Unweave/W eave Proi.	51,500	4	6	5	123	9,211	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 57.0	Y	N	N	71.0
													35,000	4				1	CSTL BEAM		v			95.0
М	82805 Notes: Tier 3	3 3 Bridge - co	I 694	8286-64 ded in Chapter	I 694 SB OVER UP RR 152 Program. Economic	VASHINGTO stimulus (AR)	1967 RA) fund	ing used.	2010	YES	2010	RDK	(36,500)	(8)	6	7	145	6,257	SPAN	HS 41.9	(N)	N	N	(98.0)
													35,000	4		5			CSTL BEAM	HS 41.9	Υ			84.0
М	82806 Notes: Tier 3	3 3 Bridge - co	I 694 ost not inclu	8286-64 ded in Chapter	I 694 NB OVER UP RR r 152 Program. Economic	VASHINGTO stimulus (ARI	1967 RA) fund	ling used.	2010	YES	2010	RDK	(36,500)	(7)	6	(6)	145		SPAN	(HS 30.6)	(N)	N	N	(93.7) (96.7)
М	6513	2	I 35E	6280-353	MARYLAND (COUNTY ROAD 31) OVER I 35E	RAMSEY	1958	\$14,546,185	2012	YES	2012	RPL	22,500 (27,900)	4	5	5	199	19,930	STEEL BEAM SPAN	HS 32.0 (HS 48.0)	Υ	N	N	77.0
				1	1	1			1	1	1													


Notes:


			,					re Critical and S												,				
									_ ₽					(NB	IS RAT	ING)	_							
DISTRICT	BRIDGE NUMBER	CHAP. 152 TIER	ROUTE NUMBER	SP#	FACILITY - FEATURE CROSSED	COUNTY	YEAR BUILT	TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE 2012	PLANNED YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	YEAR OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION	CH 152 WORK PLANNED	ADT	D E C K	S U P	S U B	BRIDGE LENGTH	DECK AREA	MAIN SPAN TYPE	LOAD (OPERATING) RATING	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT	FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE	FRACTURE CRITICAL	SUFFICIENCY RATING
М	6515	1	I 35E	6280-308	I 35E OVER CAYUGA ST & BNSF RR	RAMSEY	1965	\$161,980,647	2014	NO		RPL	148,000	5	4	4	1,285	120,185	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 29.0	Υ	N	N	40.8
	Notes:	1		1	T	1			1		1	ı			1									
М	6517 Notes: Cost	2 incl w/ Br 6	1 35E 515 (Cayuga	6280-308	I 35E OVER BNSF RR	RAMSEY	1963		2014	NO		RPL	148000 (149,000)	4	4	4	298	34,992	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 31.3 (HS 30.6)	Y	N	N	53.0 (51.8)
М		2			I 35E OVER	RAMSEY	4004		2014	NO		RPL	144,000		Ι,		405	40.400	STEEL BEAM	HS 44.0	Y		N	04.0
	9265		I 35E	6280-308	PENNSYLVANIA AVE	RAIVISEY	1964		2014	NO		RPL	(154,000)	4	4	4	165	19,166	SPAN	HS 44.0	Y	N	IN	64.0
	Notes: Cost	ıncl w/ Br 6			W OATH ST OVED I						1		12 200						DDESTD DEAM	UC FOO				10.7
М	9053	1	I 35W	2782-320	W 94TH ST OVER I 35W	HENNEPIN	1957	\$8,900,627	2014	NO		RPL	12,800 (11,000)	5	4	6	199	12,815	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 53.8 (HS 31.9)	Y	N	N	48.7 (49.1)
	Notes:				COUNTY ROAD E2						1													
М	9570	2	I 35W	6284-163	(COUNTY ROAD 73) OVER I 35W	RAMSEY	1964	\$13,617,140	2016	NO		RPL	5,700 (10,100)	7	4	5	214	8,284	PRESTR BEAM SPAN	HS 55.0 (HS 39.3)	Υ	N	N	52.0
	Notes:			l	IOVER I 35W																			
М	9796	1	I 35W		W 76TH ST OVER I 35W	HENNEPIN	1959		2008	YES	2009	RPL	23,800	4	4	7	187	12,037	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 49.3	Y	N	N	44.5
	Notes:		1	l		1	1				1	1	1				1 1			1				
М	27871	1	I 35W	2782-278	I 35W SB OVER HWY. 65 NB	HENNEPIN	1967	\$26,509,477	2018	NO		RPL	48,500	5	5	4	363	12,973	CCONC BOX GIRD	HS 67.0	Y	N	N	44.1
	Notes:				HWY. 121 NB OVER I														CSTL BEAM					
М	27930	2	I 35W	2782-281	35W SB	HENNEPIN	1964		2007	YES	2009	RPL	6,000	4	5	6	307	10,254	SPAN	HS 31.5	Y	N	N	62.4
	Notes:		1		HWY. 62 EB OVER I						1	RPL w/	1						CCONC BOY	1				
М	27932	1	I 35W	2782-281	35W	HENNEPIN	1964		2007	YES	2009	Crosstown Project	50,000	4	4	6	376	12,558	CCONC BOX GIRD	HS 36.0	Y	N	N	37.0
	Notes:			I		1	I				1	RPL w/	1		1		1 1			, I				
М	27937	2	I 35W	2782-281	HWY. 62 WB OVER I 35W NB	HENNEPIN	1964		2007	YES	2009	Crosstown	49,000	4	4	6	224	5,720	CCONC BOX GIRD	HS 38.5	Υ	N	N	55.4
	Notes:	<u> </u>	l	l								Proiect		l	<u> </u>	l								
М	27938	2	I 35W	2782-281	35W SB TO EB HWY.	HENNEPIN	1964		2007	YES	2009	RPL w/ Crosstown	22,750	4	4	7	290	7,382	CCONC BOX	HS 45.2	Υ	N	N	64.2
	Notes:				62 OVER I 35 NB	<u> </u>						Proiect	<u> </u>					•	GIRD					
М	27939	2	I 35W	2782-281	I 35W SB OVER E 60TH ST	HENNEPIN	1963		2007	YES	2009	RPL w/ Crosstown Project	85,000	4	4	7	127	7,786	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 33.7	Υ	N	N	58.1
	Notes:	1		1		1					1									1				
М	27940	2	I 35W	2782-281	I 35W NB OVER E 60TH ST	HENNEPIN	1963		2007	YES	2009	RPL w/ Crosstown Proiect	85,000	4	4	7	127	7,786	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 33.7	Y	N	N	58.1
	Notes:	1	1	1	SEW OR TO HIMN CO	1					1	RPL w/	1		<u> </u>				CCONC BOX	1				
М	27941	2	I 35W	2782-281	35W SB TO HWY. 62 EB OVER HWY. 62 WB	HENNEPIN	1964		2007	YES	2009	Crosstown Project	22,750	4	4	5	244	6,212	GIRD	HS 62.1	Y	N	N	64.2
	Notes:			I	II35W RAMP TO HWY.						ı	1	I	1	1	1				1				
М	62853	2	I 35W		36 EB OVER HWY. 280 NB	RAMSEY	1970		2019-2027	NO		RPL	10,000	6	6	6	294	12,777	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 37.0	Ν	N (Y)	Υ	97.3
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	197. All NI	BIS condition i	ratings are satisfactory. No	ormal mainter	nance pla	anned for the progran	n years. Re	placement	will be neede	ed beyond 201	18.							1				
М	27776C	2	I 394		I 394R WB OVER I 394 WB ON RAMP	HENNEPIN	1987		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	2,175	7	7	7	626	32,446	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 43.0	N	N (Y)	Υ	95.7 (96.7)
	Notes: FC b	ridge built ir	1989. All N	NBIS condition	ratings are good. Normal	maintenance	planned	for the program yea	rs. Paint an	d overlay v	vill be needed	d beyond 218.	See endno	te 1.	1		1			1				
М	27776F	2	I 394		394R EB RAMP OVER I 94 EB (ST. PAUL)	HENNEPIN	1987		2028-2034	NO		RE-OL	1,087	7	7	7	1,200	31,403	CSTL BEAM SPAN	HS 43.0	N	N (Y)	Υ	95.8 (96.8)


Notes:

Note 1: Newer bridges were designed and fabricated with improved details for resistance to fatigue. Steel specifications in the mid-1970's required steel "toughness" properties that provide resistance to fatigue. A Fracture Control Plan published in 1978 by AASHTO was also utilized to fabricate bridges using improved welding techniques for assembly.












Chapter 152
TH Bridge Improvement Program
District 4







Ch 152 TH Bridge Improvement Program

- Tier-1
- Tier-2
- Commissioner Priority
- Otherwise Addressed


Detroit Lakes



Chapter 152
TH Bridge Improvement Program
District 6










Chapter 152
TH Bridge Improvement Program
District 7





Ch 152 TH Bridge Improvement Program

- Tier-1
- Tier-2
- ▲ Commissioner Priority



Mankato

