						В	rid <u>ge Ir</u>	nspectio	n						
Bridge File Num	ber	01161 -3	Bridge					Form T			PSR				
Year Built/Year		1998/199						Lot No.			4	4			
Supstr								Inspector Na		ne	Garry Robe	Garry Roberts			
Bridge or Town I	Name	STAVEL	Y					Inspector Class		BR CLS A	-				
Located Over			EEK, 2.1	2.25.8, V	VATERC	RS	-ST	Assistant Name							
Located On		527:02 C	1 7.858					Assistant Class							
Water Body CI./	Year							Inspection Date			22-May-201	22-May-2010			
Navigabil. Cl./Ye						Dat			Data Entry By			Alyssa Boynton			
Legal Land Loca	ation	SE SEC	15 TWP	14 RGE	28 W4M			Data Entry Date				17-Aug-2010			
Longitude, Latitu	ude	-113:44:(	06, 50:09	53		Reviewer Nar					Ash Morjaria				
Road Authority Alberta Transportation (AIT)					Г)	Review Date			28-May-201						
Contract Main. Area CMA26						Dept. Reviewer Nam									
Clear Roadway/Skew 9.1 /					Dept. Reviewer N				18-Aug-201						
AADT/Year		490 / 200	09 (A)					Follow-				-			
Road Classificat	tion	RCU-209	9-110												
Detour Length (ł	km)	3													
Allowable Load (	(t): Sin	gle CS1	28		Semi CS		62 49		Tr	ain	CS3 62	3 62		> On Critical Spans >Critical Member	
Design Loading:		CS7	'50										> Primary	Span	
						Po	sting Ir	nformati							
Required Load F		(t)		Single				Sei					k Train	-	
Posted Loading	(t)			Single				Sei			_		k Train		
Posted:	Lane	EB			tion (Y/N	-	No			ce (Y/N	,		ridge (Y/N)	No	
Posted:	Lane	WB		At Junc	tion (Y/N	)	No	In A	In Advance (Y/N) No			At Bi	ridge (Y/N)	No	
Remarks	Not Re	equired													
Hazard Marker A	At Bridg	e (Y/N)	No												
Remarks															
Other Sign Types Pine Coulee Reservo				servoir											
							- ·	ocated							
Utility Attachmer	nts   TE	ELEPHO	NE UTILI	TIES-PH	ONE LIN	IE; I	POWEF		IES-PO	OWER	LINE				
Telephone	SRW							Gas		1W	1W @ N RW				
Power	North	Row						Municipal							
Others								Probler	n (Y/N	) No					
Remarks															
								ch Roac							
						st	Now	Explan			dition				
						8	8	In vertion	cal sag	curve					
Horizontal Align						-									
Vertical Alignme	ent		40.055			6	7								
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width	ent (m)		10.000			6									
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump	ent (m)					-	7	-							
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N)	ent (m)		10.000 Yes			6 7	7	150x15	0 HSS	on 60	k75 I-beam pos	sts			
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N) Guardrail	ent (m)		Yes			6		150x15	0 HSS	on 60	x75 I-beam pos	sts			
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N) Guardrail Length (m)	ent (m)		Yes 99.000			6 7	7	150x15	0 HSS	on 60	k75 I-beam pos	sts			
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N) Guardrail Length (m) Current Standa	ent (m)	۷)	Yes 99.000 Yes			6 7	7	150x15	0 HSS	on 60	<75 I-beam pos	sts			
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N) Guardrail Length (m) Current Standa Termination Ty	ent (m)	۷)	Yes 99.000	OWN		6 7 9	8	150x15	0 HSS	on 60.	k75 I-beam pos	sts			
Vertical Alignme Roadway Width Approach Bump Guardrail (Y/N) Guardrail Length (m) Current Standa	ent (m)	 ۷)	Yes 99.000 Yes	OWN		6 7	7	150x15	0 HSS	i on 60.	<75 I-beam pos	sts			

				Supers	tructure				
Bridge Component			Last		Explanation of Condition				
(Primary Span : DBT, 2 Span	s, Lengths	s(m): 28-38, A-	Ident N						
Special Features									
Special Feature				Х					
(Type : )									
Special Feature				Х					
(Туре : )									
Wearing Surface/Deck Top D	etail Rating	S							
N (%) 1	(%)	2 (%)	3 (%)						
Last 0	0	0		0					
<b>Now</b> 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0						
Wearing Surface			6	6	Moderate transverse cracks				
(Material Type : ACP)									
(Thickness(mm) : 50)									
Lateral Connection Problem (Y/N)	No								
Deck Top			N	N					
Deck Rideability			8	8					
Deck Joints			8	8	1 loose boltat NW curb cover plate				
Temperature (deg. C)	12								
(Expansion Type : )									
(Fixed Type : )									
Gap Size (mm)	Gap	Location							
90	W ab	ut							
80	E abi	ut							
Deck Drainage			4	5	All but one of six drains are missing grates @ deck				
Drains Clogged (Y/N)	No								
Curbs/Median			8	8					
(Curb Type : Standard)									
Scaling (Percent Area)	0								
Bridge Rail			8	8					
(Type : BRIDGE TUBE)									
Bridge Rail Posts			8 8 POST						
(Type : GALVANIZED POS STEEL)	ST STEEL;(	GALVANIZED			Most anchor bolts-steel without galvanizing-all surface corroded				
Bridge Rail/Posts Coating			8	6	]				
(Type : )									
Sidewalk			X	X					
Girder Detail Ratings									
	(count)	2 (count)	3 (cou	unt)	-				
Last 0	0	0		0	-				
<b>Now</b> 0	0	0		0					
Girders			8	8					
Cracking (Y/N)	No								
Spalling (Percent Area)	0				8 lines continuous girders				
(Number Of Girders : 100007	)								

Alberta Transportation

			Supers	tructure
Bridge Component		Last	Now	Explanation of Condition
(Primary Span : DBT, 2 Spans,	Lengths(m): 28-38, A	-Ident N	lumbe	r: )
Diaphragms/Cross Frame		8	8	
Bearings		5	6	Pins bent towards stream 10mm @ W
Temperature (deg. C)	12			beyond max contraction @ W Pins bent 5 to 20mm towards stream @
(Expansion Type : REINFOR TEFLON AND STAINLESS S	CED NEOPRENE BEA	RING W	VITH	E-have been beyond max contraction @ E
(Fixed Type : <b>REINFORCED</b>	PAD BEARING)			Exp @ abuts and fixed neopad at pier
Coating Adequate (Y/N)	Yes			
Functioning (Y/N)	Yes		_	
Deck Underside		8	8	
Stains (Percent Area)	0			
Span Alignment Problems				
Vertical (Y/N)	No			_
Horizontal (Y/N)	No			
Superstructure General Ratin	g	5	6	
			Subst	ructure
Bridge Component		Last	Now	Explanation of Condition
Abutments				
Bearing Seats/Caps		8	8	
(Type : CONCRETE)				
Backwalls/Breastwalls		8	8	
Wingwalls		8	8	
Piles		N	N	Buried
Paint/Coating		5	5	
Abutment Stability		7	8	
Scour/Erosion		9	7	
Piers/Bents				
(Type : <b>PIER-SOLID</b> )				
Bearing Seats/Caps		8	8	
(Type : CONCRETE)				
(Total Number of Bearing Piles	: 0)			-
Pier Shaft/Piles		8	8	
Bracing/Struts/Sheathing		X	X	
Nose Plate		9	8	
Paint/Coating		7	7	
(Colour Description : )				
(Colour Code : )				
Pier Stability		8	8	
Scour		N	N	То Deep
Debris (Y/N)	No			
Substructure General Rating		7	8	

		S	Structu	re Usage				
		Last	Now	Explanation of Condition				
Channel								
(U/S Direction : N)								
(D/S Direction : <b>S</b> )				Reservoir				
Alignment		9	9					
Bank Stability		7	7					
HWM (m below Top of Curb)	4.0			No visable HWM				
Drift (Y/N)	No							
Slope Protection		9	8					
(Type : <b>RIP RAP; RIP RAP</b> )								
Guidebank/Spurs		8	8					
Adequacy of Opening		9	7					
(Fish Compensation Measure 1	NONE)		_					
(Fish Compensation Measure 2	NONE)							
Channel General Rating		9	8					

		Maintenance	Recommend	lations					
Inspector Recommendations	Year	Inspector Comments		Department Comm	nents		Target Year	Est. Cost	Cat #
REPAIR/REPLACE BRIDGE RAIL									
GALVANIZE/PAINT BRIDGE RAIL									
SEAL CURBS									
PATCH DECK									
SEAL DECK									
OVERLAY DECK									
REPAIR/REPLACE DECK JOINTS									
RESET/ PAINT BEARINGS									
WASHING									
SHOTCRETE REPAIRS									
REPAIR ABUTMENT SCOUR/EROSIC	N								
PLACE ADDITIONAL RIP RAP									
REMOVE DRIFT ACCUMULATION									
OTHER ACTION									
OTHER ACTION									
OTHER ACTION									
OTHER ACTION									
				Î					
Structural Condition Rating (Last/No (%)	w) 66.7/77	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	t/Now)	70.0/72.4	Est. Repl. Yr	2063	Maint. Rec	qd. (Y/N)	No
Structural Condition Rating (Last/No (%) Special Comments for Next Inspection	w) 66.7/77.	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	t/Now)	70.0/72.4 Department Comments	Est. Repl. Yr	2063	Maint. Rec	ąd. (Y/N)	No
(%) Special Comments for Next Inspection	w) 66.7/77.	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	t/Now)	Department	Est. Repl. Yr		Maint. Rec		No
(%) Special Comments for	w) 66.7/77.	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	t/Now)	Department Comments	Est. Repl. Yr				No
(%) Special Comments for Next Inspection Maintenance Reviewed By	w) 66.7/77	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	t/Now)	Department Comments	Est. Repl. Yr				No
(%) Special Comments for Next Inspection Maintenance Reviewed By Proposed Long-Term Strategy	w) 66.7/77	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	:t/Now)	Department Comments	Est. Repl. Yr				No
(%)         Special Comments for Next Inspection         Maintenance Reviewed By         Proposed Long-Term Strategy         On 3-Year Program (Y/N)         Proposed Action	w) 66.7/77.	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)		Department Comments	Est. Repl. Yr				No
(%)         Special Comments for Next Inspection         Maintenance Reviewed By         Proposed Long-Term Strategy         On 3-Year Program (Y/N)         Proposed Action         Previous Inspector's Name	Tom Carey	.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	Previous	Department Comments Date	Est. Repl. Yr				No
(%)         Special Comments for Next Inspection         Maintenance Reviewed By         Proposed Long-Term Strategy         On 3-Year Program (Y/N)         Proposed Action         Previous Inspector's Name         Next Inspection Date		.8 Sufficiency Rating (Las (%)	Previous	Department Comments Date					No