Utah Historic Bridge Inventory: Volume 2

National Register Criteria for Evaluation and National Register Recommendations

Report prepared for

Utah Department of Transportation

Report prepared by

Mead & Hunt, Inc.

www.meadhunt.com

June 2011

Table of Contents

Page

Executive Summary 1

1. Overview of National Register Criteria for Evaluation 2

2. Application of *Criterion A* to Utah Historic Bridges, Settlement-1965 4

A. Transportation 4

(1) Utah highway and bridge development, settlement-1945 sub-themes 5

(a) Early road improvement and promotional associations 5

(b) S.R. and U.S. Highways 5

(c) Connections to state boundaries 5

(d) Grade-separations 5

(e) Enhance auto tourism in southern Utah 6

(f) Depression-era programs 6

(g) Strategic Highway Network 6

(h) Water reclamation projects 7

(2) Utah highway and bridge development, 1946-1965 sub-themes 7

(a) Expansion of S.R. and U.S. Highways 7

(b) Interstate overpasses 7

(c) Major crossings and improvements in access and safety 8

(d) Water reclamation projects 8

(e) Natural resource extraction 8

3. Application of *Criterion C* to Utah Historic Bridges, Settlement-1965 9

A. Distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction 9

(1) Patterns of features common to a particular bridge type 9

(2) Variation of features within bridge types 18

(3) Evolutions and transitions 18

B. High artistic value 18

C. Work of a master 19

4. Integrity Requirements for National Register Eligibility 20

A. Assessing integrity related to *Criterion A* 22

B. Assessing integrity related to *Criterion C* 23

5. Eligibility Recommendations 25

A. Pre-1946 Bridges – Eligibility recommendations summary 25

(1) *Criterion A: Transportation* 25

(a) Early road improvement and promotional associations 25

(b) S.R. and U.S. Highways 25

(c) Connections to state boundaries 25

(d) Grade-separations 26

(e) Enhance auto tourism in southern Utah 26

(f) Depression-era programs 27

(g) Strategic Highway Network 27

(h) Water reclamation projects 27

(2) *Criterion C: Design/Construction* 28

B. Post-1945 bridges – Eligibility recommendations summary 29

(1) *Criterion A: Transportation* 29

(a) Expansion of State Route Highways and U.S. Highways 29

(b) Interstate overpasses 29

(c) Major crossings and improvements in access and safety 29

(d) Reclamation projects 30

(e) Natural resource extraction 30

(2) *Criterion C: Design/Construction* 31

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region 34

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County 79

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region 130

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County 200

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region 274

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County 310

Appendices

A National Bridge Inventory

B Related Historic Contexts and National Register Areas of Significance

C Examples of Railing Types

Tables

1 Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value 11

2 Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion A* 22

3 Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion C* 23

4 Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion A* (by Sub-Theme) for Post-1945 Bridges 28

5 Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion C* (by Bridge Type) for Post-1945 Bridges 28

6 Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion A* (by Sub-Theme) for Post-1945 Bridges 31

7 Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion C* (by Bridge Type) for Post-1945 Bridges 31

Executive Summary

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) completed a historic context, *National Register of Historic Places* (National Register) *Criteria for Evaluation* (evaluation criteria), and National Register eligibility determinations for 619 structures constructed in Utah through 1965 for which UDOT has responsibility.[1] *Utah Historic Bridge Inventory: Volume I – Historic Bridge Context, Settlement-1965* (Volume I) provides the historic context of bridge construction from settlement through 1965, while this report, *Utah Historic Bridge Inventory: Volume 2: National Register Criteria for Evaluation and National Register Recommendations* (Volume 2), provides the application of the evaluation criteria on Utah's bridges constructed through 1965, and National Register eligibility recommendations. These reports will allow UDOT to make informed and timely reviews of proposed bridge projects by providing National Register eligibility determinations and to understand the effects that proposed projects may have on historic properties.

This project assists UDOT to comply with federal preservation laws and regulations that affect the management of historic bridges. These laws and regulations include Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended) and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act (U.S. DOT Act) of 1966 (as amended). The project will also assist in complying with Utah Antiquities Act U.C.A. 9-8-404 (Section 404). Section 404 is a state law with similar requirements as Section 106 of the NHPA and pertains to state-funded projects.

This report was preceded by the preparation of Volume I, which identifies the important themes in Utah transportation history and bridge construction. This report builds upon a previous historic overview and bridge-specific research completed for UDOT covering Utah bridge history from settlement to 1945.[2] Volume I provides the context for the evaluation of the significance of individual bridges under the evaluation criteria and follows the guidelines of *National Register Bulletins: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* and *How to Complete the National Register Form*, as well as the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Identification, Evaluation, and Registration*.

This report sets forth registration criteria for identifying if bridges under the jurisdiction of UDOT built through 1965 possess historic significance and integrity by applying the evaluation criteria. The discussion of historic significance, integrity, and the types of alterations that result in a loss of integrity may also be applied to minor structures under the jurisdiction of UDOT. Minor structures are often referred to as culverts and are less than 20 feet in length.

The evaluation criteria and resulting determinations are based on research conducted for the development of the historic context, review of Utah's National Bridge Inventory (NBI) data, bridge inspection file review, the previous historic overview, and current inspection images for bridges constructed through 1965. Field survey of structures and local research was not completed. Limited site-specific bridge research was conducted.

---

[1] Bridges that carry the Interstate were previously evaluated as not eligible and are exempt from Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with Section 6007 of SAFETEA-LU. As such, Interstate bridges were not evaluated as part of this project. Interstate bridges are not included in this total.

[2] Clayton Fraser, "Historic Overview," 1997, available at Utah Department of Transportation, Salt Lake City, Utah.

1. Overview of National Register Criteria for Evaluation

The evaluation of Utah's bridges constructed in Utah through 1965 for which UDOT has responsibility is based on the evaluation criteria as outlined in *National Register Bulletins: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* and *How to Complete the National Register Form*.

The National Register employs four criteria for evaluation: *A*, *B*, *C*, and *D*. *Criterion A* and *Criterion B* involve associative value, *Criterion C* involves design or construction value, and *Criterion D* involves information value. This section provides a brief overview of the National Register Criteria that apply to vehicular bridges in Utah from the subject period.

- *Criterion A: Events – Properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history*

  Criterion A recognizes bridges that have an important association with single events, a pattern of events, repeated activities, or historic trends that are significant within the context of transportation and bridge-building history.

- *Criterion B: Persons – Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past*

  Criterion B recognizes bridges that illustrate the important achievements of a person who was significant in the past. Structures must be compared to other properties associated with the work of the individual to identify those that best represent a person's historic contributions. Architects, artisans, artists, and engineers are often represented by their works, which are eligible under *Criterion C*. Therefore, the significant works of engineers or bridge-building firms are generally eligible under *Criterion C*, not *Criterion B*, and it is unlikely that bridges from the subject period are significant under *Criterion B*.

- *Criterion C: Design/Construction – Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction*

  Criterion C recognizes bridges that have distinctive design or construction characteristics that demonstrate the following: (1) the pattern of features common to a particular class of resources, (2) the individuality or variation of features that occurs within the class, (3) the evolution of that class of resources, and/or (4) the transition between classes of resources. Bridges from the subject period are most likely to be significant under *Criterion C*.

- *Criterion D: Information Potential – Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history*

  Criterion D is most often applied to archaeological properties and it is highly unlikely that any bridges from the subject period would be eligible under *Criterion D*.

Sections 3 and 4 provide a detailed discussion of *Criteria A* and *C* applied to vehicular bridges in Utah through 1965. *Criteria B* and *D* generally do not apply to bridges.

Structures less than 50 years in age
The evaluation criteria outlined in this report provide registration criteria for structures constructed through 1965. Structures that are less than 50 years in age at the time of evaluation will need to meet the evaluation criteria and *Criterion Consideration G* for properties less than 50 years old. The following should be considered for structures that are less than 50 years old:

- Structures considered to be a fragile resource type that may never reach 50 years of age can be found to meet *Criterion Consideration G*.

- If the plan and design of the structure was completed prior to the 50-year mark, the structure does not need to meet *Criterion Consideration G*.

If a structure less than 50 years in age is not able to meet *Criterion Consideration G*, it may still possess significance under the evaluation criteria and qualify for listing on the National Register when it reaches 50 years in age.

Interstate Highway System structures
Bridges that carry the Interstate were previously evaluated for the National Register in accordance with Section 6007 of SAFETEA-LU and were not evaluated as part of this project. In Utah, no Interstate structures were identified as eligible for the National Register.

Structures that cross the Interstate were not previously evaluated under Section 6007 of SAFETEA-LU and are being assessed for National Register eligibility applying the evaluation criteria outlined in this report.

Bridges excluded from evaluation
Bridges that are known to have been previously evaluated or that are listed in the National Register were not reevaluated as part of this project, including bridges located on the Interstate Highway System. Non-bridge structures found within UDOT's bridge inspection database were not evaluated as part of this project. These include natural rock formations that carry a roadway, which appear in UDOT's bridge inspection database. Bridges that were replaced or found to be nonextant are not included in the results. Bridges and non-bridge structures in UDOT's bridge inspection database that were excluded from evaluation are provided in Sections 5.G and 5.H.

2. Application of *Criterion A* to Utah Historic Bridges, Settlement-1965

Bridges may be eligible under *Criterion A* for an association with important events or trends that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Utah history. To be eligible under *Criterion A*, bridges must have an important and direct association with the event or trend. Important state and regional events and trends related to the theme of transportation are described in Volume 1. This project focused on state-level trends related to Utah's transportation history.

Significance under *Criterion A* requires a direct relationship between a bridge and an important event or trend; an indirect or inferential relationship is not adequate to support significance under *Criterion A*. For example, a highway network may be associated with an important period in the development of a National Park Unit or an important industry. However, within the larger transportation network, an individual bridge is not likely to have played a direct role in the development of a National Park Unit. Because of this, it is often difficult to demonstrate an association is direct enough for significance under *Criterion A*. For an individual bridge to possess a direct association, physical evidence must clearly demonstrate that its role, individually, was related to an important event or trend.

A. Transportation

The theme of transportation relates to Utah's bridges built in response to state and federal initiatives following the establishment of the Utah State Road Commission (USRC) and a highway engineering department to develop the highway system in Utah. The system includes U.S. Highways, State Route (S.R.) highways, the Strategic Highway Network, and the post-war Interstate Highway system. National, state, and regional highway networks, including the Interstate Highway system, are important trends in Utah's transportation history. Volume 1 identified the events and trends that are listed below as the sub-themes to consider under *Criterion A: Transportation*. Volume I provides greater discussion on the role each sub-theme played in Utah's transportation history and identifies select highways and bridges associated with each sub-theme.

An individual bridge within a larger transportation system of local, S.R. Highways, and U.S. highways is not likely to be significant simply because of its presence within a network of interconnected transportation resources. For an individual structure to demonstrate a direct association, it needs to, on its own, represent a transition or evolution of the overall roadway or independently be an important crossing that stands out within the larger transportation network, such as an early U.S. or S.R. Highway. These bridges are more likely to possess significance as one component within the overall highway system or a particular roadway segment under these sub-themes.

The identification and evaluation of bridges under *Criterion A* was based on the information available during a review of the bridge inspection files at UDOT in March 2010, which included bridge plans, and the themes identified in Volume I. Fewer bridge plans were available for county-owned bridges than state-owned bridges. No local research was completed and no information was collected from UDOT District Offices or county highway departments. These bridges may require reevaluation under *Criterion A* if additional information is obtained that establishes a direct association with a National Register theme

in the future. Additional related historic contexts and National Register Areas of Significance, which are beyond the scope of this project but may be considered for bridges if site-specific research is completed in the future, are provided in Appendix B.

Section 5 of this report and the individual bridge inventory forms produced as part of this project provide a rationale on whether individual bridges have a significant association with these sub-themes to establish a direct association under *Criterion A*.

(1) Utah highway and bridge development, settlement-1945 sub-themes

(a) Early road improvement and promotional associations

A number of organizations arose to improve roads and designate cross-country routes in the early twentieth century in Utah. The establishment of these routes represents important trends that facilitated highway and commercial development in addition to tourism. A bridge constructed in direct response to the designation of the Lincoln Highway, Midland Trail, or Arrowhead Trail highway routes may possess significance for an association under this sub-theme. The construction date of the bridge needs to fall within the period of significance with the route and should predate the incorporation of the route into the state highway system.

(b) S.R. and U.S. Highways

The first act of the USRC was to designate a S.R. Highway system in 1910. For the next three decades, the USRC carried out a consistent policy of expanding and improving this network of roads. In order to carry out its program the USRC, in conjunction with the state legislature, developed tax sources to fund road work within the state. The passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1916, which provided federal funding to state's on a matching basis, greatly expanded the USRC's work. The designation of three Utah routes as U.S. Highways in 1926 also provided funding for road improvement. Prior to World War II improvements consisted primarily of widening, grading, and surfacing roads, particularly to create "dust-free" surfaces. It also included the design of more permanent bridges of steel and concrete materials.

(c) Connections to state boundaries

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Utah's road network was entirely insular with only one route (U.S. Highway 91) crossing a state boundary into Idaho. One of the USRC's missions was to establish improved roads to connect Utah to the Colorado, Arizona, and Nevada state borders. Interstate connections through Kanab on U.S. 89, St. George on U.S. 91 (south), Wendover on U.S. 40 in the pre-World War II (prewar) period, and the Colorado border via U.S. 70 in the postwar period ended Utah's geographic and economic isolation. Bridge construction was an integral part of this route improvement that provided auto access to and from other states. Bridges may be significant for their role in providing important inter-state connections.

(d) Grade-separations

The USRC grade-separation program was initiated in 1918 to eliminate dangerous intersections of highways and railroads. Two solutions to the problem were recommend by the USRC, the one

being relocation and the other the construction of elevated bridges that separated auto traffic from the railroad traffic. In the 1930s the program was greatly enhanced by federal appropriations specifically for grade-separation projects. This program carried through the war years with some major grade-separations constructed on the Strategic Highway Network. The USRC's goal was to eliminate all surface railroad and road intersections throughout the state. Early examples of grade-separation structures may be significant for their association with this important initiative by the USRC and the federal government.

(e) Enhance auto tourism in southern Utah

The USRC recognized that one of the most needed road improvements in the state was to provide access to scenic areas of southern Utah to attract tourists. USRC efforts resulted in a route from Salt Lake City through southern Utah to Las Vegas. This route through southern Utah also provided an "all-season" route from the intermountain states to Los Angeles. This important transportation link was essential to bringing visitors to the National Park Service and National Forest Service Units that were designated in Utah in the 1920s. Access to the parks was realized through joint state and federal efforts that involved bridge and tunnel construction in remote and difficult terrain. Bridges and tunnels directly associated with opening access to the southern Utah canyon lands and recreational areas may be significant under this transportation sub-theme.

(f) Depression-era programs

State and federal programs intended to stabilize the economy and increase employment represents an important trend in Utah transportation history. In Utah, both the USRC and particularly the federal government, through various New Deal programs, provided relief funding, programs, and policies that affected highway and bridge construction under this sub-theme. For an individual structure to be eligible related to this sub-theme, it needs to, on its own, clearly represent distinctive design directly associated with a Depression-era program that stands out within the larger transportation network or have a direct association with a Depression-era project during the early period in which Depression-era projects were implemented by the USRC.

(g) Strategic Highway Network

The Federal-Aid National Highway Act of 1939 made federal funding available for highway work deemed essential to national defense without the need for state matching funds, and the Defense Act of 1941 made additional "emergency" funds available. Much of the work deemed "essential" was concentrated on the roads within the Strategic Highway Network and roads in and around military installations and vital defense industries. These routes were often the same ones identified on the Pershing Map of 1922.

Beginning in the mid-1930s the federal government revived and expanded existing military facilities and began construction of new facilities in the vicinities of Salt Lake City and Ogden. Among the most important were the Ogden Arsenal; Hill Air Force Base; Fort Douglas, where the Ninth Command Headquarters was relocated from the Presidio in San Francisco; and the Wendover Air Force Base, where the 509th Composite Group trained for their mission to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These bases were located within close proximity to

U.S. 91 and 40. In 1940 the Secretary of War designated the selected routes as the Strategic Highway Network. For an individual structure to be eligible related to its association with the Strategic Highway Network, it needs to, on its own, clearly represent a distinctive design directly related to the program that stands out within the larger transportation network.

(h) Water reclamation projects

Large-scale transportation improvements to facilitate water development undertakings and reclamation efforts intended to impound water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, and recreation are associated with an important state and regional roadway trend. Bridges designed by the Bureau of Reclamation or that directly facilitated the development of a water development project may possess significance if they possess a direct association with this sub-theme.

(2) Utah highway and bridge development, 1946-1965 sub-themes

(a) Expansion of S.R. and U.S. Highways

The expansion of S.R. and U.S. Highways following the end of World War II is an important event within the study period. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 expanded federal funding available for U.S. Highways, S.R. Highways, and local county roads. Beginning in 1947 the USRC initiated an ambitious program of establishing a network of expressways and freeway improvements, including replacement of many of the state's deficient bridges. Roadway improvement projects may be significant as early examples in the expansion of U.S. and S.R. highway systems in Utah.

(b) Interstate overpasses

The development of the Interstate Highway system is an important trend; however, bridges that carry the Interstate within the study period have been previously evaluated and are exempt from Section 106 review.[3] Highway grade-separation bridges constructed within the study period, referred to as overpasses, which cross the Interstate are not exempt from Section 106 review and were evaluated for their association with the development of the Interstate Highway system in Utah.

However, an individual bridge within a larger transportation system such as the Interstate Highway system is not likely to be significant simply because of its presence within this network of interconnected resources. For an individual structure to be eligible related to this association, it needs to, on its own, clearly represent a transition or evolution of bridge design directly associated with the development of the Interstate Highway system or independently be an important crossing that stands out within the larger transportation network.

[3] Interstate bridges (those that carry the Interstate) were previously evaluated for the National Register in accordance with Section 6007 of the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU).

(c) Major crossings and improvements in access and safety

Structures constructed to cross major rivers, such as the Colorado and Green Rivers, or deep gorges and canyons played a role in expanding the transportation network in the state by opening areas that were previously difficult to access. UDOT also directed roadway projects to eliminate dangerous road segments and provide greater access to rural communities, and major bridge projects to span major crossings, particularly in southern Utah to span its major rivers and gorges. Bridges that span large river, gorge, and canyon crossings, thought to be associated with safety improvements, or that opened areas of the state previously difficult to access, may possess significance for their role in the development and expansion of transportation in Utah during the study period.

(d) Water reclamation projects

Large-scale transportation improvements to facilitate water development undertakings and reclamation efforts intended to impound water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, and recreation are associated with an important state and regional roadway trend. Bridges designed by the Bureau of Reclamation or that directly facilitated the development of a water development project may possess significance if they possess a direct association with this sub-theme.

Large-scale projects include Flaming Gorge Dam (1958-1964), Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Powell (1956-1966), Steinaker Reservoir (1956-1962), Pine View Reservoir and Dam (1935-1937 with road improvements in 1958), and Willard Bay Reservoir (1949-1950). Historical information on these projects is found in Volume I. To have an association under this sub-theme, bridge construction must have occurred during the construction and development of the reclamation project. The period of association varies for each individual reclamation project and is shown in parenthesis above for each project. An individual bridge under this sub-theme is more likely to possess significance as a component of a larger road improvement program or a roadway segment constructed specifically in response to a project than individually under this sub-theme.

(e) Natural resource extraction

Utah highways were improved and bridges were built to serve the needs of mining and natural resource extraction of uranium ore, oil, coal, and copper. Additional roadway and bridge improvements resulted from rocket testing ranges and fuel production plants to develop missiles during the Cold War. These activities required that the roads leading to these facilities be improved to accommodate the heavy equipment required for these industries. Bridges designed to a greater load capacity to service the special transportation needs of these industries may demonstrate significance for an association under this sub-theme. Bridges constructed specifically for or by a mining company to facilitate the transport and process of natural resource extraction may also constitute a direct association under this sub-theme.

3. Application of *Criterion C* to Utah Historic Bridges, Settlement-1965

Criterion C applies to bridges that may be significant for design and construction, including such elements as engineering, architecture, and aesthetic treatment. *Criterion C* is the most likely criterion to apply to Utah bridges.

In the subject period, bridges will generally possess significance under *Criterion C* only for distinctive features related to its superstructure. For example, in the design of a prestressed concrete T-beam bridge, the significance is associated with the beams that form the superstructure, not the abutments and piers that form the substructure, or the railings.

Section 5 and individual bridge inventory forms produced as part of this project provide a rationale on whether the bridge displays distinctive features or aesthetic treatments under *Criterion C*, along with a statement of significance.

The three basic considerations of *Criterion C* that apply to bridges are discussed in this section. A bridge may possess significance if it meets the requirements outlined. The National Register definition of each requirement is followed by an expanded discussion of its potential application to Utah bridges of the subject period.

A. Distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction

This consideration of *Criterion C* applies to bridges that have distinctive design or construction characteristics that demonstrate the following: the pattern of features common to a particular type of bridge, the individuality or variation of features that occurs within the type, or an evolution or transition of that bridge type.

(1) Patterns of features common to a particular bridge type

Under *Criterion C,* bridges may possess significance as a specimen of its type or period of construction. To qualify under this aspect of *Criterion C*, it must be demonstrated that the bridge represents an important example of bridge building practices at a particular time. Four bridge type categories have been defined to assist in placing bridges within the context of specimens of a type or period of construction to determine if bridges within these categories represent important bridge design or construction. The following applies to assessing National Register significance under *Criterion C* related to bridge types demonstrating the pattern of features common to a bridge type:

- Prefabricated and standardized bridge types – Superstructures of certain bridge types were increasingly prefabricated by manufacturers, such as steel and concrete pipe and box culverts, and/or standardized in USRC and the Bureau of Public Road plans or

specifications.[4] The development and subsequent use of standard plans and specifications resulted in limited differences in bridge design and construction in much the same way as prefabrication. As a result, prefabricated bridges and bridge types known to have been standardized are likely to provide few individual distinctions. For a bridge in this category to be considered significant under this aspect of *Criterion C*, it must be an early example of prefabrication or standardization prior to the period of subsequent widespread use and within its bridge type or have been constructed before the USRC began implementing standard plans for its bridge type.

- Established bridge types – Bridge types that are common both nationally and in Utah by utilizing well-established bridge construction and design practices and are likely to provide few individual distinctions. For a bridge in this category to be considered significant under this aspect of *Criterion C*, it must illustrate the earliest use of its application in Utah and exhibit distinctive design features when compared to other specimens of its type in Utah or have been constructed before the USRC began implementing standard plans for its bridge type. Examples of the earliest use of an established bridge type coupled with distinctive design features provide examples of the evolution or variation of design and construction within an established bridge type. Bridges meeting these requirements may illustrate an evolution within an established bridge type and are evaluated under *evolutions and transitions*.

- Rare bridge types – This category includes bridge types that were not commonly used in Utah (generally less than 10 extant examples). The following bridge types were not commonly used in Utah and are considered important as specimens of bridge building practices based on their rarity: concrete deck arch (111), steel deck arch (311), continuous steel deck arch (411), steel thru arch (312), continuous concrete deck arch (211), simple and continuous steel girder and floorbeam system (303, 403), continuous steel thru arch (412), continuous steel deck truss (409), steel continuous rigid frame (407), and tunnels (018), and truss sub-types identified in Table 1 Bridges within rare types possess significance as one of relatively few specimens of its type. Prestressed concrete box beam (505) has a population of less than 10, but because it is a newly introduced material it is evaluated below under *evolutions and transitions*.

Table 1 identifies if a particular bridge type possesses significance as a specimen of its type or period of construction under this aspect of *Criterion C*.

[4] See Tables 1 and 2 in Volume I for a listing of the national and state standardized bridge types; in addition, reinforced concrete T-beam (104) and reinforced concrete rigid frame (107) were identified during bridge inspection file review.

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Concrete rigid frame					
Concrete rigid frame (107)	15%	117	1915-1965	The character-defining feature of the concrete rigid frame is the integrated design and construction of the vertical and horizontal elements, creating one homogenous unit.	Established bridge type – This is known to be a standardized bridge type; however, the date in which standard plans were developed is unknown. As such, this bridge type is treated as an established bridge type. Early examples of this type include construction prior to 1930 when its use had become widespread nationally and in Utah. Exceptional Main Span Length – greater than 125 feet, concrete rigid frame (107) Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant. Open frame design – few examples of this variation exist in Utah. An open or “ribbed rigid frame” provides a variation likely developed to provide increased efficiencies within this bridge type by using less concrete. This design variation is considered significant. Type – specific aesthetic treatment may include coursing and incised pilaster details; however, these treatments are not considered significant for high artistic value. This bridge type was known to be standardized because standard plans were found during research. However, the research did not reveal the date in which the standard plans were first developed. Plans found in the UDOT bridge inspection files reference a standard open balustrade concrete railing. As such, the presence of open balustrade concrete railings is not considered a significant aesthetic treatment for this bridge type. Modest metal pole type railings are also not considered an aesthetic treatment.
Continuous concrete rigid frame (207)	3%	20	1920-1962		

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Reinforced concrete beams					
Concrete slab (101)	6%	48	1905-1965	The character-defining feature of this type is the cast-in-place, reinforced concrete, flat slab.	Concrete slabs and girders are a standardized bridge type; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1913 and 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1913 when this type was first standardized are significant examples of the evolution of this type. Concrete T-Beam is standardized bridge type; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1923 when this type was first standardized are significant examples of the evolution of this type Exceptional Main Span Length: • > 35 feet, concrete slab (101) • > 65 feet, concrete T-beam (104) • > 80 feet, continuous concrete T-beam (204) Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant. Plans found in the UDOT bridge inspection files reference a standard open balustrade concrete railing. As such, the presence of open balustrade concrete railings is not considered a significant aesthetic treatment for this bridge type. Modest metal pole type railings are also not considered an aesthetic treatment.
Continuous concrete slab (201)	2%	13	1925-1964		
Concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder (202)	<1%	1	1959	The character-defining features of this type are multiple (three or more) reinforced concrete beams, each equally supporting, but not integrated with, the deck, which only distributes live loads to the girders.	
Concrete T-beam (104)	6%	48	1913-1965	The character-defining feature of the concrete T-beam is a slab integrated with longitudinal beams to create a tee section.	
Continuous concrete T-beam (204)	6%	51	1932-1965		
Continuous concrete box beam (205)	<1%	1	1961	The character-defining feature of the concrete box beam is the hollow, box-shaped, longitudinal beam, which was designed and arranged in many variations, including round or rectangular interior void, variable depth or not, with or without deck, and adjacent or spread beams.	

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Prestressed concrete beams ***					
Prestressed concrete multi-beam or girder (502)	6%	48	1960-1965	The character-defining feature of the bridge type is the use of prestressed concrete beams, the essential component of the superstructure, supporting a concrete deck slab.	The introduction and early use of prestressed concrete, a new material and technology, is considered significant as an evolution in bridge design and construction. The Utah Highway Department introduced standards for the use of prestressed concrete in 1960. Though it was a newly introduced type in Utah, prestressed concrete had been in widespread use nationwide by 1960. While the use of prestressed concrete In Utah is far behind national trends, the earliest examples in Utah that were constructed prior to 1960 represent an important new method of bridge construction within the state and are considered significant. Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant. Double T-beam design – The earliest extant bridge with a double T-beam design was constructed in 1959, which coincides with the widespread use of this bridge type nationally. A Double T-beam design is a common variation within this bridge type. As such, this characteristic was determined not to be a significant variation. No type-specific aesthetic treatments identified.
Prestressed concrete T-beam (504)	3%	22	1957-1965	The character-defining feature of the prestressed concrete T-beam is a slab integrated with longitudinal beams to create a tee section.	
Prestressed concrete box beam (505)	<1%	2	1964	Character-defining features of the bridge type include box-shaped longitudinal beams in either adjacent (multiple) or spread configuration, and in either continuous or non-continuous arrangements.	
Concrete arch					
Concrete deck arch (111) and continuous concrete deck arch (211)	<1%	7	1920-1956	The character-defining features of the concrete deck arch include the closed spandrel, concrete deck arch, the arch ring, barrel, and the spandrel wall.	This is a rare bridge type. Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant. Centenary arch design – few examples of this variation exist in Utah. A centenary arch provides a variation likely developed to increase the load capacity and is a significant variation of type. Type-specific aesthetic treatments may include incising or recessed panels on the arch ring or spandrels.

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Concrete culvert					
Concrete culvert (119)	8%	64	1931-1965	Character-defining features of the concrete box culvert include four sides, some or all of which may be reinforced, and a square or rectangular opening. Character-defining features of the concrete pipe culvert include the prefabricated pipe with a round opening.	This is a standardized and prefabricated bridge type; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1913 and 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1913 when this type was first standardized are significant examples of the evolution of this type. No type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments identified. A large skew typically represents response to an engineering challenge considered an important variation except for culverts. The use of under fill as part of the bridge structure on culverts does not present a design challenge to accomplish a large skew; consequently, culverts with large skews are prevalent and not considered an important variation in this bridge type. Concrete box and pipe culverts have changed very little in both appearance and basic design since their introduction, and due to their ubiquity, the structure type is unlikely to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Often a modest structure, culverts generally are not significant for technological innovation, aesthetics, or design under *Criterion C*.
Continuous concrete culvert (219)	9%	74	1930-1965		

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Steel beam and girder					
Steel multi-beam or girder (302)	20%	153	1919-1965	Character-defining features of this type are multiple (three or more) parallel longitudinal steel beams or girders, each equally supporting, but not integrated with, the concrete deck, which only distributes live loads to the girders.	Steel beams and girders are standardized bridge types; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1923, when this type was first standardized, are significant examples of the evolution of this type Exceptional Main Span Length: • > 145 feet steel multi-beam or girder (302) • > 120 feet continuous steel multi-beam or girder (402) The use of large-scale all welded connections on bridge construction prior to 1942 represents the period of early use of this technology in bridge design in Utah and is considered a significant feature. Early use of high tensile bolts (1955-1957) – The use of high tensile bolts to replace rivets in steel bridges was a national phenomenon that occurred in the mid- and late 1950s. AASHO published standards for the use of high tensile bolts in 1957. The state of Utah published standards for high tensile bolts in 1960. Research and bridge plan review found that the first bridge plan that noted the use of high tensile bolts in Utah was dated 1961. Because of the late adoption of this technology, no bridges are recommended that derive significance from the early use of high tensile bolts in Utah. Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant.
Continuous steel multi-beam or girder (402)	3%	23	1931-1965		
Steel girder and floorbeam system (303) and Continuous steel girder and floorbeam system (403)	<1%	3	1955-1965	Character-defining features of the steel girder and floorbeam bridge type are the two longitudinal beams or girders at the outside edges of the deck and the use of an arrangement of floorbeams and stringers between the girders to support the deck	

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Steel arch					
Steel deck arch (311)	<1%	3	1957-1965	Character-defining features of steel deck arches include the curved girder or truss top chord, bottom chord, suspenders, and hinges.	This is a rare bridge type. Early use of high tensile bolts (1955-1957) – The use of high tensile bolts to replace rivets in steel bridges was a national phenomenon that occurred in the mid- and late 1950s. AASHO published standards for the use of high tensile bolts in 1957. The state of Utah published standards for high tensile bolts in 1960. The first bridge plan that noted the use of high tensile bolts in Utah was dated 1961. Because of the late adoption of this technology, no bridges are recommended that derive significance from the early use of high tensile bolts in Utah. Skew – A bridge with a skew greater than 54 degrees demonstrates an engineering design that is an important variation within a given bridge type as a distinctive engineering feature and is considered significant. No type-specific aesthetic treatments identified.
Continuous steel deck arch (411)	<1%	1	1965		
Steel thru arch (312)	<1%	2	1954-1962	Character-defining features of steel through arches include the curved girder or truss top chord, bottom chord, suspenders, ties, and hinges.	
Continuous steel thru arch (412)	<1%	1	1965		
Steel truss					
Steel though truss (310), steel deck truss (309), continuous steel deck truss (409)	2%	18	1910-1951	Character-defining features of the prefabricated truss type include the modules, which are manufactured as truss end units (with one sloped chord) or as center-span units (parallel chords), joined together with pin connections. Bailey trusses could be assembled in seven different configurations based on the character-defining modules.	Warren pony truss is standardized bridge type; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1913 and 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1913 when this type was first standardized are significant examples of the evolution of this type. Pratt configuration, through overhead, and deck truss types are rare bridge types. Exceptional Main Span Length: • > 120 feet for steel through overhead truss (310) Bailey truss configuration is significant variation within the steel truss bridge type. No type-specific aesthetic treatments identified.
Steel other Steel thru truss (310)					
Steel continuous rigid frame (407)	<1%	1	1965	Character-defining features of this bridge type include a monolithic substructure and superstructure of one continuous fabric, such that the legs are integral with the horizontal girders.	This is a rare bridge type. No type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments identified.

Table 1. Application of *Criterion C* to Individual Bridge Types to Identify Distinctive Characteristics and High Artistic Value

Bridge Type	**Prevalence of Use** (Percentage of total extant bridge population constructed through 1965)*	**Total Number Extant built prior to 1966**	**Utah Range of Years in Use** (Based on extant structures constructed through 1965)	**Description of Type and Character-defining Features**	**Significant type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments****
Steel culvert (319)	2%	18	1950-1965	Character-defining features of the steel box culvert include four sides and a square or rectangular opening. Character-defining features of the steel pipe culvert include the prefabricated pipe with a round opening.	This is a standardized and prefabricated bridge type; examples within the first three years of the introduction of standards plans in 1913 and 1923 are early examples of this bridge type. Examples constructed before 1913 when this type was first standardized are significant examples of the evolution of this type. No type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments identified. Skew – A large skew typically represents response to an engineering challenge considered an important variation except for culverts. The use of under fill as part of the bridge structure on culverts does not present a design challenge to accomplish a large skew; consequently, culverts with large skews are prevalent and not considered an important variation in this bridge type. Steel box and pipe culverts have changed very little in both appearance and basic design since their introduction, and due to their ubiquity, the structure type is unlikely to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Often a modest structure, culverts generally are not significant for technological innovation, aesthetics, or design under *Criterion C*.
Timber Slab					
Timber slab (701)	<1%	4	1950-1960	Character-defining features of the bridge type include the use of timber members arranged in a longitudinal orientation parallel to the flow of traffic, and a system of transverse members or cross beams, which assist in distributing the load between timber members.	This is an established bridge. No type-specific distinctive characteristics or aesthetic treatments identified.
Timber multi-beam or girder (702)	5%	38	1923-1960	The character-defining feature of this type is the use of longitudinal timber beams.	
Tunnels (018)	< 1%	2	1941	The character-defining feature is the tunnel and the portal structure	This is a rare structure type.

* Due to rounding, the percentages shown for the prevalence of use will not equal 100 percent. This table provides an analysis of bridge types constructed through 1965 for the purposes of establishing relative rarity of the overall population to develop the evaluation criteria.

** Length characteristics are not provided for uncommon bridge types in Utah's extant bridge population with 10 examples or less. A relative comparison among few examples does not provide useful analysis. Main span length is considered because those bridges designed at the outer limits of span length for its span type may represent an engineering solution to a particular site condition and/or design problem. Values for main span length have been determined by an analysis of NBI data and/or extrapolation from existing contexts, including the NCHRP Project 25-25, Task 15, *A Context for Common Historic Bridge Types* (2005, prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff and Engineering and Industrial Heritage).

*** A review of NBI data, bridge inspection files, images, and available plans from UDOT found the use of an estimated date of construction was a common practice, resulting in large numbers of bridges with a date of construction in 1955, 1960, and 1965. The context found that prestressed concrete was introduced between 1955 and 1960.

(2) Variation of features within bridge types

This area of *Criterion C* takes into account variations in bridge features, choices in the use and availability of materials and technology, and important firsts and innovations in common bridge types. Variations of a type may be identified through an evaluation and comparison of structural characteristics, such as exceptional main span length, exceptional skew, and other design features specific to individual bridge types. See Table 1 for significant features and variations within bridge type that demonstrate significance under *Criterion C*.

(3) Evolutions and transitions

Evolutions or transitions within a bridge type may be identified through the introduction or application of new materials, designs, and technologies. Individual bridges within established and common types may illustrate an evolution or transition of its type if it is associated with the period of early use (often the first several years of its application in Utah or nationally) and exhibits distinctive design features when compared to other specimens of its type in Utah, or was constructed before the USRC began implementing standard plans for its bridge type. The introduction and early use of prestressed concrete, a new material and technology, is considered significant as an evolution within bridge types.

See Table 1 for a discussion of evolutions or transitions within a bridge type that demonstrate significance under *Criterion C*.

B. High artistic value

Bridges designed with outstanding architectural style expressed in their overall form, aesthetic treatment, or ornamentation may possess high artistic value. Most Utah bridges were utilitarian and the intentional application of ornamentation was limited. The use of prefabricated bridge elements and standard specifications and/or plans for bridge components contributed to the limited application of ornamentation and bridge aesthetics were generally not emphasized in the engineering literature of the period. As such, aesthetic treatments on bridges were found to be limited. Exceptions include bridges that display Neoclassical design features that exemplify the City Beautiful aesthetic, the Art Deco/Streamline Moderne styles, or Rustic style.

The addition of any one aesthetic treatment, such as a decorative railing or pilasters, usually is not adequate to demonstrate high artistic value, including simple open balustrade concrete railings of standard design or modest metal pole type railings (see Appendix C for select examples of these railing types). The overall design and form must reflect aesthetic design intent versus limited or isolated application of ornamentation. In some cases, aesthetic treatment was considered in the design of the overall form of the structure. Examples of bridges with possible significance may be those that display elements of the Modernist style resulting in simple structures with the graceful lines and sophisticated use of materials stand out from other example within a bridge type. However, typically few bridges in the subject period will reflect enough of the Modernist style or design aesthetic to possess high artistic value under *Criterion C*.

The historic context identified five Utah bridges that were recognized by the American Institute of Steel Construction for qualities related to design and construction and aesthetics at the time of their construction. These bridges are monumental in nature, crossing major rivers or gorges, and exhibit aesthetic qualities in their overall form for when compared to other bridges within the study period. Table 1 provides aesthetic treatments specific to applicable bridge types that are considered significant under this consideration.

C. Work of a master

Bridges designed by a significant engineer, architect, or firm may be significant as the work of a master. An eligible bridge must have notable evidence reflecting the distinguishing characteristics of the significant designer. This high standard requires both the presence of a recognized engineering master and a bridge that clearly reflects that master's characteristic work.

National and state specifications and design standards were applied to most bridge constructed during the study period. As such, the increasing adoption of national standards served to change the involvement of individual engineers and firms from the highly individualistic bridge-building practices of early twentieth century firms to a more anonymous, professionalized, and institutionalized approach to bridge engineering.

The context found that state and counties increased the use of consulting engineers and firms for bridge design generally after 1959. Review of available bridge plans reveals there are few bridges that were not designed by the USRC before 1959.[5] Individual engineers and consulting firms may be associated with large bridge projects in the postwar period, but it is unlikely that individual bridge designs would reflect the distinguishing characteristics of a single prominent engineer or firm since the consultants were required to apply the same national and state standards that USRC engineers used.

A bridge recognized for its significance as the work of an engineering master would need to clearly convey distinguishing characteristics evident only to the master's important work or be a rare example of an important early bridge builder in order to be considered significant under this consideration of *Criterion C*.

[5] Research completed for Volume 1 and a review of the bridge inspection files at UDOT in March 2010 found fewer bridge plans for county-owned bridges than for state-owned bridges.

4. Integrity Requirements for National Register Eligibility

According to the *National Register Bulletin – How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the evaluation criteria, but also must display historic integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance.

Historic integrity should be distinguished from structural (or functional) integrity. Structural integrity describes the ability of a bridge to function as it was originally designed and may be present in a structure that has little or no historic integrity. On the other hand, a bridge may retain historic integrity while losing structural integrity. For example, a bridge significant for its superstructure design that has had its substructure undermined through flooding may not function as originally designed due to a reduced load capacity. However, the bridge would retain historic integrity because no change had been made to the fabric of the superstructure, which is the significant element of the bridge.

Within the concept of integrity, the evaluation criteria recognize seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The seven aspects of integrity are:

- *Design – The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.*

  Design refers to the physical features that make up the structure. In bridges, changes in design often are closely related to changes in materials.

- *Materials – The physical elements that were used in the original design and construction of a bridge.*

  Bridge materials (concrete, steel, or timber) are used in a structure's design and construction. Bridge materials are intimately connected with design.

- *Workmanship – The physical evidence of the crafts used in the construction of a bridge.*

  Workmanship and crafts reflect the labor and skill of artisans. With the increasing standardization and industrialization of bridge design and construction during the twentieth century, the use of crafts became rare and is unlikely to be a significant aspect of integrity for bridges of the subject period.

- *Location – The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.*

  Location refers to the specific place where a bridge was built or an event occurred.

- *Setting – The physical environment of a historic property*

  Setting refers to the character of the place in which the bridge played its historical role. Setting often reflects the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve.

- *Feeling – A bridge's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.*

  The aspect of feeling results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character.

- *Association – The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.*

  A property retains association if it is the place where the important event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer.

An important part of establishing integrity is determining whether a bridge retains the essential physical features that are character defining and enable it to convey its historic identity. This process involves the following steps: (1) defining the essential physical features related to significance, (2) determining if the features are retained and visible enough to convey significance, and (3) determining which aspects of integrity are important to the bridge's significance and if they are present. That is, the amount of change to a bridge—its loss of integrity—needs to be weighed against its engineering and historical significance in making eligibility recommendations. In some cases, alterations during the structure's historical period may contribute to its significance and thus would not lead to an assessment of a loss of integrity.

Different aspects of integrity affect the eligibility of a structure in different ways, depending on how each relates to the property's significance. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance under each of the evaluation criterion. Therefore, the assessment of integrity for *Criterion A* differs from the assessment for *Criterion C*. A discussion of the aspects of integrity and their relationship to *Criteria A* and *C* follows. Examples of the types of alterations that may render a structure not eligible for listing in the National Register are included.

Review of available bridge plans and bridge inspection files indicates standard railing designs were established prior to World War II and applied to reinforced concrete and steel bridge types. These railings are characterized as modest metal railings that extend between concrete end posts and concrete railing with an open balustrade. Appendix C provides select examples of these railing types. The loss of an original railing by itself will typically not result in an overall loss of historic integrity. See Tables 2 and 3 for details on the assessment of historic integrity under *Criteria A* and *C*.

A. Assessing integrity related to *Criterion A*

Criterion A relates to the significance of a structure gained through its historical associations. Therefore, integrity aspects of location, setting, feeling, and association play an important role in conveying the structure's significance. As a result, these aspects of integrity are often weighed more heavily in the assessment of a structure's overall historic integrity under *Criterion A*. Integrity aspects of design, workmanship, and materials are also important, but alterations that affect these aspects may not result in the same level of diminished integrity. Table 2 summarizes examples of alterations and provides guidance on their relative importance to the loss of historic integrity for a structure to be eligible under *Criterion A*.

Table 2
Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion A*

Category	Item	Examples
Location, setting, feeling, and association	***Extensive alteration*** These alterations lead to an overall loss of historic integrity that renders a structure not eligible under *Criterion A.*	• Relocated, where relocation clearly separates structure from context of historic theme (e.g., bridge is significant for relationship with historic road and is relocated away from the historic road). • Widened superstructure with additional lanes not representing the evolution of a transportation route and historic theme. • Extensive overall loss of historic integrity due to cumulative alterations.
	Alterations These alterations were evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Depending on the degree of alteration and number of alterations, the cumulative effect may lead to an overall loss of historic integrity that render a structure not eligible under *Criterion A*; however, one of these alterations taken alone generally did not render a structure not eligible.	• Relocated superstructure, where relocation site may possess some elements of historic theme (e.g., bridge is significant as gateway and is relocated to another gateway site). • Rural bridge has been encroached upon with development or other features that diminish its ability to convey its association with the historic theme. • Lengthened superstructure. • Replacement of main members integral to superstructure.

Table 2
Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion A*

Category	Item	Examples
Materials, workmanship, and design	***Minor alterations*** These alterations must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Depending on the degree of alteration and number of alterations, the cumulative effect may lead to an overall loss of historic integrity that render a structure not eligible under *Criterion A*; however, one of these alterations taken alone generally did not render a structure not eligible.	• Replacement of features/materials not in-kind. • Change in railing/parapet, including replacement or loss.

B. Assessing integrity related to *Criterion C*

Since *Criterion C* relates to the engineering and/or architectural significance of a structure, the integrity aspects of design, workmanship, and materials are typically the most important aspects of historic integrity when evaluating a bridge under *Criterion C*. This is because they allow a structure to convey its physical features and characterize the type, period, or method of construction. A change of location or setting may result in diminished integrity under *Criterion C* when the design of the bridge appears to have been influenced by the immediate environment or site conditions. Table 3 summarizes examples of alterations and their relative importance to the loss of historic integrity for a structure eligible under *Criterion C*.

Table 3
Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion C*

Category	Item	Examples
Materials, workmanship, and design	***Extensive alterations*** These alterations lead to an overall loss of historic integrity that renders a structure not eligible under *Criterion C*.	• Superstructure replacement. • Replacement of main members integral to superstructure. • Widening of the structure. • Lengthened superstructure. • Multiple, substantial, individual alterations creating cumulative effect on integrity.

Table 3
Assessment of Historic Integrity Under *Criterion C*

Category	Item	Examples
	Alterations These alterations must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Depending on the degree of alteration and number of alterations, the cumulative effect may lead to an overall loss of historic integrity that render a structure not eligible under *Criterion C*; however, one of these alterations taken alone generally did not render a structure not eligible.	• Added main members. • Replacement of features/materials not in-kind. • Change in railing/parapet, including replacement or loss.
Location, setting, feeling, and association	***Inappropriate relocation*** When taken alone, this loss of integrity generally will not render a structure not eligible.	• Relocated superstructure.

5. Eligibility Recommendations

The evaluation criteria were applied to the bridges constructed through 1965 following the National Register Criteria for Evaluation outlined in Sections 3, 4, and 5. A summary of bridges within each construction period are provided in Sections 5.A and 5.B, and a tabular listing of eligibility recommendations is provided in Sections 5.C through 5.H.

A. Pre-1946 Bridges – Eligibility recommendations summary

(1) *Criterion A: Transportation*

(a) Early road improvement and promotional associations

Twelve bridges were identified for a potential association with the Lincoln Highway, Midland Trail, or the Arrowhead Trail. These bridges were constructed prior to 1926, during the period these routes functioned and before being designated as U.S. Highways, and are located in close proximity to the alignment of one of the named highways. The alignment of the early named highways followed existing early twentieth century roads and frequently changed over time. Delineating the exact routes was not completed as part of this study; however, the Lincoln Highway and the Midland Trail are known to have followed portions of former U.S. 30 and 40 and the Arrowhead Trail is known to have followed portions of former U.S. 91. Former U.S. 30 and U.S. 40 subsequently became I-80 and former U.S. 91 became I-15. Based on the research completed for this project, none of the twelve bridges identified was found to have direct association with an early named highway and they were not considered significant under this sub-theme. Further investigations may reveal a direct association or identify additional bridges that need to be evaluated under this sub-theme.

(b) S.R. and U.S. Highways

Eleven bridges located on the U.S. and S.R. Highway system were built within the early period (1910-1925 for S.R. Highways; 1926-1931 for U.S. Highways) of USRC's prewar road and bridge improvement program. Investigations into these bridges did not reveal any evidence that demonstrates that the construction of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation in Utah. These bridges were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(c) Connections to state boundaries

Four bridges located on the U.S. and S.R. Highway systems were built during the early twentieth century (prior to 1935), to connect Utah to the Colorado, Arizona, and Nevada state borders. The following road segments were reviewed for bridges associated with this sub-theme:

- Former U.S. 91 (current I-15) between Brigham City and the Idaho border in Cache County

- Former U.S. 91 (current 1-15) between St. George and the Nevada border in Washington County

- U.S. 89 between Kanab and the Arizona Border in Kane County
- S.R. 40 between Ft. Duchesne through Vernal to the Colorado border in Duchesne and Uintah Counties
- Former U.S. 30 (current I-80) between Emory and the Wyoming border in Utah, Morgan, and Rich Counties
- Former U.S. 40 (current I-80) from Salt Lake to the Nevada border in Tooele County

Investigations into these bridges did not reveal any evidence that demonstrates that the construction of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation in Utah. These bridges were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(d) Grade-separations

Ten bridges carried a railroad over a highway during the USRC's program to improve safety at highway and railroad intersections during the prewar period. Investigation into these bridges found that steel girders (302) were a common bridge type (comprising nine of the 10 bridges) and the construction of these bridges ranged from 1935 to 1939. Investigations did not reveal early examples or important design features that demonstrates that the construction of any of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation in Utah. As such, these grade-separation structures are not considered to be significant under this sub-theme.

Five of the bridges (Cache County Bridge 0C 145, Emery County Bridge 0C 144, Salt Lake County Bridge 0C 141, and Utah County Bridges 0C 149 and 0D 413) have distinguishable features within their bridge type and are recommended eligible under *Criterion C* or other sub-themes under *Criterion A*.

(e) Enhance auto tourism in southern Utah

Six bridges were located on routes that provide access to scenic and recreational areas in southern Utah, such as National Park Service Units and National Forests, or that appeared to shorten or substantially improve park or forest access in the state (i.e. made an important contribution in shortening the route to a park or recreation area, overcame a major obstacle to access such as a canyon, or was in close proximity to a National Park or National Forest or entrance). Investigations found two tunnel structures (Garfield Bridge No. 0V 55 and 0V 56) were constructed for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, and provide access to Bryce Canyon National Park carrying traffic through areas of the state with mountainous terrain. These structures have a direct association with efforts to improve access to recreational areas in southern Utah. These bridges were considered significant, evaluated for historic integrity, and recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence was found that demonstrates that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of this sub-theme. The remaining bridges appear to have been constructed as one component within larger highway improvement projects.

(f) Depression-era programs

A total of 104 bridges constructed between 1934 and 1942 were reviewed to identify bridges that either represent distinctive features or have a direct association with a depression-era project within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of Depression-era projects. Six bridges (Cache County Bridge 0D 368, Davis County Bridge 0D 378, Salt Lake County Bridge 0C 141, Sevier County Bridge 0D 375A, and Weber County Bridges 0D 388 and 389) were associated with specific projects funded under the Depression-era projects. These bridges were considered significant, evaluated for historic integrity, and recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence was found that demonstrates that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of this sub-theme. The remaining bridges do not appear to have distinguishable features when compared to other bridges constructed during the Depression-era and do not have a known direct association with a Depression-era program and were recommended not eligible.

(g) Strategic Highway Network

Eleven bridges were constructed between 1942 and 1945 in counties known to have provided access to military installations and vital defense industries (Tooele, Utah, Morgan, Rich, Cache, Weber, Salt Lake, Juab, Millard, Beaver, Iron, and Washington Counties) or that are located along the Strategic Highway Network (former U.S. 91 and former U.S. 40). Portions of former U.S. 40 subsequently became I-80 and portions of former U.S. 91 became I-15. Investigations into these 11 bridges did not reveal any evidence that demonstrates that the construction of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation related to specific World War II transportation programs. These bridges were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(h) Water reclamation projects

Seven bridges were identified under this sub-theme. Two bridges (Cache County Bridge 005052D and Carbon County Bridge 0D 202) provide direct transportation access to reclamation facilities and contributed individually to the facilitating transportation access to or over a water development undertaking or reclamation project. The construction of these bridges illustrates a direct response to these reclamation projects and were evaluated for historic integrity and are recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence was found that clearly demonstrates that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of this sub-theme. The remaining bridges appear to have been constructed as one component within larger highway improvement project to facilitate the construction of a reclamation project and were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

Table 4. Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion A* (by Sub-Theme) for Pre-1946 Bridges

Sub-Theme	Total Number of Bridges Subject to Evaluation	Total Eligible Under *Criterion A*
Early road improvement and promotional associations	12	0
State Route Highways and U.S. Highways	11	0
Connections to state boundaries	4	0
Grade-separations	10	0
Enhance auto tourism in southern Utah	6	2
Depression-era programs	104	6
Strategic Highway Network	11	0
Water reclamation projects	7	2
Total	**165**	**10**

(2) *Criterion C: Design/Construction*

Table 5. Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion C* (by Bridge Type) for Pre-1946 Bridges

Main Span Code	Bridge Type	Total Number of Bridges Subject to Evaluation	Total Eligible Under *Criterion C*
107	Concrete frame	25	1
207	Concrete continuous frame	5	0
101	Concrete slab	22	2
201	Concrete continuous slab	3	1
104	Concrete T-beam	37	2
204	Concrete continuous T-beam	6	1
111	Concrete arch – deck	2	2
211	Concrete continuous arch – deck	2	2
119	Concrete culvert	12	0
219	Concrete continuous culvert	8	0
302	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder	44	6
402	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder	4	1
303, 403	Steel simple and continuous girder and floorbeam system	1	0
310	Steel truss – through	14	11
409	Continuous steel truss – deck	1	1
702	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder	22	0
018	Tunnel	2	2
	Total	**210**	**32**

Total eligible bridges for pre-1946 bridges:

- 10 bridges recommended eligible under *Criterion A*
- 32 bridges recommended eligible under *Criterion C*
    - 25 bridges recommended eligible for distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction
    - Six bridges recommended eligible for high artistic value
    - One bridge recommended eligible for work of a master
- Seven bridges recommended eligible under both *Criterion A* and *Criterion C*

B. Post-1945 bridges – Eligibility recommendations summary

(1) *Criterion A: Transportation*

(a) Expansion of State Route Highways and U.S. Highways

Ten bridges located on the U.S. and S.R. highway system were built within the early period (1947-1948) of USRC's post-World War II road and bridge improvement program. Investigations into these bridges did not reveal any evidence that demonstrates that the construction of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation in Utah. Individually these bridges were not considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(b) Interstate overpasses

Twenty-three Interstate overpasses were identified within the study period. Investigations into Interstate overpass bridges did not reveal any evidence that demonstrates that the construction of these bridges, individually, played an important role in transportation in Utah. Individually these bridges were not considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(c) Major crossings and improvements in access and safety

Twelve bridges were identified that cross major river crossings, such as the Colorado, Green, or San Juan Rivers, or appeared to shorten or substantially improve park access (i.e. made an important contribution in shortening the route to a park or recreation area, overcame a major obstacle to access, such as a canyon, or was in close proximity to the park entrance). Investigations found two of the bridges (San Juan County Bridge No. 037008C and Uintah County Bridge 0C 640) were constructed for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and provide access to areas of the state that were previously difficult to access or that were inaccessible. These bridges have a direct association with efforts by the federal government to improve access to Native American lands. These bridges are considered significant, evaluated for historic integrity, and are recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence

demonstrates that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of this sub-theme. The remaining bridges appear to have been constructed as one component within larger highway improvement projects and were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(d) Reclamation projects

Thirty-three bridges were identified under this sub-theme. Seven bridges were constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. An additional 26 structures were located in close geographic proximity to a reclamation project on a known route supplying equipment, personnel, and materials for the construction of dams, reservoirs, pumping stations, and work camps. Two bridges (Weber County Bridge 0D 737and Daggett County Bridge 0C 724) provide direct transportation access to reclamation facilities and contributed individually to the facilitation of a water development undertaking or reclamation efforts in which they are associated. These bridges clearly illustrate a direct response in the construction of the bridges to these reclamation projects. These two bridges were evaluated for historic integrity and are recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence was found that clearly demonstrates that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of this sub-theme. These bridges were constructed as one component within larger highway improvement projects to facilitate the construction of a reclamation project and were not individually considered to possess significance under this sub-theme.

(e) Natural resource extraction

Twenty-nine bridges were identified and evaluated for a possible association under the sub-theme of providing transportation for natural resource extraction and mining operations. These bridges were in close proximity to a known mining or extractive operation (i.e. a copper mine or smelter facility, a crushing mill, or a coal or oil field, or specific facilities used to transport raw materials). Four bridges (Salt Lake County Bridges 0C 436, 4C 371, 0D 449, and 2C 371) were constructed as grade-separation bridges to cross a line of the Kennecott Railroad. These bridges facilitated the development of copper mining by providing important access and transport of materials by rail to and from mining operations. These bridges display a direct association with natural resource extraction and were evaluated for historic integrity and are recommended eligible for the National Register. Two bridges (Salt Lake County Bridge Nos. 0C 253 and 0C 254) were designed by the Utah Copper Company. The state entered into an agreement with the Kennecott Copper Company to maintain these bridges, while the USRC maintained the roadway. These bridges are grade-separation structures that carry the Kennecott Railroad to facilitate activities associated with copper mining. They have a direct association with natural resource extraction and were evaluated for historic integrity and are recommended eligible for the National Register. No evidence was found to demonstrate that the construction of the remaining bridges, individually, played an important role in the development of these natural resource extraction industries.

Table 6. Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion A* (by Sub-Theme) for Post-1945 Bridges

Sub-Theme	Total Number of Bridges Subject to Evaluation	Total Eligible Under *Criterion A*
Expansion of State Route and U.S. Highways	10	0
Interstate Overpasses	23	0
Major Crossings and Improvements in Access and Safety	12	2
Reclamation Projects	33	2
Natural Resource Extraction	29	6
Total	**105**	**10**

(2) *Criterion C: Design/Construction*

Table 7. Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion C* (by Bridge Type) for Post-1945 Bridges

Main Span Code	Bridge Type	Total Number of Bridges Subject to Evaluation	Total Eligible Under *Criterion C*
107	Concrete frame	71	3
207	Concrete continuous frame	12	0
101	Concrete slab	26	2
201	Concrete continuous slab	4	0
202	Concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder	1	0
104	Concrete T-beam	10	2
204	Concrete continuous T-beam	11	1
205	Concrete continuous box beam or girders - multiple	1	1
502	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder	19	0
504	Prestressed concrete T-beam	22	2
505	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple	2	0
111	Concrete arch - deck	4	3
119	Concrete culvert	43	0
219	Concrete continuous culvert	49	0
302	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder	75	2
402	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder	12	1

Table 7. Summary of Eligibility Recommendations for *Criterion C* (by Bridge Type) for Post-1945 Bridges

Main Span Code	Bridge Type	Total Number of Bridges Subject to Evaluation	Total Eligible Under *Criterion C*
403	Steel continuous girder and floorbeam system	2	0
311	Steel arch - deck	2	2
312	Steel arch - thru	2	2
412	Steel continuous arch - thru	1	1
310	Steel truss - thru	1	1
407	Steel continuous frame	1	1
319	Steel culvert	18	0
701	Timber slab	4	0
702	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder	16	0
	Total	**409**	**24**

Total eligible bridges for post-1945 bridges:

- 10 bridges recommended eligible under *Criterion A*
- 24 bridges recommended eligible under *Criterion C*
    - 20 bridges recommended eligible for distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction
    - Four bridges recommended eligible for high artistic value
    - No bridges recommended eligible for work of a master
- Two bridges recommended eligible under both *Criterion A* and *Criterion C*

A tabular listing of eligibility recommendations is provided below. Separate listings are provided for each construction period: one list is organized by UDOT Region (Sections 5.C and 5.E) and one list is organized by county (Sections 5.D and 5.F). Inventory forms for each bridge with images were provided to UDOT as part of this effort.

This section also provides a tabular listing of bridges excluded from the inventory and the reason for exclusion. Separate listings are provided; one list is organized by UDOT Region (Section 5.G) and one list is organized by county (Section 5.H).

Sections organized by UDOT Regions are organized as follows:

- Region 1 Local
- Region 2 Local
- Region 3 Local
- Region 4C Local
- Region 4P Local
- Region 4R Local
- Region 1
- Region 2
- Region 3
- Region 4C
- Region 4P
- Region 4R

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003004D	Box Elder	0	TOWN STR.-FA. #526	DEEP CREEK	1941	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003021C	Box Elder	0	6800 WEST STREET	WEST CORINNE CANAL	1920	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003025D	Box Elder	0	6800 WEST STREET	WEST CORINNE CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003027C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003032C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1940	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003033C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003039C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003040C	Box Elder	0	TOWN ROAD-FA.#512	MALAD RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003041C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1945	Steel continuous truss - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003046D	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1928	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003047C	Box Elder	0	CITY ROAD-GARLAND	WEST CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003048A	Box Elder	0	CO. RD. F.A. #506	MALAD RIVER	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003051C	Box Elder	0	FA. #510	DRAINAGE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003064D	Box Elder	0	300 EAST STREET	BOX ELDER CREEK	1930	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005004D	Cache	0	CITY STREET	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1920	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005034C	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005043D	Cache	0	500 NO. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005044D	Cache	0	600 NO. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005046D	Cache	0	200 E. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1920	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005051D	Cache	0	CITY STREET	WELLSVILLE CANYON CREEK	1920	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005052D	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD FA#545	HYRUM DAM SPILLWAY	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Hyrum Dam and Reservior project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029001C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST CANYON CREEK	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029002C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029006C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1930	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029013D	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY CREEK	1927	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029014D	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER & LOST CREEK	1934	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033001A	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS CREEK	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033006C	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1917	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge represents the work of a significant bridge builder in Utah. As such, it illustrates the work of a master and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

James J. Burke was responsible for fabricating early steel truss bridges in Utah. Research and data collection reveal that few examples of the work of Burke remain. As such, this bridge is a rare and important example of the characteristic work of one of the earliest Utah bridge builders.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033014C	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057003D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	WARREN CANAL	1938	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057015D	Weber	0	WEBER COUNTY ROAD	HOOPER CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057020V	Weber	0	CITY STREET	HOOPER CANAL	1945	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057025C	Weber	0	GRANT AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057028D	Weber	0	GRAMERCY AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1938	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057048D	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK OGDEN RIVER	1938	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035003D	Salt Lake	0	13400 SOUTH STREET	UTAH AND SALT LAKE CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035010D	Salt Lake	0	5300 SOUTH STREET	LITTLE COTTONWOOD CR.	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035019D	Salt Lake	0	2100 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1943	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035040C	Salt Lake	0	8800 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035049D	Salt Lake	0	11400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035064D	Salt Lake	0	COTTONWOOD LANE	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1940	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035065D	Salt Lake	0	WALKER LANE	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1938	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035066D	Salt Lake	0	HIGHLAND DRIVE	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1936	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035068D	Salt Lake	0	ARBOR LN.(5000 SO)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035069D	Salt Lake	0	6200 SOUTH STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey design significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035079D	Salt Lake	0	12300 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1941	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035081D	Salt Lake	0	13580 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1945	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035131D	Salt Lake	0	5600 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035154D	Salt Lake	0	500 EAST STREET	MILL CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043027C	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043029D	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	ECHO CREEK	1924	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043046C	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	ABANDONED RAILROAD GRADE	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013004C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1945	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013005C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013007C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1915	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013030C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	B.I.A. CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013058C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1929	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
023005D	Juab	0	CNTY.ROAD,F.A .#270	YUBA DAM SPILLWAY	1932	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047027A	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY GULCH CREEK	1939	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049001D	Utah	0	200 SOUTH STREET	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1925	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049017D	Utah	0	800 EAST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049019D	Utah	0	400 EAST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049033D	Utah	0	CITY ST.,10300 NO.	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049035D	Utah	0	CITY ST.,6000 WEST	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049037D	Utah	0	4000 WEST STREET	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049048C	Utah	0	CO RD-800 WEST ST	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049050C	Utah	0	GOOSENEST DR,CO.RD	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049055C	Utah	0	CO.RD.,5600 W. ST.	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049056C	Utah	0	200 EAST STREET	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049065A	Utah	0	CO. RD.AT NEBO CRK	THISTLE CREEK	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
051003D	Wasatch	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD.	CURRANT CREEK	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
051007A	Wasatch	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD	PROVO RIVER	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001003C	Beaver	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAVER RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001010C	Beaver	0	NAVAJO TRAIL	BEAVER RIVER	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007007C	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	COAL WASH	1915	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007010A	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007015C	Carbon	0	PRICE CITY STREET	PRICE RIVER	1910	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007020C	Carbon	0	HELPER CITY STREET	HARD SCRABBLE WASH	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007021D	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	SPRING CANYON WASH	1920	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007027C	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	PRICE RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007030D	Carbon	0	NORTH MAIN STREET	SPRING CANYON WASH	1922	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017002C	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017004C	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017011A	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017015D	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1933	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017024D	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	ESCALANTE RIVER	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017044C	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1928	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019005C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	PACK CREEK	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019014C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019015C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	DANISH WASH	1930	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019016A	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1933	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019017A	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1939	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019018A	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	COAL CREEK	1933	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019020C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	THOMPSON WASH	1919	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019031C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS WASH	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021003C	Iron	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT WASH	1932	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021004D	Iron	0	PAROWAN MAIN ST.	PAROWAN CREEK	1925	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
025004A	Kane	0	COUNTY ROAD	LONG VALLEY CREEK	1937	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
025008C	Kane	0	TOWN STREET	EAST FORK VIRGIN RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
027005A	Millard	0	COUNTY ROAD	CENTRAL UTAH CANAL	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
031009A	Piute	0	COUNTY ROAD	OTTER CR. RES. OUTLET CH	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
031012D	Piute	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039003C	Sanpete	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039019A	Sanpete	0	400 EAST STREET	PLEASANT CREEK	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039020A	Sanpete	0	900 EAST STREET	PLEASANT CREEK	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041012D	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041016E	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	VERMILLION CANAL	1940	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041025C	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1920	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041034A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVEN MILE CREEK	1944	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041036A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALINA CREEK	1934	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053011D	Washington	0	MIDDLETON DRIVE	MIDDLETON WASH	1927	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053012D	Washington	0	HURRICANE CITY RD.	LEEDS CREEK	1931	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053013C	Washington	0	COUNTY ROAD	VIRGIN RIVER	1908	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053019C	Washington	0	BRIDGE STREET	VIRGIN RIVER	1924	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053023D	Washington	0	TOWN ROAD	WET SANDY WASH	1924	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053025D	Washington	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY FORK CREEK	1930	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053026D	Washington	0	COUNTY ROAD	ASH CREEK	1925	Concrete continuous arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053031C	Washington	0	COUNTY ROAD	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1931	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 368	Cache	0.994	SR-101	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 261	Morgan	0.998	SR-167	GORDON CREEK	1927	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 499	Weber	1.441	SR-60	UP&L PENSTOCK PIPE	1929	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 744	Weber	2.239	SR-97	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 147	Box Elder	3.639	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-13	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 378	Davis	4.279	SR-37	HOOPER CANAL	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 383	Box Elder	5.217	SR-13	CHASE SLOUGH	1937	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 734	Davis	8.107	SR-106	FARMINGTON CREEK	1927	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 820	Box Elder	8.146	SR-102	WEST CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 377	Morgan	8.779	SR-66	EAST CANYON CREEK	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 427	Rich	10.29	SR-16	WOODRUFF CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 164	Morgan	13.174	SR-66	WEBER RIVER	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 382	Rich	17.192	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1934	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 446	Box Elder	17.466	SR-102	CORINNE CANAL	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 635	Cache	18.966	SR-23	NEWTON CREEK	1938	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 324	Rich	19.959	SR-16	BIG CREEK	1934	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 381	Rich	20.164	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 411	Box Elder	20.562	SR-13	CORINNE CANAL	1938	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 420	Rich	23.989	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 345	Box Elder	28.695	SR-13	MALAD RIVER	1933	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 388	Weber	28.746	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 681	Cache	29.029	SR-23	WEST CACHE CANAL	1932	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 980	Box Elder	29.165	SR-13	BOTHWELL CANAL	1939	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 389	Weber	29.2	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 395	Weber	32.418	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 145	Cache	42.401	US-91 (SR-91)	ABANDONED RAILROAD X-ING	1936	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 330	Davis	70.65	SR-68, SBL	US-89 (SR-89)	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is associated with an important historic program or project at the state or local level; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey historical significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge possesses artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey design significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge represents an uncommon, rare, or newly established bridge type in Utah; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey engineering significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 588A	Cache	104.201	SR-30	LITTLE BEAR RIVER O'FLO	1937	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 588D	Cache	104.715	SR-30	LITTLE BEAR RIVER O'FLO	1937	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 388	Rich	133.283	SR-30	BECKWITH CANAL	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 205	Rich	134.176	SR-30	BEAR RIVER	1941	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents large-scale welding for bridge construction during the early period of use of this technology in Utah and is considered a significant design feature.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 707	Cache	386.597	US-89 (SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1233	Cache	463.075	US-89 (SR-89)	HYDE PARK CANAL	1931	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 191	Summit	0.19	SR-302	WEBER RIVER	1940	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 779	Salt Lake	1.247	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-140	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 258	Salt Lake	4.882	SR-190	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 410	Salt Lake	6.016	SR-71 (700 EAST)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 719	Summit	13.042	SR-32	WEBER-PROVO DIV.CANAL	1942	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 807	Salt Lake	14.347	SR-209	LITTLE COTTONWOOD CREEK	1935	Concrete continuous arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment in bridge design associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 480	Salt Lake	57.293	SR-68,REDWOOD ROAD	SURPLUS CANAL	1936	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1068	Salt Lake	313.453	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1067	Salt Lake	313.582	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1066	Salt Lake	313.852	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 141	Salt Lake	313.862	UTA,LIGHT RAIL LN.	US-89 (SR-89)	1936	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1065	Salt Lake	314.652	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 811	Salt Lake	372.857	US-89 (SR-89)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1916	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 14.2	Wasatch	0	Heber Creeper RR	Provo River	1938	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 3.3	Wasatch	0	Heber Creeper RR	Upper Provo River	1938	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 3.5	Wasatch	0	Heber Creeper RR	Provo River	1938	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 413	Utah	0.865	SR-114	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREET	1937	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 72	Duchesne	1.193	SR-311	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1928	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 427	Utah	1.534	SR-198	HIGH LINE CANAL	1930	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 199	Utah	1.699	SR-114	PROVO RIVER	1941	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents large-scale welding for bridge construction during the early period of use of this technology in Utah and is considered a significant design feature.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 149	Utah	2.699	SR-164 WBL ONLY	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1941	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 140	Utah	3.075	UTAH RAILWAY	SR-51	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 139	Utah	3.155	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-51	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2249	Utah	3.444	SR-52	MURDOCK CANAL	1941	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 470	Wasatch	5.211	SR-113	PROVO RIVER	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 431	Utah	7.737	SR-92	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1939	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 447	Utah	11.561	SR-198	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1940	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 166	Wasatch	17.426	HEBER CREEPER RR.	SR-189	1939	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 246	Uintah	38.762	SR-121	STEINAKER SERVICE CANAL	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 402	Juab	41.069	SR-28	SALT CREEK	1924	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 282	Duchesne	66.045	US-40 STOCKTRAIL	RED CREEK	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 560	Duchesne	97.195	US-40 (SR-40)	ANTELOPE CREEK	1926	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 593	Duchesne	114.686	US-40 (SR-40)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1926	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 22	Utah	328.457	US-89 (SR-89)-Main	HOBBLE CREEK	1913	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 451	Utah	336.181	US-89 (SR-89)	PROVO RIVER	1942	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 149	Utah	344.858	UNION PACIFIC RR	US-89 (SR-89)	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 739	Uintah	353.76	US-191 (SR-191)	ASHLEY CREEK	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 144	Emery	0.239	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-19	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 417	Carbon	0.492	SR-139	SO.SPRING GLEN STREAM	1933	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 416	Washington	0.71	SR-212	MILL CREEK	1937	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 385	Sevier	0.89	SR-76	UNNAMED WASH	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 360	Carbon	1.308	SR-139	SPRING GLEN WASH	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 285	Beaver	1.31	SR-160	BEAVER RIVER	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 600	Millard	2.939	SR-99	CHALK CREEK	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is associated with an important historic program or project at the state or local level; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey historical significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 375A	Sevier	3.512	SR-256	SEVIER RIVER	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 639	Sanpete	3.949	SR-116	SAN PITCH RIVER	1938	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 55	Garfield	4.63	ROCK ARCH TUNNEL	SR-12	1941	Other tunnel

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge crosses a major river, gorge, or canyon or provides access to scenic areas and has an important and direct association with efforts by the state to improve transportation access within Utah.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 56	Garfield	4.726	ROCK ARCH TUNNEL	SR-12	1941	Other tunnel

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge crosses a major river, gorge, or canyon or provides access to scenic areas and has an important and direct association with efforts by the state to improve transportation access within Utah.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 276	Sevier	8.165	SR-24	NORTH CEDAR CREEK	1927	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 272	Sevier	9.274	SR-118	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 158	Washington	10.968	SR-9	VIRGIN RIVER	1937	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 202	Carbon	11.377	SR-96	SCOFIELD DAM SPILLWAY	1944	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Scofield Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 426	Washington	14.827	SR-9	DRY WASH	1934	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 82	Washington	31.543	SR-9	SPRINGDALE WASH	1926	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 387	Sevier	34.036	SR-72	POST HOLLOW WASH	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 154	Kane	34.902	SR-14	SWAINS CREEK	1935	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1254	Sanpete	55.975	SR-132	SAN PITCH RIVER	1931	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 401	Carbon	67.823	SR-10	PRICE RIVER	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 237	Millard	85.33	US-6 (SR-6)	DESERET CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

C. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 689	Kane	85.81	US-89 (SR-89)	VIRGIN RIVER	1932	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 204	Kane	90.906	US-89 (SR-89)	LONG VALLEY CREEK	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 729	Garfield	137.563	US-89 (SR-89)	SANDY CREEK	1931	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 322	Utah	202.125	US-6 (SR-6)	SOLDIER CREEK	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 339	Carbon	247.111	US-6 (SR-6)	FLOOD WASH	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 394	Sanpete	277.911	US-89 (SR-89)	PLEASANT CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Beaver

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001003C	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAVER RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001010C	Region 4C Local	0	NAVAJO TRAIL	BEAVER RIVER	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 285	Region 4C	1.31	SR-160	BEAVER RIVER	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003004D	Region 1 Local	0	TOWN STR.-FA. #526	DEEP CREEK	1941	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003021C	Region 1 Local	0	6800 WEST STREET	WEST CORINNE CANAL	1920	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003025D	Region 1 Local	0	6800 WEST STREET	WEST CORINNE CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003027C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003032C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1940	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003033C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003039C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003040C	Region 1 Local	0	TOWN ROAD-FA.#512	MALAD RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003041C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1945	Steel continuous truss - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003046D	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1928	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003047C	Region 1 Local	0	CITY ROAD-GARLAND	WEST CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003048A	Region 1 Local	0	CO. RD. F.A. #506	MALAD RIVER	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003051C	Region 1 Local	0	FA. #510	DRAINAGE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003064D	Region 1 Local	0	300 EAST STREET	BOX ELDER CREEK	1930	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 147	Region 1	3.639	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-13	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 345	Region 1	28.695	SR-13	MALAD RIVER	1933	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 383	Region 1	5.217	SR-13	CHASE SLOUGH	1937	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 411	Region 1	20.562	SR-13	CORINNE CANAL	1938	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 446	Region 1	17.466	SR-102	CORINNE CANAL	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 820	Region 1	8.146	SR-102	WEST CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 980	Region 1	29.165	SR-13	BOTHWELL CANAL	1939	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005004D	Region 1 Local	0	CITY STREET	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1920	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005034C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005043D	Region 1 Local	0	500 NO. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005044D	Region 1 Local	0	600 NO. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005046D	Region 1 Local	0	200 E. ST. LOGAN	HYDE PARK CANAL	1920	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005051D	Region 1 Local	0	CITY STREET	WELLSVILLE CANYON CREEK	1920	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
005052D	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD FA#545	HYRUM DAM SPILLWAY	1935	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Hyrum Dam and Reservior project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 145	Region 1	42.401	US-91 (SR-91)	ABANDONED RAILROAD X-ING	1936	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 368	Region 1	0.994	SR-101	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 681	Region 1	29.029	SR-23	WEST CACHE CANAL	1932	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 707	Region 1	386.597	US-89 (SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 588A	Region 1	104.201	SR-30	LITTLE BEAR RIVER O'FLO	1937	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 588D	Region 1	104.715	SR-30	LITTLE BEAR RIVER O'FLO	1937	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 635	Region 1	18.966	SR-23	NEWTON CREEK	1938	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1233	Region 1	463.075	US-89 (SR-89)	HYDE PARK CANAL	1931	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007007C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	COAL WASH	1915	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007010A	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007015C	Region 4P Local	0	PRICE CITY STREET	PRICE RIVER	1910	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007020C	Region 4P Local	0	HELPER CITY STREET	HARD SCRABBLE WASH	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007021D	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SPRING CANYON WASH	1920	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007027C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	PRICE RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007030D	Region 4P Local	0	NORTH MAIN STREET	SPRING CANYON WASH	1922	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 339	Region 4P	247.111	US-6 (SR-6)	FLOOD WASH	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 202	Region 4P	11.377	SR-96	SCOFIELD DAM SPILLWAY	1944	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Scofield Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 360	Region 4P	1.308	SR-139	SPRING GLEN WASH	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 401	Region 4P	67.823	SR-10	PRICE RIVER	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 417	Region 4P	0.492	SR-139	SO.SPRING GLEN STREAM	1933	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 378	Region 1	4.279	SR-37	HOOPER CANAL	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 734	Region 1	8.107	SR-106	FARMINGTON CREEK	1927	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of an established bridge type, and illustrates its type and period of construction prior to its widespread use. It represents an important transition and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 330	Region 1	70.65	SR-68, SBL	US-89 (SR-89)	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is associated with an important historic program or project at the state or local level; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey historical significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge possesses artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey design significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge represents an uncommon, rare, or newly established bridge type in Utah; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey engineering significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013004C	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1945	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013005C	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013007C	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1915	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013030C	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	B.I.A. CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013058C	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1929	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 72	Region 3	1.193	SR-311	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1928	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 282	Region 3	66.045	US-40 STOCKTRAIL	RED CREEK	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 560	Region 3	97.195	US-40 (SR-40)	ANTELOPE CREEK	1926	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 593	Region 3	114.686	US-40 (SR-40)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1926	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Emery

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 144	Region 4P	0.239	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-19	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Garfield

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017002C	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017004C	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017011A	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017015D	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1933	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017024D	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	ESCALANTE RIVER	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Garfield

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017044C	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1928	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 729	Region 4R	137.563	US-89 (SR-89)	SANDY CREEK	1931	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 55	Region 4R	4.63	ROCK ARCH TUNNEL	SR-12	1941	Other tunnel

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge crosses a major river, gorge, or canyon or provides access to scenic areas and has an important and direct association with efforts by the state to improve transportation access within Utah.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 56	Region 4R	4.726	ROCK ARCH TUNNEL	SR-12	1941	Other tunnel

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge crosses a major river, gorge, or canyon or provides access to scenic areas and has an important and direct association with efforts by the state to improve transportation access within Utah.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019005C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	PACK CREEK	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019014C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019015C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DANISH WASH	1930	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019016A	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1933	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019017A	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1939	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019018A	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	COAL CREEK	1933	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019020C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	THOMPSON WASH	1919	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019031C	Region 4P Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS WASH	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Iron

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021003C	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT WASH	1932	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021004D	Region 4C Local	0	PAROWAN MAIN ST.	PAROWAN CREEK	1925	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Juab

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
023005D	Region 3 Local	0	CNTY.ROAD,F.A. #270	YUBA DAM SPILLWAY	1932	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 402	Region 3	41.069	SR-28	SALT CREEK	1924	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Kane

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
025004A	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	LONG VALLEY CREEK	1937	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
025008C	Region 4R Local	0	TOWN STREET	EAST FORK VIRGIN RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 204	Region 4R	90.906	US-89 (SR-89)	LONG VALLEY CREEK	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 689	Region 4R	85.81	US-89 (SR-89)	VIRGIN RIVER	1932	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 154	Region 4R	34.902	SR-14	SWAINS CREEK	1935	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Millard

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
027005A	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	CENTRAL UTAH CANAL	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 237	Region 4C	85.33	US-6 (SR-6)	DESERET CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 600	Region 4C	2.939	SR-99	CHALK CREEK	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is associated with an important historic program or project at the state or local level; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey historical significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029001C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST CANYON CREEK	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029002C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029006C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1930	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029013D	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY CREEK	1927	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
029014D	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER & LOST CREEK	1934	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 164	Region 1	13.174	SR-66	WEBER RIVER	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 261	Region 1	0.998	SR-167	GORDON CREEK	1927	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 377	Region 1	8.779	SR-66	EAST CANYON CREEK	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Piute

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
031009A	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	OTTER CR. RES. OUTLET C	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
031012D	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Rich

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033001A	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS CREEK	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033006C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1917	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge represents the work of a significant bridge builder in Utah. As such, it illustrates the work of a master and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

James J. Burke was responsible for fabricating early steel truss bridges in Utah. Research and data collection reveal that few examples of the work of Burke remain. As such, this bridge is a rare and important example of the characteristic work of one of the earliest Utah bridge builders.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
033014C	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1914	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 388	Region 1	133.283	SR-30	BECKWITH CANAL	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Rich

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 205	Region 1	134.176	SR-30	BEAR RIVER	1941	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents large-scale welding for bridge construction during the early period of use of this technology in Utah and is considered a significant design feature.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 324	Region 1	19.959	SR-16	BIG CREEK	1934	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 381	Region 1	20.164	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 382	Region 1	17.192	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1934	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 420	Region 1	23.989	SR-16	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 427	Region 1	10.29	SR-16	WOODRUFF CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035003D	Region 2 Local	0	13400 SOUTH STREET	UTAH AND SALT LAKE CAN	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035010D	Region 2 Local	0	5300 SOUTH STREET	LITTLE COTTONWOOD CR.	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035019D	Region 2 Local	0	2100 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1943	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035040C	Region 2 Local	0	8800 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035049D	Region 2 Local	0	11400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035064D	Region 2 Local	0	COTTONWOOD LANE	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1940	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035065D	Region 2 Local	0	WALKER LANE	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1938	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035066D	Region 2 Local	0	HIGHLAND DRIVE	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1936	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035068D	Region 2 Local	0	ARBOR LN.(5000 SO)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035069D	Region 2 Local	0	6200 SOUTH STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey design significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035079D	Region 2 Local	0	12300 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1941	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035081D	Region 2 Local	0	13580 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1945	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035131D	Region 2 Local	0	5600 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035154D	Region 2 Local	0	500 EAST STREET	MILL CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 141	Region 2	313.862	UTA,LIGHT RAIL LN.	US-89 (SR-89)	1936	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 779	Region 2	1.247	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-140	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 258	Region 2	4.882	SR-190	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1934	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 410	Region 2	6.016	SR-71 (700 EAST)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 480	Region 2	57.293	SR-68,REDWOOD ROAD	SURPLUS CANAL	1936	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 807	Region 2	14.347	SR-209	LITTLE COTTONWOOD CREEK	1935	Concrete continuous arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of a stone-faced veneer, an aesthetic treatment in bridge design associated with the Rustic style.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 811	Region 2	372.857	US-89 (SR-89)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1916	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1065	Region 2	314.652	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1066	Region 2	313.852	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1067	Region 2	313.582	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1068	Region 2	313.453	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1919	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Sanpete

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039003C	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1925	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039019A	Region 4R Local	0	400 EAST STREET	PLEASANT CREEK	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
039020A	Region 4R Local	0	900 EAST STREET	PLEASANT CREEK	1945	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 394	Region 4R	277.911	US-89 (SR-89)	PLEASANT CREEK	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 639	Region 4R	3.949	SR-116	SAN PITCH RIVER	1938	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1254	Region 4R	55.975	SR-132	SAN PITCH RIVER	1931	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Sevier

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041012D	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041016E	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	VERMILLION CANAL	1940	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041025C	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1920	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041034A	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVEN MILE CREEK	1944	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041036A	Region 4R Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALINA CREEK	1934	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 385	Region 4R	0.89	SR-76	UNNAMED WASH	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Sevier

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0A 387	Region 4R	34.036	SR-72	POST HOLLOW WASH	1941	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 272	Region 4R	9.274	SR-118	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 375A	Region 4R	3.512	SR-256	SEVIER RIVER	1934	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 276	Region 4R	8.165	SR-24	NORTH CEDAR CREEK	1927	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043027C	Region 2 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1938	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043029D	Region 2 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	ECHO CREEK	1924	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043046C	Region 2 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	ABANDONED RAILROAD GRADE	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 191	Region 2	0.19	SR-302	WEBER RIVER	1940	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 719	Region 2	13.042	SR-32	WEBER-PROVO DIV.CANAL	1942	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047027A	Region 3 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY GULCH CREEK	1939	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 246	Region 3	38.762	SR-121	STEINAKER SERVICE CANA	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 739	Region 3	353.76	US-191 (SR-191)	ASHLEY CREEK	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049001D	Region 3 Local	0	200 SOUTH STREET	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1925	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049017D	Region 3 Local	0	800 EAST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1940	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049019D	Region 3 Local	0	400 EAST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1935	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049033D	Region 3 Local	0	CITY ST.,10300 NO.	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049035D	Region 3 Local	0	CITY ST.,6000 WEST	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049037D	Region 3 Local	0	4000 WEST STREET	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1945	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049048C	Region 3 Local	0	CO RD-800 WEST ST	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049050C	Region 3 Local	0	GOOSENEST DR,CO.RD	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049055C	Region 3 Local	0	CO.RD.,5600 W. ST.	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049056C	Region 3 Local	0	200 EAST STREET	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049065A	Region 3 Local	0	CO. RD.AT NEBO CRK	THISTLE CREEK	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 139	Region 3	3.155	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-51	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 140	Region 3	3.075	UTAH RAILWAY	SR-51	1935	Steel girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 149	Region 3	344.858	UNION PACIFIC RR	US-89 (SR-89)	1937	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

The design of this bridge has high artistic value as expressed in the application of aesthetic treatments in bridge design associated with the Art Deco and Streamline Moderne styles.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 199	Region 3	1.699	SR-114	PROVO RIVER	1941	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents large-scale welding for bridge construction during the early period of use of this technology in Utah and is considered a significant design feature.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 22	Region 3	328.457	US-89 (SR-89)-Main	HOBBLE CREEK	1913	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge is an example of design prior to standardization within a given bridge type and represents an important evolution of its type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 322	Region 4P	202.125	US-6 (SR-6)	SOLDIER CREEK	1932	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 413	Region 3	0.865	SR-114	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREE	1937	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 431	Region 3	7.737	SR-92	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1939	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 447	Region 3	11.561	SR-198	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1940	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 451	Region 3	336.181	US-89 (SR-89)	PROVO RIVER	1942	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 427	Region 3	1.534	SR-198	HIGH LINE CANAL	1930	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2249	Region 3	3.444	SR-52	MURDOCK CANAL	1941	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 149	Region 3	2.699	SR-164 WBL ONLY	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1941	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Wasatch

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
051003D	Region 3 Local	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD.	CURRANT CREEK	1929	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
051007A	Region 3 Local	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD	PROVO RIVER	1940	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 166	Region 3	17.426	HEBER CREEPER RR.	SR-189	1939	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 470	Region 3	5.211	SR-113	PROVO RIVER	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 14.2	Region 3	0	Heber Creeper RR	Provo River	1938	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 3.3	Region 3	0	Heber Creeper RR	Upper Provo River	1938	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
HEBER RR 3.5	Region 3	0	Heber Creeper RR	Provo River	1938	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053011D	Region 4C Local	0	MIDDLETON DRIVE	MIDDLETON WASH	1927	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053012D	Region 4C Local	0	HURRICANE CITY RD.	LEEDS CREEK	1931	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053013C	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	VIRGIN RIVER	1908	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053019C	Region 4C Local	0	BRIDGE STREET	VIRGIN RIVER	1924	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053023D	Region 4C Local	0	TOWN ROAD	WET SANDY WASH	1924	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is an early example of a standardized type within a given bridge type and represents an important type and period of construction and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering in Utah.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053025D	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY FORK CREEK	1930	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053026D	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	ASH CREEK	1925	Concrete continuous arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053031C	Region 4C Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1931	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 158	Region 4C	10.968	SR-9	VIRGIN RIVER	1937	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge has been previously listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register or is a contributing resource within a historic district listed in the National Register. Therefore, this bridge was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Rationale:

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 416	Region 4C	0.71	SR-212	MILL CREEK	1937	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E 426	Region 4C	14.827	SR-9	DRY WASH	1934	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 82	Region 4C	31.543	SR-9	SPRINGDALE WASH	1926	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057003D	Region 1 Local	0	CITY STREET	WARREN CANAL	1938	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057015D	Region 1 Local	0	WEBER COUNTY ROAD	HOOPER CANAL	1935	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057020V	Region 1 Local	0	CITY STREET	HOOPER CANAL	1945	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057025C	Region 1 Local	0	GRANT AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1931	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057028D	Region 1 Local	0	GRAMERCY AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1938	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057048D	Region 1 Local	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK OGDEN RIVE	1938	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

D. Eligibility Recommendations for Pre-1946 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 388	Region 1	28.746	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 389	Region 1	29.2	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed within the early period (1934-1936) of the state's implementation of projects under the National Recovery Act.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 395	Region 1	32.418	SR-39	BEAVER CREEK	1936	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 499	Region 1	1.441	SR-60	UP&L PENSTOCK PIPE	1929	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number	District:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 744	Region 1	2.239	SR-97	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1942	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003006C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003008D	Box Elder	0	CITY RD-TREMONTON	HIGHLINE CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003010V	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	FAUST VALLEY WASH	1965	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003012A	Box Elder	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#506	CORINNE CANAL	1948	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003013C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003014F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003017C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003019D	Box Elder	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#506	MALAD RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003020F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003022F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1962	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003023C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003024C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003042F	Box Elder	0	CITY STREET	MALAD RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003044F	Box Elder	0	CITY ROAD-GARLAND	MALAD RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003050D	Box Elder	0	CO.RD. FA. #510	MALAD RIVER	1951	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003053F	Box Elder	0	FA. #523OAD	BLACK SLOUGH	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003056D	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WILLARD CANAL	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003059E	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1957	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003060E	Box Elder	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#504	BLUE CREEK	1954	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005001D	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1955	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005002D	Cache	0	LOGAN CITY STREET	LOGAN RIVER	1953	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005003D	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	LOGAN RIVER	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005010D	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005014E	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	SPRING CREEK	1948	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005018D	Cache	0	300 W. ST. LOGAN	BENSON CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005019D	Cache	0	100 W. ST. LOGAN	BENSON CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005029C	Cache	0	100 NO. ST. LOGAN	LOGAN RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005031F	Cache	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005048D	Cache	0	200 NORTH STREET	HYDE PARK CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005058D	Cache	0	City Street	Logan River	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011004E	Davis	0	1000 EAST STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011005F	Davis	0	200 SOUTH STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011007F	Davis	0	300 NORTH STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011010D	Davis	0	2300 NORTH STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011011D	Davis	0	1300 NORTH STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029003C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029007F	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNION PACIFIC RR	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029008C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029009E	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	PETERSON CREEK	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029010C	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER BASIN CANAL	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029011D	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	DEEP CREEK	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029012D	Morgan	0	MORGAN COUNTY ROAD	EAST CANYON CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029015D	Morgan	0	COUNTY ROAD	LOST CREEK	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029017C	Morgan	0	SPEC.SERV.DIST.RD.	WEBER RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033005C	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033008A	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	BECKWITH CANAL	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033016C	Rich	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1947	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057001F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	WARREN CANAL	1959	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is significant as an example of the earliest use (prior to 1960) of prestressed concrete in Utah. Early use of prestressed concrete represents an important new evolution in bridge design and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057002D	Weber	0	FARR WEST CITY ST.	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057007D	Weber	0	FARR WEST CITY ST.	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057008D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057009F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	WARREN CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057010D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057011D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057012D	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1955	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057014D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057016D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1963	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057017D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057019D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057021D	Weber	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057024F	Weber	0	PARKER DRIVE-OGDEN	WEBER RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057026F	Weber	0	LINCOLN AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057031A	Weber	0	COUNTY PARK ROAD	SOUTH FORK OGDEN RIVER	1955	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057038C	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	NO.BR.SO.FK. OGDEN RIVER	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057039D	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK OGDEN RIVER	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057045C	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVER	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057046E	Weber	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057047E	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FK.OGDEN R.O'FLOW	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057049D	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVER	1947	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035006E	Salt Lake	0	WINCHESTER STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1950	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035011D	Salt Lake	0	MAIN STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1955	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035012D	Salt Lake	0	4800 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035016D	Salt Lake	0	1300 WEST STREET	SOUTH JORDAN CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035028D	Salt Lake	0	4100 SOUTH STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035035F	Salt Lake	0	8000 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035086D	Salt Lake	0	3200 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035088D	Salt Lake	0	4700 SOUTH STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035089D	Salt Lake	0	4000 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035095D	Salt Lake	0	INDIANA AVENUE	JORDAN RIVER	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035098D	Salt Lake	0	400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035099D	Salt Lake	0	300 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035100F	Salt Lake	0	200 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1956	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is significant as an example of the earliest use (prior to 1960) of prestressed concrete in Utah. Early use of prestressed concrete represents an important new evolution in bridge design and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035105V	Salt Lake	0	2700 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1950	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035106F	Salt Lake	0	1000 NORTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035107F	Salt Lake	0	650 NORTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035110D	Salt Lake	0	4780 SOUTH STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1965	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035116D	Salt Lake	0	6400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035124D	Salt Lake	0	13800 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035136C	Salt Lake	0	Co.Rd.,Neilson Ave	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035150D	Salt Lake	0	GOLF CR. ENTR. RD.	SURPLUS CANAL	1956	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043008C	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043009A	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY FORK OF WEBER RIVER	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043010A	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043011A	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK, WEBER RIVER	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043014A	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK BEAVER CREEK	1960	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043020F	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043021F	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043030F	Summit	0	200 WEST STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043033E	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	CHALK CREEK	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043038D	Summit	0	100 NORTH STREET	CHALK CREEK	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043039F	Summit	0	COALVILLE CITY ST.	WEBER RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043042F	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043045E	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	ECHO CREEK	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043049E	Summit	0	CENTER STREET	BEAVER CREEK	1950	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043001D	Summit	0.431	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER OVERFLOW CH.	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013001F	Duchesne	0	CO.RD.AT SAND CRK.	DUCHESNE RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013002F	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013012A	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1952	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013015C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	LAKE FORK CREEK	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013032C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013033C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013057C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013061C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	GREY MOUNTAIN CANAL	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013064C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013067A	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1952	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
023001D	Juab	0	COUNTY FRONTAGE RD	SEVIER RIVER	1950	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047002A	Uintah	0	1500 EAST ST.-CO.	NEOLA NO. 1 CANAL	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047004D	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	UINTAH RIVER	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047007E	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	DEEP CREEK	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047014A	Uintah	0	2000 NORTH ST.-CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047015C	Uintah	0	1500 WEST ST. - CO.	ASHLEY CREEK	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047018A	Uintah	0	500 SOUTH ST.-CTY.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047019A	Uintah	0	1000 SOUTH ST.-CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047023A	Uintah	0	500 WEST ST. - CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047024A	Uintah	0	VERNAL AVE. - CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047030E	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1953	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047034C	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	BRUSH CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047035C	Uintah	0	500 NORTH ST. - CO.	ASHLEY CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049002D	Utah	0	400 SOUTH STREET	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049003D	Utah	0	AMER.FK.CITY STR.	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049010D	Utah	0	800 NORTH STREET	PROVO RIVER	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049014D	Utah	0	200 WEST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049016D	Utah	0	200 SOUTH STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049020D	Utah	0	400 SOUTH STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049025F	Utah	0	800 SOUTH STREET	PROVO RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049066C	Utah	0	COUNTY ROAD	DIAMOND FORK CREEK	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049085C	Utah	0	CO.RD. AT KYUNE	PRICE RIVER & UPRR	1962	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
051009D	Wasatch	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD	PROVO RIVER	1956	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007022D	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	MINNIE MAUD CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007023D	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	ARGYLE CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007026E	Carbon	0	CO. RD. (OLD SR-6)	PRICE CANAL	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015005C	Emery	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS WASH	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015016C	Emery	0	COUNTY ROAD	BROWNS WASH	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015017D	Emery	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015023V	Emery	0	CITY ROAD	BROWNS WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017014A	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017023A	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017037E	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	ESCALANTE RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019010D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	SOLITUDE WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019011D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	CASTLE CREEK	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019013D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	CISCO WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019021D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019022D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	FLOY WASH	1948	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019028E	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	BOOTLEGGER WASH	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019029D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	SAGER'S WASH	1950	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019030D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	PINTO WASH	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019032C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	DANISH WASH	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019033D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	BITTER CREEK WASH	1952	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019034D	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	WESTWATER WASH	1952	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019039C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	ONION CREEK	1953	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
021009D	Iron	0	PAROWAN CITY ST.	PAROWAN CREEK	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027003F	Millard	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027012F	Millard	0	COUNTY ROAD	HIGHLINE CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027015F	Millard	0	COUNTY ROAD	ABRAHAM CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037006C	San Juan	0	COUNTY ROAD	LONG CANYON CREEK	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037008C	San Juan	0	COUNTY ROAD	SAN JUAN RIVER	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and crosses a major river that opened areas previously difficult to access. As such, it has an important and direct association with efforts by the federal government to improve access to Native American lands and open other areas of the state.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037009C	San Juan	0	COUNTY ROAD.#236	MULE CANYON	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037014C	San Juan	0	COUNTY ROAD	CANE SPRINGS WASH	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
039013D	Sanpete	0	COUNTY ROAD	SAN PITCH RIVER	1965	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041021E	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	VERMILLION CANAL	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041029E	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	DENMARK WASH	1953	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041048D	Sevier	0	COUNTY FRONTAGE RD	IVIE CREEK	1951	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
053001D	Washington	0	TONIQUINT DRIVE	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
053041A	Washington	0	COUNTY ROAD	PINTO WASH	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
055006A	Wayne	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT RIVER	1958	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4P Local

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
055007C	Wayne	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT RIVER	1951	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

Bailey truss configuration represents an important variation within this rare bridge type. Designed for use by the military, surplus Bailey truss bridges were available following World War II and used across the country. This is significant as a representative example of a rare bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2059	Grand	3.949	SR 279	WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1346	Davis	0	SR-103	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 431	Box Elder	0.06	US-91 (SR-91)	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 737	Weber	0.086	SR-158	PINEVIEW DAM SPILLWAY	1956	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Pineview Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 24	Box Elder	0.13	SR-240	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 631B	Davis	0.169	SR-106, 400 NO.ST.	UPRR & W.BNTFUL CITY ST.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 631A	Davis	0.231	SR-131, 400 NO.ST.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 740	Weber	0.483	SR-168	U.P.& L.CO. PENSTOCK	1964	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 730	Cache	0.732	SR-237	LOGAN-NORTHERN CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 25	Cache	0.855	SR-61	BEAR RIVER	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1044	Cache	1.384	SR-142	WEST CACHE CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
2C 314	Weber	2.259	SR-79EBL 31st ST.	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
4C 314	Weber	2.261	SR-79, WBL 31ST.	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 286	Weber	2.869	SR-204 (WALL AVE)	OGDEN RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 249	Davis	3.549	SR-37	LAYTON CANAL	1956	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1105	Weber	3.606	SR-158	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVER	1958	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1045	Cache	5.402	SR-142	CLARKSTON CREEK	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 8	Cache	5.694	SR-218	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 280	Weber	5.987	SR-134	WEBER RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 459	Box Elder	6.084	SR-30	GROUSE CREEK	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 496A	Davis	6.179	SR-126	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 548	Cache	6.511	SR-61	CUB RIVER	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 496B	Davis	6.987	SR-126	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 297	Rich	7.58	SR-16	SALARATUS CREEK	1957	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 626	Cache	7.706	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1141	Cache	9.473	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1142	Cache	10.007	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 804	Weber	10.864	SR-134	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 634	Weber	11.644	SR-39	OGDEN RIVER	1959	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 386	Cache	12.529	SR-142	BEAR RIVER	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 383	Morgan	13.535	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-66	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 536	Morgan	14.391	SR-65	EAST CANYON CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 571	Cache	15.434	SR-142	CUB RIVER	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1099	Weber	18.147	SR-39	SO.BR.SO.FK.OGDEN RIVER	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1100	Weber	18.398	SR-39	NO.BR.SO.FK.OGDEN RIVER	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 551	Box Elder	18.796	SR-102	BEAR RIVER	1953	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 500	Cache	18.925	US-91 (SR-91)	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1947	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 597	Cache	24.429	US-91 (SR-91)	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1957	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 616	Box Elder	24.457	POCATELLO VAL.CO.R	I-84 (SR-84) EBL & WBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 540	Cache	25.916	US-91 (SR-91)	LOGAN RIVER	1951	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 329	Morgan	100.976	COUNTY ROAD	I-84 (SR-84) & UPRR	1964	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 1	Box Elder	367.451	CO RD (CEMENT PL.)	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 3	Box Elder	370.496	CO RD (CALLS FORT)	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 5	Box Elder	371.95	HONEYVILLE CITY ST	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 4	Box Elder	375.537	COUNTY ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
3C 336	Davis	384.675	SR-89 SBL	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 49	Salt Lake	0	1700 EAST STREET	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1032	Salt Lake	0.74	SR-287	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1272	Salt Lake	1.073	SR-201	OQUIRRH HILLS DRAIN	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 449	Salt Lake	2.09	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-48	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 907	Salt Lake	2.27	SR-190	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1954	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 254	Salt Lake	2.737	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was designed by the Utah Copper Company as a grade-separation structure on the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line. It was built to connect the company's mine at Bingham Canyon with its smelter at Garfield during the period of expansion following 1945. This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the need of the copper mining industry. As a grade-separation bridge, it is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 384	Salt Lake	2.844	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-266	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 385	Salt Lake	3.23	UTA,LIGHT RAIL LN.	SR-266	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
2C 371	Salt Lake	3.832	SR-201 EBL	KENNECOTT RAILROAD SPUR	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
4C 371	Salt Lake	3.871	SR-201 WBL	KENNECOTT RAILROAD SPUR	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 48	Salt Lake	4.209	SR-181,1300 EAST	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 737	Salt Lake	5.064	SR-201	MAGNA PIPE CONDUIT	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 436	Salt Lake	5.628	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1965	Steel continuous girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 253	Salt Lake	7.763	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was designed by the Utah Copper Company as a grade-separation structure on the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line. It was built to connect the company's mine at Bingham Canyon with its smelter at Garfield during the period of expansion following 1945. This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the need of the copper mining industry. As a grade-separation bridge, it is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1227	Salt Lake	13.437	SR-71	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 288	Summit	23.343	SR-32	WEBER RIVER	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1210	Summit	28.917	SR-32	SILVER CREEK	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 269	Summit	45.605	SR-150	BEAR RIVER	1956	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 128	Summit	48.355	SR-150	BEAR RIVER (EAST FORK)	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 621	Tooele	61.837	COUNTY ROAD	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 564	Salt Lake	61.978	SR-68,(REDWOOD RD)	JORDAN RIVER	1953	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1070	Salt Lake	364.084	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1064	Salt Lake	367.414	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
1D 672	Salt Lake	383.518	RP.SR89NB TO I15NB	RAMP I-15NB TO SR-89NB	1961	Concrete continuous box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 11	Utah	0	5TH-6TH EAST ST	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 640	Uintah	0.02	SR-88	GREEN RIVER	1962	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and crosses a major river that opened areas previously difficult to access. As such, it has an important and direct association with efforts by the federal government to improve access to Native American lands and open other areas of the state.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 344	Utah	0.096	SR-145,INT.X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15), NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 347	Utah	0.107	SR-180, INT.X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 588	Duchesne	0.292	SR-87	DUCHESNE RIVER	1959	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 886	Utah	1.065	SR-92	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1950	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 525	Duchesne	1.611	SR-121	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 570	Uintah	2.72	SR-149	BRUSH CREEK	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 609	Utah	6.626	SR-115	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2222	Utah	8.678	SR-189	MURDOCK CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 902	Duchesne	9.178	SR-208	GOLDEN STAIR HOLLOW WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 569	Duchesne	9.668	SR-208	DUCHESNE RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1140	Duchesne	11.748	SR-121	UINTAH CANAL NO.1	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 249	Juab	12.186	SR-132	SEVIER RIVER	1948	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 259	Duchesne	19.576	SR-87	LAKE FORK CREEK	1949	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1161	Juab	22.615	SR-28	CHRISS WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2298	Utah	26.714	SR-73	CEDAR FORT CANAL	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 235	Utah	37.013	SR-73	JORDAN RIVER	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 561	Duchesne	58.877	SR-35	DUCHESNE RIVER	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 595	Duchesne	65.046	US-40 (SR-40)	RED CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 592	Duchesne	66.5	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND WASH	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 62	Duchesne	87.225	US-40 (SR-40)	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1293	Duchesne	95.67	US-40 (SR-40)	GREY MOUNTAIN CANAL	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 966	Duchesne	100.231	US-40 (SR-40)	BRIDGELAND-MYTON WASH	1954	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1096	Duchesne	106.38	US-40 (SR-40)	DRY GULCH CANAL	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 321	Uintah	121.697	US-40 (SR-40)	UINTAH RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1158	Uintah	129.569	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1499	Uintah	130.972	US-40 (SR-40)	HALFWAY HOLLOW WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1500	Uintah	133.777	US-40 (SR-40)	TWELVE MILE WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 828	Uintah	142.611	US-40 (SR-40)	STEINAKER CANAL	1965	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1030	Uintah	164.709	US-40 (SR-40)	COW WASH	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1029	Uintah	168.613	US-40 (SR-40)	POWDER SPRINGS WASH	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1015	Uintah	169.348	US-40 (SR-40)	SNAKE JOHN WASH	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 467	Uintah	174.517	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND SPRING WASH	1955	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 936	Utah	193.263	US-6 (SR-6)	SHEEP CREEK	1954	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 349	Utah	275.327	Proctor Ln 4250 W.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 10	Utah	280.37	5TH-6TH EAST ST.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
3D 603	Utah	327.693	US-89 (SR-89) SBL	SR-51	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 372	Daggett	392.605	SR-191	FLAMING GORGE RESERVOIR	1962	Steel arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 724	Daggett	393.355	US-191, (SR-191)	FLAMING GORGE DAM SPLWAY	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Flaming Gorge Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 636	Washington	0	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 665	Washington	0.04	SR-228,INTER X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 260	Carbon	0.043	SR-244	PRICE RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2057	Grand	0.062	SR-279	POTASH PLANT WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 298	Kane	0.559	US-89 (SR-89)	BLUE POOL WASH	1958	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2061	Emery	0.75	SR-57	SOUTH WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 558	Sevier	1.453	SR-24	SEVIER RIVER	1954	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1047	Sevier	1.73	SR-120	RICHFIELD CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 440	San Juan	1.759	SR-262	RECAPTURE WASH	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1304	Grand	1.77	SR-279 & UPRR	LONG CANYON WASH	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 275	Iron	2.043	SR-14	SALT CREEK	1949	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 742	Emery	2.329	SR-29	LOWRY CREEK	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 910	Garfield	2.335	SR-22	ANTIMONY DRY WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2058	Grand	2.361	SR-279	UNNAMED WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 229	Emery	2.589	SR-19	GREEN RIVER	1948	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 573	Millard	2.739	SR-132	SEVIER RIVER	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 546	Iron	2.885	SR-130	COAL CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1138	San Juan	3.079	SR-262	HORSE CREEK WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 580	Grand	3.087	SR-128	BLACK BILL WASH	1956	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is within a rare bridge type and displays a catenary arch design. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this uncommon bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 276	Iron	3.482	SR-14	ROCKY CANYON WASH	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 517	Piute	4.255	SR-62	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1150	Grand	5	SR-128	JACKASS CANYON WASH	1960	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1827	Sevier	5.279	SR-24	ROCKY FORD CANAL	1953	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1007	Grand	6.211	SR-128	BIG BEND WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1198	Piute	6.835	SR-22	OTTER CREEK	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0A 446	Sanpete	7.942	SR-137	TWELVE MILE WASH	1947	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 817	Beaver	8.5	SR-153	BEAVER RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 307	Iron	9.502	SR-56	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1114	Emery	10.182	SR-29	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1256	Garfield	11.543	SR-12	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1055	Sevier	12.255	SR-118	RICHFIELD CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 651	San Juan	12.503	SR-163	HALGAITAH WASH	1957	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2052	Washington	12.677	SR-59	GOULD'S WASH	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 608	Emery	15.014	SR-29	GRIMES WASH	1954	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1287	Grand	15.256	SR-279	MOAB CANYON WASH	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 245	Garfield	17.191	SR-12	WATER CANYON WASH	1962	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 319	San Juan	18.881	SR-262	MONTEZUMA CREEK	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 650	San Juan	19.022	SR-163	UNNAMED WASH	1957	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 293	Washington	19.704	SR-18	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1957	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1005	Millard	20.885	SR-125	CENTRAL UTAH WATER CANAL	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 274	San Juan	20.904	SR-163	SAN JUAN RIVER	1954	Steel arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1419	Garfield	21.174	SR-12	CAMPBELL CREEK	1958	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 300	Kane	21.178	US-89 (SR-89)	PARIA RIVER	1958	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 811	San Juan	21.963	SR-163	UNNAMED WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 710	San Juan	22.018	SR-262	McELMO CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1124	Garfield	22.185	SR-12	BRYCE CANYON WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 565	Utah	22.663	SR-96	WHITE RIVER	1953	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1120	Kane	22.807	US-89 (SR-89)	SAND HOLLOW WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1125	Garfield	23.799	SR-12	BIG WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1710	Sevier	24.112	SR-118	NORTH CEDAR CREEK	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 281	Garfield	25.798	SR-12	PARIA RIVER	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1334	San Juan	26.817	SR-163	TWIN WASH	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1077	Garfield	27.29	SR-12	WILD CAT WASH	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 703	San Juan	27.984	SR-163	LIME CREEK	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 322	Garfield	28.774	SR-12	DRY WASH	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 629	Washington	30.713	CO RD INTER X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 810	Emery	31.691	SR-31	HUNTINGTON CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 528	Iron	31.903	SR-56	PINTO WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 578	Emery	32.095	SR-10	ROCK CANYON WASH	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1328	Washington	32.233	SR-9	BLACK CANYON WASH	1963	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1604	Emery	32.973	SR-10	POULSEN WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 604	Kane	37.011	US-89 (SR-89)	BUCKSKIN GULCH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 284	Garfield	37.107	SR-12	HENRIEVILLE WASH	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 83	Emery	37.518	SR-10	COTTON WOOD WASH	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 928	San Juan	39.936	SR-163	BUTLER WASH	1965	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 624	Beaver	42.458	SR-21	CORRAL CANYON WASH	1954	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 513	Grand	43.914	SR-128	NASH WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 489	Garfield	45.271	SR-95	DIRTY DEVIL RIVER	1965	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1107	Kane	45.453	US-89 (SR-89)	PETRIFIED HOLLOW WASH	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 490	Garfield	47.278	SR-95	COLORADO RIVER	1965	Steel continuous arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1091	Garfield	48.17	SR-12	ALLENS WASH	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1106	Kane	48.222	US-89 (SR-89)	SEAMAN'S WASH	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1062	Sanpete	51.398	SR-132	HOLLOW WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1092	Garfield	52.758	SR-12	UPPER VALLEY WASH	1957	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 491	San Juan	53.607	SR-95	WHITE CANYON	1965	Steel continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 605	Kane	54.04	US-89 (SR-89)	JOHNSON WASH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 957	Beaver	60.992	SR-21	FRISCO WASH	1953	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1176	Carbon	63.164	SR-10	MILLER CREEK	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 642	Wayne	66.888	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 306	Kane	68.354	US-89 (SR-89)	KANAB CREEK	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 526	Beaver	68.634	SR-21	BIG WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 583	Wayne	72.065	SR-24	SULPHUR CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 582	Wayne	72.161	SR-24	SAND CREEK WASH	1954	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 510	Beaver	72.646	SR-21	MILFORD-NEVADA WASH	1947	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1418	Garfield	74.482	SR-12	CALF CREEK	1964	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 355	Wayne	79.398	SR-24	SULPHUR CREEK	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 337	Kane	80.848	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST FORK VIRGIN RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 235	Wayne	81.187	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2277	San Juan	84.962	US-191 (SR-191)	PETERS WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 808	Wayne	90.35	SR-24	PLEASANT CREEK	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 807	Wayne	92.062	SR-24	BLUE FLAT WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 279	Wayne	94.494	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 292	San Juan	95.119	US-191 (SR-191)	HATCH WASH	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1039	Beaver	95.55	SR-21	BEAVER RIVER	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1546	Wayne	97.767	SR-24	CAINEVILLE WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 659	Beaver	100.322	SR-21	BEAVER RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 875	Wayne	106.251	SR-24	CHAFFAN WASH	1963	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 733	Beaver	112.574	CO.RD.NO.OF BEAVER	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1171	Wayne	113.054	SR-24	SAND WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 116	Wayne	115.163	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 301	San Juan	115.442	SR-95	COTTONWOOD WASH	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 700	Beaver	120.126	CO. RD. INTER X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 607	San Juan	120.154	SR-95	BIG CANYON WASH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1037	Grand	125.081	US-191 (SR-191)	PACK CREEK	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 590	Grand	125.543	US-191 (SR-191)	MILL CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 285	Grand	128.281	US-191 (SR-191)	COLORADO RIVER	1955	Steel continuous girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 444	Grand	143.289	US-191 (SR-191)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 872	Sevier	156.675	US-50 (SR-50)	DENMARK WASH	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1504	Emery	159.719	SR-24	BUCKMASTER WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 312	Carbon	231.072	US-6 (SR-6)	UTAH RAILWAY TRACKS	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1172	Carbon	231.974	US-6 (SR-6)	HARD SCRABBLE CREEK	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1611	Carbon	235.427	US-6 (SR-6)	CONSUMERS WASH	1951	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 532	Carbon	235.584	US-6 (SR-6)	PRICE RIVER	1952	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge represents an uncommon, rare, or newly established bridge type in Utah constructed; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey engineering significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 368	Carbon	251.601	US-191 (SR-191)	PRICE RIVER	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 668	Carbon	254.102	US-191 (SR-191)	WILLOW CREEK	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 311	Carbon	255.929	US-6 (SR-6)	GRASSY TRAIL CREEK	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

E. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 320	Carbon	256.593	US-6 (SR-6)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 669	Carbon	259.763	US-191 (SR-191)	WILLOW CREEK	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1178	Emery	261.969	US-6 (SR-6)	BIG SPRINGS WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1183	Emery	263.16	US-6 (SR-6)	ICELANDER WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1308	Emery	273.599	US-6 (SR-6)	MARSH FLAT WASH	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1309	Emery	278.14	US-6 (SR-6)	COOKS WASH	1963	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	County:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 389	Emery	278.397	US-6 (SR-6)	PRICE RIVER	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Beaver

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 510	Region 4C	72.646	SR-21	MILFORD-NEVADA WASH	1947	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 526	Region 4C	68.634	SR-21	BIG WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 659	Region 4C	100.322	SR-21	BEAVER RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 700	Region 4C	120.126	CO. RD. INTER X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 733	Region 4C	112.574	CO.RD.NO.OF BEAVER	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 817	Region 4C	8.5	SR-153	BEAVER RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 957	Region 4C	60.992	SR-21	FRISCO WASH	1953	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Beaver

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1039	Region 4C	95.55	SR-21	BEAVER RIVER	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 624	Region 4C	42.458	SR-21	CORRAL CANYON WASH	1954	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003006C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003008D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY RD-TREMONTON	HIGHLINE CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003010V	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	FAUST VALLEY WASH	1965	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003012A	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#506	CORINNE CANAL	1948	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003013C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003014F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003017C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003019D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#506	MALAD RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003020F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003022F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1962	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003023C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003024C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003042F	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	MALAD RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003044F	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY ROAD-GARLAND	MALAD RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003050D	Region 1 Loc	0	CO.RD. FA. #510	MALAD RIVER	1951	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003053F	Region 1 Loc	0	FA. #523OAD	BLACK SLOUGH	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003056D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WILLARD CANAL	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003059E	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1957	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
003060E	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY RD.-FA.#504	BLUE CREEK	1954	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 431	Region 1	0.06	US-91 (SR-91)	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 459	Region 1	6.084	SR-30	GROUSE CREEK	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 551	Region 1	18.796	SR-102	BEAR RIVER	1953	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 616	Region 1	24.457	POCATELLO VAL.CO.R	I-84 (SR-84) EBL & WBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 1	Region 1	367.451	CO RD (CEMENT PL.)	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 3	Region 1	370.496	CO RD (CALLS FORT)	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 4	Region 1	375.537	COUNTY ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 5	Region 1	371.95	HONEYVILLE CITY ST	I-15 (SR-15) NB & SB	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 24	Region 1	0.13	SR-240	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005001D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1955	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005002D	Region 1 Loc	0	LOGAN CITY STREET	LOGAN RIVER	1953	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005003D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	LOGAN RIVER	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005010D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005014E	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	SPRING CREEK	1948	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005018D	Region 1 Loc	0	300 W. ST. LOGAN	BENSON CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005019D	Region 1 Loc	0	100 W. ST. LOGAN	BENSON CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005029C	Region 1 Loc	0	100 NO. ST. LOGAN	LOGAN RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005031F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005048D	Region 1 Loc	0	200 NORTH STREET	HYDE PARK CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
005058D	Region 1 Loc	0	City Street	Logan River	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 386	Region 1	12.529	SR-142	BEAR RIVER	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 500	Region 1	18.925	US-91 (SR-91)	LITTLE BEAR RIVER	1947	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 540	Region 1	25.916	US-91 (SR-91)	LOGAN RIVER	1951	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays aesthetic qualities in the overall design to distinguish it as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 548	Region 1	6.511	SR-61	CUB RIVER	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 571	Region 1	15.434	SR-142	CUB RIVER	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 597	Region 1	24.429	US-91 (SR-91)	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1957	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 626	Region 1	7.706	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 730	Region 1	0.732	SR-237	LOGAN-NORTHERN CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1044	Region 1	1.384	SR-142	WEST CACHE CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1045	Region 1	5.402	SR-142	CLARKSTON CREEK	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1141	Region 1	9.473	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1142	Region 1	10.007	SR-101	BLACKSMITH FORK RIVER	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 8	Region 1	5.694	SR-218	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 25	Region 1	0.855	SR-61	BEAR RIVER	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007022D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MINNIE MAUD CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007023D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	ARGYLE CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
007026E	Region 4P Lc	0	CO. RD. (OLD SR-6)	PRICE CANAL	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 260	Region 4P	0.043	SR-244	PRICE RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 311	Region 4P	255.929	US-6 (SR-6)	GRASSY TRAIL CREEK	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge possesses significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C for its distinctive features; however, it does not retain the historic integrity necessary to convey its design, engineering, or construction significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 312	Region 4P	231.072	US-6 (SR-6)	UTAH RAILWAY TRACKS	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 320	Region 4P	256.593	US-6 (SR-6)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 368	Region 4P	251.601	US-191 (SR-191)	PRICE RIVER	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 532	Region 4P	235.584	US-6 (SR-6)	PRICE RIVER	1952	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge represents an uncommon, rare, or newly established bridge type in Utah constructed; however, it does not retain historic integrity necessary to convey engineering significance. As such, it is not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 668	Region 4P	254.102	US-191 (SR-191)	WILLOW CREEK	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 669	Region 4P	259.763	US-191 (SR-191)	WILLOW CREEK	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1172	Region 4P	231.974	US-6 (SR-6)	HARD SCRABBLE CREEK	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Carbon

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1176	Region 4P	63.164	SR-10	MILLER CREEK	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1611	Region 4P	235.427	US-6 (SR-6)	CONSUMERS WASH	1951	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Daggett

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 372	Region 3	392.605	SR-191	FLAMING GORGE RESERVOIR	1962	Steel arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 724	Region 3	393.355	US-191, (SR-191)	FLAMING GORGE DAM SPLWAY	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Flaming Gorge Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011004E	Region 1 Loc	0	1000 EAST STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011005F	Region 1 Loc	0	200 SOUTH STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011007F	Region 1 Loc	0	300 NORTH STREET	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011010D	Region 1 Loc	0	2300 NORTH STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
011011D	Region 1 Loc	0	1300 NORTH STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 249	Region 1	3.549	SR-37	LAYTON CANAL	1956	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 496A	Region 1	6.179	SR-126	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 496B	Region 1	6.987	SR-126	WEBER-DAVIS CO. CANAL	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 631A	Region 1	0.231	SR-131, 400 NO.ST.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 631B	Region 1	0.169	SR-106, 400 NO.ST.	UPRR & W.BNTFUL CITY ST	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1346	Region 1	0	SR-103	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
3C 336	Region 1	384.675	SR-89 SBL	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013001F	Region 3 Loc	0	CO.RD.AT SAND CRK.	DUCHESNE RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013002F	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013012A	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1952	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013015C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	LAKE FORK CREEK	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013032C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013033C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013057C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	CANAL	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013061C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	GREY MOUNTAIN CANAL	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013064C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
013067A	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DUCHESNE RIVER	1952	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 259	Region 3	19.576	SR-87	LAKE FORK CREEK	1949	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 525	Region 3	1.611	SR-121	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 561	Region 3	58.877	SR-35	DUCHESNE RIVER	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 569	Region 3	9.668	SR-208	DUCHESNE RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 588	Region 3	0.292	SR-87	DUCHESNE RIVER	1959	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 592	Region 3	66.5	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND WASH	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 595	Region 3	65.046	US-40 (SR-40)	RED CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 902	Region 3	9.178	SR-208	GOLDEN STAIR HOLLOW WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 966	Region 3	100.231	US-40 (SR-40)	BRIDGELAND-MYTON WASI	1954	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Duchesne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1096	Region 3	106.38	US-40 (SR-40)	DRY GULCH CANAL	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1140	Region 3	11.748	SR-121	UINTAH CANAL NO.1	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1293	Region 3	95.67	US-40 (SR-40)	GREY MOUNTAIN CANAL	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 62	Region 3	87.225	US-40 (SR-40)	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Emery

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015005C	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	SALERATUS WASH	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015016C	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BROWNS WASH	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015017D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
015023V	Region 4P Lc	0	CITY ROAD	BROWNS WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 229	Region 4P	2.589	SR-19	GREEN RIVER	1948	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 389	Region 4P	278.397	US-6 (SR-6)	PRICE RIVER	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 578	Region 4P	32.095	SR-10	ROCK CANYON WASH	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Emery

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 608	Region 4P	15.014	SR-29	GRIMES WASH	1954	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 742	Region 4P	2.329	SR-29	LOWRY CREEK	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 810	Region 4P	31.691	SR-31	HUNTINGTON CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1114	Region 4P	10.182	SR-29	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1178	Region 4P	261.969	US-6 (SR-6)	BIG SPRINGS WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1183	Region 4P	263.16	US-6 (SR-6)	ICELANDER WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1308	Region 4P	273.599	US-6 (SR-6)	MARSH FLAT WASH	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Emery

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1309	Region 4P	278.14	US-6 (SR-6)	COOKS WASH	1963	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1504	Region 4P	159.719	SR-24	BUCKMASTER WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1604	Region 4P	32.973	SR-10	POULSEN WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2061	Region 4P	0.75	SR-57	SOUTH WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 83	Region 4P	37.518	SR-10	COTTON WOOD WASH	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Garfield

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017014A	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MAMMOTH CREEK	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017023A	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
017037E	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	ESCALANTE RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 281	Region 4R	25.798	SR-12	PARIA RIVER	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 284	Region 4R	37.107	SR-12	HENRIEVILLE WASH	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 322	Region 4R	28.774	SR-12	DRY WASH	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Garfield

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 489	Region 4R	45.271	SR-95	DIRTY DEVIL RIVER	1965	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 490	Region 4R	47.278	SR-95	COLORADO RIVER	1965	Steel continuous arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 245	Region 4R	17.191	SR-12	WATER CANYON WASH	1962	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 910	Region 4R	2.335	SR-22	ANTIMONY DRY WASH	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1077	Region 4R	27.29	SR-12	WILD CAT WASH	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Garfield

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1091	Region 4R	48.17	SR-12	ALLENS WASH	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1092	Region 4R	52.758	SR-12	UPPER VALLEY WASH	1957	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1124	Region 4R	22.185	SR-12	BRYCE CANYON WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1125	Region 4R	23.799	SR-12	BIG WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1256	Region 4R	11.543	SR-12	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1418	Region 4R	74.482	SR-12	CALF CREEK	1964	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1419	Region 4R	21.174	SR-12	CAMPBELL CREEK	1958	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019010D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	SOLITUDE WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019011D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	CASTLE CREEK	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019013D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	CISCO WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019021D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY WASH	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019022D	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	FLOY WASH	1948	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019028E	Region 4P Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BOOTLEGGER WASH	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019029D	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	SAGER'S WASH	1950	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019030D	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	PINTO WASH	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019032C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	DANISH WASH	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019033D	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	BITTER CREEK WASH	1952	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019034D	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	WESTWATER WASH	1952	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
019039C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	ONION CREEK	1953	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 285	Region 4P	128.281	US-191 (SR-191)	COLORADO RIVER	1955	Steel continuous girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 444	Region 4P	143.289	US-191 (SR-191)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 513	Region 4P	43.914	SR-128	NASH WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 580	Region 4P	3.087	SR-128	BLACK BILL WASH	1956	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is within a rare bridge type and displays a catenary arch design. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this uncommon bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 590	Region 4P	125.543	US-191 (SR-191)	MILL CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1007	Region 4P	6.211	SR-128	BIG BEND WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1037	Region 4P	125.081	US-191 (SR-191)	PACK CREEK	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1150	Region 4P	5	SR-128	JACKASS CANYON WASH	1960	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1287	Region 4P	15.256	SR-279	MOAB CANYON WASH	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1304	Region 4P	1.77	SR-279 & UPRR	LONG CANYON WASH	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2057	Region 4P	0.062	SR-279	POTASH PLANT WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2058	Region 4P	2.361	SR-279	UNNAMED WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V2059	Region 4P Lc	3.949	SR 279	WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Iron

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
021009D	Region 4C Lc	0	PAROWAN CITY ST.	PAROWAN CREEK	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 275	Region 4C	2.043	SR-14	SALT CREEK	1949	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 276	Region 4C	3.482	SR-14	ROCKY CANYON WASH	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 307	Region 4C	9.502	SR-56	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 528	Region 4C	31.903	SR-56	PINTO WASH	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 546	Region 4C	2.885	SR-130	COAL CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Juab

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
023001D	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY FRONTAGE RD	SEVIER RIVER	1950	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 249	Region 3	12.186	SR-132	SEVIER RIVER	1948	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1161	Region 3	22.615	SR-28	CHRISS WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Kane

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 298	Region 4R	0.559	US-89 (SR-89)	BLUE POOL WASH	1958	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 300	Region 4R	21.178	US-89 (SR-89)	PARIA RIVER	1958	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 306	Region 4R	68.354	US-89 (SR-89)	KANAB CREEK	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 337	Region 4R	80.848	US-89 (SR-89)	EAST FORK VIRGIN RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 604	Region 4R	37.011	US-89 (SR-89)	BUCKSKIN GULCH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 605	Region 4R	54.04	US-89 (SR-89)	JOHNSON WASH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1106	Region 4R	48.222	US-89 (SR-89)	SEAMAN'S WASH	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Kane

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1107	Region 4R	45.453	US-89 (SR-89)	PETRIFIED HOLLOW WASH	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1120	Region 4R	22.807	US-89 (SR-89)	SAND HOLLOW WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Millard

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027003F	Region 4C Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027012F	Region 4C Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	HIGHLINE CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
027015F	Region 4C Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	ABRAHAM CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 573	Region 4C	2.739	SR-132	SEVIER RIVER	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1005	Region 4C	20.885	SR-125	CENTRAL UTAH WATER CANAL	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029003C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029007F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNION PACIFIC RR	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029008C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029009E	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	PETERSON CREEK	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029010C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER BASIN CANAL	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029011D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DEEP CREEK	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029012D	Region 1 Loc	0	MORGAN COUNTY ROAD	EAST CANYON CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029015D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	LOST CREEK	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
029017C	Region 1 Loc	0	SPEC.SERV.DIST.RD.	WEBER RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 329	Region 1	100.976	COUNTY ROAD	I-84 (SR-84) & UPRR	1964	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 383	Region 1	13.535	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-66	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 536	Region 1	14.391	SR-65	EAST CANYON CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Piute

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 517	Region 4R	4.255	SR-62	EAST FORK SEVIER RIVER	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1198	Region 4R	6.835	SR-22	OTTER CREEK	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Rich

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033005C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WOODRUFF-RANDOLPH CANAL	1952	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033008A	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BECKWITH CANAL	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
033016C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAR RIVER	1947	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 297	Region 1	7.58	SR-16	SALARATUS CREEK	1957	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035006E	Region 2 Loc	0	WINCHESTER STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1950	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035011D	Region 2 Loc	0	MAIN STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1955	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035012D	Region 2 Loc	0	4800 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035016D	Region 2 Loc	0	1300 WEST STREET	SOUTH JORDAN CANAL	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035028D	Region 2 Loc	0	4100 SOUTH STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035035F	Region 2 Loc	0	8000 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035086D	Region 2 Loc	0	3200 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035088D	Region 2 Loc	0	4700 SOUTH STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1960	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035089D	Region 2 Loc	0	4000 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1965	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035095D	Region 2 Loc	0	INDIANA AVENUE	JORDAN RIVER	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035098D	Region 2 Loc	0	400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035099D	Region 2 Loc	0	300 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035100F	Region 2 Loc	0	200 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1956	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is significant as an example of the earliest use (prior to 1960) of prestressed concrete in Utah. Early use of prestressed concrete represents an important new evolution in bridge design and construction.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035105V	Region 2 Loc	0	2700 WEST STREET	UTAH & SALT LAKE CANAL	1950	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035106F	Region 2 Loc	0	1000 NORTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035107F	Region 2 Loc	0	650 NORTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035110D	Region 2 Loc	0	4780 SOUTH STREET	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1965	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035116D	Region 2 Loc	0	6400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035124D	Region 2 Loc	0	13800 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1950	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035136C	Region 2 Loc	0	Co.Rd.,Neilson Ave	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
035150D	Region 2 Loc	0	GOLF CR. ENTR. RD.	SURPLUS CANAL	1956	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 253	Region 2	7.763	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was designed by the Utah Copper Company as a grade-separation structure on the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line. It was built to connect the company's mine at Bingham Canyon with its smelter at Garfield during the period of expansion following 1945. This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the need of the copper mining industry. As a grade-separation bridge, it is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 254	Region 2	2.737	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was designed by the Utah Copper Company as a grade-separation structure on the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line. It was built to connect the company's mine at Bingham Canyon with its smelter at Garfield during the period of expansion following 1945. This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the need of the copper mining industry. As a grade-separation bridge, it is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Utah Copper rail line.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 384	Region 2	2.844	UNION PACIFIC RR	SR-266	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 385	Region 2	3.23	UTA,LIGHT RAIL LN.	SR-266	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 436	Region 2	5.628	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-111	1965	Steel continuous girder and floorbeam system

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 449	Region 2	2.09	KENNECOTT RAILROAD	SR-48	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 564	Region 2	61.978	SR-68,(REDWOOD RD)	JORDAN RIVER	1953	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 907	Region 2	2.27	SR-190	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1954	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1032	Region 2	0.74	SR-287	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1064	Region 2	367.414	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1070	Region 2	364.084	US-89 (SR-89)	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CAN	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1227	Region 2	13.437	SR-71	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1272	Region 2	1.073	SR-201	OQUIRRH HILLS DRAIN	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 48	Region 2	4.209	SR-181,1300 EAST	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 49	Region 2	0	1700 EAST STREET	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 737	Region 2	5.064	SR-201	MAGNA PIPE CONDUIT	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
1D 672	Region 2	383.518	RP.SR89NB TO I15NB	RAMP I-15NB TO SR-89NB	1961	Concrete continuous box beam or girders - multiple

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
2C 371	Region 2	3.832	SR-201 EBL	KENNECOTT RAILROAD SPUR	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
4C 371	Region 2	3.871	SR-201 WBL	KENNECOTT RAILROAD SPUR	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historical event or trend at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role serving the transportation needs of the copper mining industry. This grade-separation bridge is significant for its direct role in the transport and processing of natural resources by the Kennecott Railroad.

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

San Juan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037006C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	LONG CANYON CREEK	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037008C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	SAN JUAN RIVER	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and crosses a major river that opened areas previously difficult to access. As such, it has an important and direct association with efforts by the federal government to improve access to Native American lands and open other areas of the state.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037009C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD.#236	MULE CANYON	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
037014C	Region 4P	Lc0	COUNTY ROAD	CANE SPRINGS WASH	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 274	Region 4P	20.904	SR-163	SAN JUAN RIVER	1954	Steel arch - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

San Juan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 292	Region 4P	95.119	US-191 (SR-191)	HATCH WASH	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 301	Region 4P	115.442	SR-95	COTTONWOOD WASH	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 319	Region 4P	18.881	SR-262	MONTEZUMA CREEK	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 440	Region 4P	1.759	SR-262	RECAPTURE WASH	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 491	Region 4P	53.607	SR-95	WHITE CANYON	1965	Steel continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it possesses high artistic value as illustrated through its overall design, outstanding architectural treatment, or notable use of ornamentation, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its design significance.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was recognized through an award for qualities related to design and aesthetics. The monumental size and overall form of this bridge distinguishes it within the post World War II period as significant for possessing high artistic value.

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

San Juan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 607	Region 4P	120.154	SR-95	BIG CANYON WASH	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 703	Region 4P	27.984	SR-163	LIME CREEK	1964	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 710	Region 4P	22.018	SR-262	McELMO CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1138	Region 4P	3.079	SR-262	HORSE CREEK WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1334	Region 4P	26.817	SR-163	TWIN WASH	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2277	Region 4P	84.962	US-191 (SR-191)	PETERS WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 650	Region 4P	19.022	SR-163	UNNAMED WASH	1957	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

San Juan

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 651	Region 4P	12.503	SR-163	HALGAITAH WASH	1957	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 811	Region 4P	21.963	SR-163	UNNAMED WASH	1962	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 928	Region 4P	39.936	SR-163	BUTLER WASH	1965	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Sanpete

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
039013D	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	SAN PITCH RIVER	1965	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0A 446	Region 4R	7.942	SR-137	TWELVE MILE WASH	1947	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1062	Region 4R	51.398	SR-132	HOLLOW WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Sevier

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041021E	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	VERMILLION CANAL	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041029E	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DENMARK WASH	1953	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
041048D	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY FRONTAGE RD	IVIE CREEK	1951	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 558	Region 4R	1.453	SR-24	SEVIER RIVER	1954	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 872	Region 4R	156.675	US-50 (SR-50)	DENMARK WASH	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1047	Region 4R	1.73	SR-120	RICHFIELD CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1055	Region 4R	12.255	SR-118	RICHFIELD CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Sevier

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1710	Region 4R	24.112	SR-118	NORTH CEDAR CREEK	1951	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1827	Region 4R	5.279	SR-24	ROCKY FORD CANAL	1953	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043001D	Region 2 Loc	0.431	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER OVERFLOW CH.	1948	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043008C	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043009A	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY FORK OF WEBER RIVE	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043010A	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043011A	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK, WEBER RIVI	1950	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043014A	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK BEAVER CREEK	1960	Timber slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043020F	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043021F	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043030F	Region 2 Loc	0	200 WEST STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043033E	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	CHALK CREEK	1958	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043038D	Region 2 Loc	0	100 NORTH STREET	CHALK CREEK	1949	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043039F	Region 2 Loc	0	COALVILLE CITY ST.	WEBER RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043042F	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043045E	Region 2 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	ECHO CREEK	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
043049E	Region 2 Loc	0	CENTER STREET	BEAVER CREEK	1950	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 128	Region 2	48.355	SR-150	BEAR RIVER (EAST FORK)	1956	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 288	Region 2	23.343	SR-32	WEBER RIVER	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 269	Region 2	45.605	SR-150	BEAR RIVER	1956	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1210	Region 2	28.917	SR-32	SILVER CREEK	1961	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Tooele

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 621	Region 2	61.837	COUNTY ROAD	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047002A	Region 3 Loc	0	1500 EAST ST.-CO.	NEOLA NO. 1 CANAL	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047004D	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	UINTAH RIVER	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047007E	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DEEP CREEK	1952	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047014A	Region 3 Loc	0	2000 NORTH ST.-CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047015C	Region 3 Loc	0	1500 WEST ST. - CO.	ASHLEY CREEK	1955	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047018A	Region 3 Loc	0	500 SOUTH ST.-CTY.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047019A	Region 3 Loc	0	1000 SOUTH ST.-CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047023A	Region 3 Loc	0	500 WEST ST. - CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047024A	Region 3 Loc	0	VERNAL AVE. - CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047030E	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	UNNAMED WASH	1953	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047034C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	BRUSH CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
047035C	Region 3 Loc	0	500 NORTH ST. - CO.	ASHLEY CREEK	1950	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 321	Region 3	121.697	US-40 (SR-40)	UINTAH RIVER	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 640	Region 3	0.02	SR-88	GREEN RIVER	1962	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a crossing that greatly improved access to areas of the state that were previously inaccessible. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge was constructed for the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and crosses a major river that opened areas previously difficult to access. As such, it has an important and direct association with efforts by the federal government to improve access to Native American lands and open other areas of the state.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 570	Region 3	2.72	SR-149	BRUSH CREEK	1954	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 828	Region 3	142.611	US-40 (SR-40)	STEINAKER CANAL	1965	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1015	Region 3	169.348	US-40 (SR-40)	SNAKE JOHN WASH	1955	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1029	Region 3	168.613	US-40 (SR-40)	POWDER SPRINGS WASH	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1030	Region 3	164.709	US-40 (SR-40)	COW WASH	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1158	Region 3	129.569	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND WASH	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1499	Region 3	130.972	US-40 (SR-40)	HALFWAY HOLLOW WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1500	Region 3	133.777	US-40 (SR-40)	TWELVE MILE WASH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 467	Region 3	174.517	US-40 (SR-40)	SAND SPRING WASH	1955	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049002D	Region 3 Loc	0	400 SOUTH STREET	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049003D	Region 3 Loc	0	AMER.FK.CITY STR.	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049010D	Region 3 Loc	0	800 NORTH STREET	PROVO RIVER	1960	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This concrete frame has an open frame design in which there are few examples in Utah. This feature is significant as one of few design variations within this bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049014D	Region 3 Loc	0	200 WEST STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049016D	Region 3 Loc	0	200 SOUTH STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049020D	Region 3 Loc	0	400 SOUTH STREET	HOBBLE CREEK	1952	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049025F	Region 3 Loc	0	800 SOUTH STREET	PROVO RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049066C	Region 3 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	DIAMOND FORK CREEK	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
049085C	Region 3 Loc	0	CO.RD. AT KYUNE	PRICE RIVER & UPRR	1962	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 235	Region 3	37.013	SR-73	JORDAN RIVER	1947	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 344	Region 3	0.096	SR-145,INT.X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15), NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 347	Region 3	0.107	SR-180, INT.X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 349	Region 3	275.327	Proctor Ln 4250 W.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 565	Region 4P	22.663	SR-96	WHITE RIVER	1953	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 609	Region 3	6.626	SR-115	SPANISH FORK RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 886	Region 3	1.065	SR-92	PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL	1950	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 936	Region 3	193.263	US-6 (SR-6)	SHEEP CREEK	1954	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2222	Region 3	8.678	SR-189	MURDOCK CANAL	1956	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2298	Region 3	26.714	SR-73	CEDAR FORT CANAL	1947	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 10	Region 3	280.37	5TH-6TH EAST ST.	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 11	Region 3	0	5TH-6TH EAST ST	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
3D 603	Region 3	327.693	US-89 (SR-89) SBL	SR-51	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Wasatch

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
051009D	Region 3 Loc	0	WASATCH COUNTY RD	PROVO RIVER	1956	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
053001D	Region 4C Lo	0	TONIQUINT DRIVE	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1962	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
053041A	Region 4C Lo	0	COUNTY ROAD	PINTO WASH	1950	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 293	Region 4C	19.704	SR-18	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1957	Steel arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 629	Region 4C	30.713	CO RD INTER X-ROAD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 636	Region 4C	0	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 665	Region 4C	0.04	SR-228,INTER X-RD	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1328	Region 4C	32.233	SR-9	BLACK CANYON WASH	1963	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E2052	Region 4C	12.677	SR-59	GOULD'S WASH	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Wayne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
055006A	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT RIVER	1958	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
055007C	Region 4R Lc	0	COUNTY ROAD	FREMONT RIVER	1951	Steel truss - thru

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

Bailey truss configuration represents an important variation within this rare bridge type. Designed for use by the military, surplus Bailey truss bridges were available following World War II and used across the country. This is significant as a representative example of a rare bridge type in Utah.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 279	Region 4R	94.494	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 235	Region 4R	81.187	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1960	Concrete continuous tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 582	Region 4R	72.161	SR-24	SAND CREEK WASH	1954	Concrete arch - deck

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge demonstrates important bridge building practices of an uncommon bridge type in Utah. As such, it illustrates the pattern of features typical of this rare bridge type and is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge represents a bridge type not common to Utah. Based on its rarity, it is considered significant as one of relatively few specimens illustrating its type.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Wayne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 583	Region 4R	72.065	SR-24	SULPHUR CREEK	1955	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 642	Region 4R	66.888	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1959	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E 355	Region 4R	79.398	SR-24	SULPHUR CREEK	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1171	Region 4R	113.054	SR-24	SAND WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0F 116	Region 4R	115.163	SR-24	FREMONT RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 807	Region 4R	92.062	SR-24	BLUE FLAT WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 808	Region 4R	90.35	SR-24	PLEASANT CREEK	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Wayne

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V 875	Region 4R	106.251	SR-24	CHAFFAN WASH	1963	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0V1546	Region 4R	97.767	SR-24	CAINEVILLE WASH	1960	Steel culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057001F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WARREN CANAL	1959	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

This bridge is significant as an example of the earliest use (prior to 1960) of prestressed concrete in Utah. Early use of prestressed concrete represents an important new evolution in bridge design and construction.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057002D	Region 1 Loc	0	FARR WEST CITY ST.	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057007D	Region 1 Loc	0	FARR WEST CITY ST.	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057008D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057009F	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WARREN CANAL	1960	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057010D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057011D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057012D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER RIVER	1955	Concrete continuous frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057014D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057016D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1963	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057017D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057019D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057021D	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	LAYTON CANAL	1962	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057024F	Region 1 Loc	0	PARKER DRIVE-OGDEN	WEBER RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057026F	Region 1 Loc	0	LINCOLN AVENUE	OGDEN RIVER	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057031A	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY PARK ROAD	SOUTH FORK OGDEN RIVE	1955	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057038C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	NO.BR.SO.FK. OGDEN RIVE	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057039D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FORK OGDEN RIVE	1950	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057045C	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVE	1959	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057046E	Region 1 Loc	0	CITY STREET	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057047E	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	MIDDLE FK.OGDEN R.O'FLC	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
057049D	Region 1 Loc	0	COUNTY ROAD	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVE	1947	Concrete frame

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 280	Region 1	5.987	SR-134	WEBER RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0C 286	Region 1	2.869	SR-204 (WALL AVE)	OGDEN RIVER	1954	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 634	Region 1	11.644	SR-39	OGDEN RIVER	1959	Concrete tee beam

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional skew of this bridge (greater than 54 degrees) demonstrates an engineering solution to accommodate a particular site challenge. An exceptional skew represents an important variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 737	Region 1	0.086	SR-158	PINEVIEW DAM SPILLWAY	1956	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge is eligible under Criterion A as it has a direct and important association with a significant historic program or project at the state level. Further, it retains the historic integrity necessary to convey its historical significance.

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion C. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

Rationale:

This bridge displays sufficient evidence to demonstrate its construction, individually, played an important role in the development of the Pineview Dam project. This bridge is integrated into the spillway structure of the dam to serve important transportation needs. It is significant for its direct association to this project.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 740	Region 1	0.483	SR-168	U.P.& L.CO. PENSTOCK	1964	Concrete slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation for Criterion A. No evidence was found during data collection activities to indicate that this bridge possesses a significant association with important historical events or trends. As such, it is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

This bridge is eligible under Criterion C because it represents a variation, evolution, or transition that is conveyed through important features or innovations related to bridge construction, design, or engineering, and it retains historic integrity necessary to convey its engineering significance.

Rationale:

The exceptional main span length of this bridge illustrates the outer limits achievable in span length within this bridge type prior to 1966. An exceptional main span length illustrates a variation within a given bridge type and is considered a significant feature in bridge engineering and construction.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0D 804	Region 1	10.864	SR-134	WILLARD CANAL	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1099	Region 1	18.147	SR-39	SO.BR.SO.FK.OGDEN RIVEI	1959	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1100	Region 1	18.398	SR-39	NO.BR.SO.FK.OGDEN RIVEI	1957	Concrete culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

F. Eligibility Recommendations for Post-1945 Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
0E1105	Region 1	3.606	SR-158	NORTH FORK OGDEN RIVE	1958	Concrete continuous culvert

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
2C 314	Region 1	2.259	SR-79EBL 31st ST.	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

Bridge Number:	District:	Mile Post:	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built	Bridge Type:
4C 314	Region 1	2.261	SR-79, WBL 31ST.	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Statement of Significance:

This bridge does not appear to possess significance under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and is recommended not eligible under Criteria A and C.

Rationale:

No evidence was found during research or data collection activities to indicate that this bridge is an important example of bridge design, engineering, or construction or that it possesses a direct and important association with historical events or trends.

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003001F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1978	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003011F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1980	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003026F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1984	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003028C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1984	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003036C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057041F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	OGDEN RIVER	c.1994	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057042F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	OGDEN RIVER	1997	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035038C	Salt Lake	0	8660 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035050F	Salt Lake	0	9400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	2010	Concrete frame

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035053F	Salt Lake	0	8710 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	2007	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035097F	Salt Lake	0	500 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1968	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035127F	Salt Lake	0	3900 SOUTH STREET	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	c.1966	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035143D	Salt Lake	0	FRONTAGE ROAD	BRIGHTON CANAL	1932	Concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043002C	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	2NDARY.CHAN.WEBER RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043012F	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	c.1971	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043031F	Summit	0	200 NORTH STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	c.1945	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043044C	Summit	0	MILLRACE RD.OAKLEY	WEBER RIVER	1987	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043047F	Summit	0	100 WEST STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	2007	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Region 3 Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013034C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1993	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047009A	Uintah	0	1500 S. ST. NAPLES	ASHLEY CREEK	1923	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047020A	Uintah	0	1500 WEST ST. -CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047025C	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY GULCH CREEK	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049032C	Utah	0	PETEETNEET BYPASS	HIGHLINE CANAL	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049047C	Utah	0	CO. RD.-400 W. ST	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049051C	Utah	0	PAYSON CANYON RD.	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001001C	Beaver	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAVER RIVER	1999	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007016C	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	PRICE RIVER	1920	Steel truss - thru

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007025D	Carbon	0	CO. RD. (OLD SR-6)	PRICE CANAL	1934	Concrete frame

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017001C	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1984	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019019C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	THOMPSON WASH	2006	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021015F	Iron	0	COUNTY ROAD	RIGHT HAND FORK CREEK	1993	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041002A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041003A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	1978	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041004A	Sevier	0	CITY STREET	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	2006	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041013A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C Local

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041015A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2003	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041024A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041028C	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	DENMARK WASH	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041030A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041042F	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1982	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053003F	Washington	0	ST.GEORGE CITY ST.	FT. PIERCE WASH	1982	Prestressed concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 260	Morgan	1.194	SR-167	DRY CREEK	1927	Concrete slab

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 166	Box Elder	3.909	US-91&SR-90EB RAMP	BOX ELDER CREEK	1971	Concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 610	Cache	4.168	SR-238	LOGAN RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 424	Morgan	6.197	SR-66	EAST CANYON CREEK	1978	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 646	Box Elder	11.977	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	EAST SNOWVILLE INT X-RD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 646	Box Elder	11.978	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	EAST SNOWVILLE INT.X-RD.	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 647	Box Elder	14.444	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	HANSEL VALLEY FARM ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 647	Box Elder	14.464	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	HANSEL VALLEY FARM ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 618	Box Elder	20.317	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	BLUE CREEK INT. X-RD.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 618	Box Elder	20.348	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	BLUE CREEK INT.X-RD.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1129	Box Elder	21.807	I-84 (SR-84)	FARM ROAD UNDERPASS	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1127	Box Elder	23.277	I-84 (SR-84)	BLUE CREEK	1958	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 619	Box Elder	26.566	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-83	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 619	Box Elder	26.567	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-83	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2207	Box Elder	39.948	I-84 (SR-84)EB&WB	BOTHWELL CANAL	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 95	Davis	87.498	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	WEBER RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 95	Davis	87.507	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	WEBER RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 763	Weber	89.2	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	U.P.& L.CO.PENSTOCK	1964	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 476	Weber	90.855	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	WEBER RIVER AND UPRR	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 476	Weber	90.868	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	WEBER RIVER AND UPRR	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 30	Morgan	96.504	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	CO.RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 29	Morgan	96.504	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	CO.RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 676	Morgan	98.219	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	PETERSON FARM ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 676	Morgan	98.219	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	PETERSON FARM ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 677	Morgan	100.439	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	STODDARD FARM	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 677	Morgan	100.439	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	STODDARD FARM	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 667	Morgan	102.289	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	MORGAN FARM ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 667	Morgan	102.289	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	MORGAN FARM ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 662	Morgan	103.333	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 662	Morgan	103.334	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 661	Morgan	103.901	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 661	Morgan	103.901	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 645	Morgan	106.172	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	CO.ACCESS RD.,INT X-ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 645	Morgan	106.172	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	CO.ACCESS RD.,INT.X-ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 611	Davis	315.242	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-93, 2600 SOUTH in NSL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 611	Davis	315.279	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-93, 2600 SOUTH in NSL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 620	Davis	316.216	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	1500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 620	Davis	316.248	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	1500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 615	Davis	316.869	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-68, 500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 615	Davis	316.906	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-68, 500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 302	Davis	318.023	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	RAMP, I-15SB TO US-89SB	1960	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 613	Davis	318.471	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PAGES LANE, 1600 NORTH	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 613	Davis	318.499	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	1600 NORTH ST.,PAGES LN.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 708	Davis	331.587	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-232	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 708	Davis	331.616	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-232	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1901	Davis	334.487	I-15 (SR-15)	DAVIS-WEBER CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1902	Davis	336.814	I-15 (SR-15)	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 910	Weber	348.805	24 IN. METAL FLUME	US-89(SR-89)	1965	Steel culvert

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1349	Box Elder	364.805	I-15 (SR-15)	BLACK SLOUGH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 2	Box Elder	374.045	I-15 (SR-15) NB	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 2	Box Elder	374.105	I-15 (SR-15) SB	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 1

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 674	Cache	377.738	US-89.(SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	c.1932	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 675	Cache	378.419	US-89.(SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	1931	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 390	Salt Lake	0	RP.900 W.TO I-15NB	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1E1322	Salt Lake	25.554	INTCHG.CONNT R.ROAD	DRAINAGE CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1324	Salt Lake	26.734	I-215 (SR-215)	DRAINAGE CANAL	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 308	Tooele	62.185	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 238	Tooele	70.985	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	DELLE DRAINAGE CHANNEL	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 239	Tooele	72.774	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SKULL VALLEY DRAIN	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 369	Salt Lake	118.185	I-80 (SR-80)	200 SOUTH STREET	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 7	Salt Lake	118.536	I-80 (SR-80)	JORDAN RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 47	Salt Lake	122.714	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	HIGHLAND DRIVE	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 50	Salt Lake	126.126	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	2000 EAST STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 50	Salt Lake	126.126	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	2000 EAST STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 424	Salt Lake	126.659	RP.I80WB TO I2155S	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 51	Salt Lake	126.781	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	SR-195NB,RAMP TO I-80WB	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 51	Salt Lake	126.804	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SR-195NB,RAMP TO I-80WB	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 20	Summit	154.977	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SR-32	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 20	Summit	154.996	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	SR-32	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 666	Summit	155.702	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	WEBER RIVER	1963	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 666	Summit	155.712	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	WEBER RIVER	1963	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 232	Summit	178.149	INTCHG.ACCESS RAMP	ECHO CREEK & UPRR	1954	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 652	Summit	185.42	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	ACCESS ROAD INT. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2108	Summit	186.391	I-80 (SR-80)EB&WB	ECHO CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2106	Summit	187.26	I-80 (SR-80)EB&WB	ECHO CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 652	Summit	187.766	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ACCESS ROAD INT. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2E1180	Summit	190.144	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ECHO CREEK	1940	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 2

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 654	Summit	191.218	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ECHO CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1445	Salt Lake	294.111	I-15 (SR-15)	DRY CREEK	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1201	Salt Lake	302.114	I-15 (SR-15)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1200	Salt Lake	303.895	I-15 (SR-15)	MILL CREEK	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 364	Utah	0.949	SB.RP.to SR-114EB	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 404	Wasatch	17.995	SR-189	DEER CREEK DAM SPILLWAY	1939	Concrete slab

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 381	Utah	158.751	US-6 (SR-6)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1933	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 361	Utah	265.411	SB.RP.TO SR-114EB	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 363	Utah	265.588	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 363	Utah	265.605	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 362	Utah	265.828	RP I15SB - SR114EB	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 360	Utah	265.853	SR114WB.R.TO I15NB	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 359	Utah	266.069	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PROVO RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 359	Utah	266.074	I-15 (SR-15)SBL	PROVO RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 17	Utah	266.547	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	820 North Street Provo	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 17	Utah	266.547	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	820 North Street Provo	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 358	Utah	266.67	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 358	Utah	266.698	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 357	Utah	266.773	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 357	Utah	266.796	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 356	Utah	267.83	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	2000 SOUTH STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 356	Utah	267.85	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	2000 SOUTH STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 16	Utah	270.162	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	400 SOUTH STREET	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 16	Utah	270.162	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	400 SOUTH STREET	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 15	Utah	270.659	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CENTER STREET IN OREM	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 15	Utah	270.659	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CENTER STREET IN OREM	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 14	Utah	271.163	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	400 NORTH STREET	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 14	Utah	271.163	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	400 NORTH STREET	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 13	Utah	271.669	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-52, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 13	Utah	271.669	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-52, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 353	Utah	272.767	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-241, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 353	Utah	272.796	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-241, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 352	Utah	273.177	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-114 & UPRR	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 352	Utah	273.205	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-114 & UPRR	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 351	Utah	274.714	200 NORTH STREET	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 346	Utah	277.132	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	100 EAST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 346	Utah	277.153	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	100 EAST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 686	Utah	277.315	I-15 (SR-15)	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 345	Utah	277.911	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 345	Utah	277.929	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 343	Utah	279.969	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 343	Utah	280.014	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 9	Utah	280.805	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	900 NORTH STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 9	Utah	280.805	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	900 NORTH STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 342	Utah	281.302	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	300 WEST ST. in LEHI	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 342	Utah	281.327	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 341	Utah	281.615	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 341	Utah	281.645	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 3

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 340	Utah	282.291	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	US-89 (SR-89),INT.X-ROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 340	Utah	282.311	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	US-89 (SR-89),INT.X-ROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 664	Washington	1.664	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	ATKINSVILLE WASH	1962	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V2104	San Juan	3.5	SR-491	Vega Wash	1955	Other culvert

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 333	Washington	5.299	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	VIRGIN RIVER	1961	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 673	Washington	5.637	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1961	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 816	Beaver	7.812	SR-153	BEAVER RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1329	Washington	11.794	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	MILL CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 738	Washington	11.995	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	WASHINGTON MAIN STREET	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 738	Washington	12.014	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	WASHINGTON MAIN STREET	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 724	Washington	15.888	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-9, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 462	Emery	15.906	SR-10	MUDDY CREEK	1942	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 724	Washington	15.908	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-9, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3E1301	Washington	19.018	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 555	Washington	19.414	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1956	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1E1081	Washington	20.168	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	HARRISBURG CREEK	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3E1296	Washington	20.168	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	HARRISBURG CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 680	Washington	23.703	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-228, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 680	Washington	23.703	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-228, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 630	Washington	27.47	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-17, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 630	Washington	27.47	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-17, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 627	Washington	31.113	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	SOUTH ASH CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 628	Washington	31.861	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 628	Washington	31.861	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 523	Washington	33.168	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	LEAP CREEK	1949	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 635	Washington	33.179	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	LEAP CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 644	Washington	36.763	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO. RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 644	Washington	36.763	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO. RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1209	Washington	37.221	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	ASH CREEK RES. SPILLWAY	1960	Concrete culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 633	Washington	40.253	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PARK ROAD-INTER X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 633	Washington	40.253	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	PARK ROAD-INTER X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1128	Washington	40.857	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	DRY CREEK	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 632	Washington	42.159	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	NEW HARMONY RD.,INT.X-RD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 632	Washington	42.159	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	NEW HARMONY RD.,INT.X-RD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 762	Iron	61.905	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	NICHOLS CANYON ROAD	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 762	Iron	61.916	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	NICHOLS CANYON ROAD	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2064	Iron	96.822	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	FREMONT WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 89	Emery	100.033	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	MUDDY CREEK	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 98	Emery	107.522	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	BITTER SEEP WASH	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 99	Emery	108.223	I-70 (SR-70).EBL	SOUTH SALT WASH	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 173	San Juan	109.308	US-191 (SR-191)	BIG MULE SHOE WASH TUN.	1940	Other culvert

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1785	Beaver	111.98	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	NORTH WASH	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 699	Beaver	116.368	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO.RD.W.FROM MANDERFIELD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 699	Beaver	116.368	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO.RD.W.FROM MANDERFIELD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 495	Emery	119.607	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	EAGLE CANYON	1965	Steel continuous arch - deck

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1376	Millard	134.089	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	COVE CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 743	Grand	141.196	US-191 (SR-191)	UPPER COURTHOUSE WASH	1985	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

G. List of Excluded Bridges by UDOT Region

Region 4C

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1983	Grand	180.674	I-70 (SR-70)	CROOKED WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1981	Grand	181.081	I-70 (SR-70)	CORRAL WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1985	Grand	181.903	I-70 (SR-70)	CRESCENT WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 764	Sevier	190.341	US-89 (SR-89)	CLEAR CREEK	1967	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 549	Grand	218.699	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	COTTONWOOD WASH	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Beaver

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
001001C	Beaver	0	COUNTY ROAD	BEAVER RIVER	1999	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 816	Beaver	7.812	SR-153	BEAVER RIVER	1950	Concrete frame

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1785	Beaver	111.98	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	NORTH WASH	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 699	Beaver	116.368	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO.RD.W.FROM MANDERFIELD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 699	Beaver	116.368	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO.RD.W.FROM MANDERFIELD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003001F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	MALAD RIVER	1978	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003011F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1980	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003026F	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEST CANAL	1984	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003028C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1984	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
003036C	Box Elder	0	COUNTY ROAD	CORINNE CANAL	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1127	Box Elder	23.277	I-84 (SR-84)	BLUE CREEK	1958	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1129	Box Elder	21.807	I-84 (SR-84)	FARM ROAD UNDERPASS	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1349	Box Elder	364.805	I-15 (SR-15)	BLACK SLOUGH	1965	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2207	Box Elder	39.948	I-84 (SR-84)EB&WB	BOTHWELL CANAL	1955	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 166	Box Elder	3.909	US-91&SR-90EB RAMP	BOX ELDER CREEK	1971	Concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 2	Box Elder	374.045	I-15 (SR-15) NB	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 618	Box Elder	20.317	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	BLUE CREEK INT. X-RD.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 619	Box Elder	26.567	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-83	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 646	Box Elder	11.978	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	EAST SNOWVILLE INT.X-RD.	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 647	Box Elder	14.444	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	HANSEL VALLEY FARM ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Box Elder

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 2	Box Elder	374.105	I-15 (SR-15) SB	BEAR RIVER	1960	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 618	Box Elder	20.348	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	BLUE CREEK INT.X-RD.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 619	Box Elder	26.566	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-83	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 646	Box Elder	11.977	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	EAST SNOWVILLE INT X-RD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 647	Box Elder	14.464	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	HANSEL VALLEY FARM ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Cache

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 610	Cache	4.168	SR-238	LOGAN RIVER	1958	Concrete frame

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 674	Cache	377.738	US-89.(SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	c.1932	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 675	Cache	378.419	US-89.(SR-89)	LOGAN RIVER	1931	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

Carbon

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007016C	Carbon	0	COUNTY ROAD	PRICE RIVER	1920	Steel truss - thru

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
007025D	Carbon	0	CO. RD. (OLD SR-6)	PRICE CANAL	1934	Concrete frame

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Non-extant

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1901	Davis	334.487	I-15 (SR-15)	DAVIS-WEBER CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1902	Davis	336.814	I-15 (SR-15)	WEBER-DAVIS CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 302	Davis	318.023	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	RAMP, I-15SB TO US-89SB	1960	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 611	Davis	315.242	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-93, 2600 SOUTH in NSL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 613	Davis	318.471	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PAGES LANE, 1600 NORTH	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 615	Davis	316.869	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-68, 500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 620	Davis	316.216	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	1500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 708	Davis	331.587	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-232	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 95	Davis	87.507	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	WEBER RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 611	Davis	315.279	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-93, 2600 SOUTH in NSL	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 613	Davis	318.499	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	1600 NORTH ST.,PAGES LN.	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 615	Davis	316.906	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-68, 500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Davis

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 620	Davis	316.248	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	1500 SOUTH STREET	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 708	Davis	331.616	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-232	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 95	Davis	87.498	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	WEBER RIVER	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Duchesne

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
013034C	Duchesne	0	COUNTY ROAD	STRAWBERRY RIVER	1993	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Emery

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 462	Emery	15.906	SR-10	MUDDY CREEK	1942	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 495	Emery	119.607	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	EAGLE CANYON	1965	Steel continuous arch - deck

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 89	Emery	100.033	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	MUDDY CREEK	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 98	Emery	107.522	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	BITTER SEEP WASH	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 99	Emery	108.223	I-70 (SR-70).EBL	SOUTH SALT WASH	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Garfield

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
017001C	Garfield	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1984	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Grand

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
019019C	Grand	0	COUNTY ROAD	THOMPSON WASH	2006	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 743	Grand	141.196	US-191 (SR-191)	UPPER COURTHOUSE WASH	1985	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1981	Grand	181.081	I-70 (SR-70)	CORRAL WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1983	Grand	180.674	I-70 (SR-70)	CROOKED WASH	1960	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1985	Grand	181.903	I-70 (SR-70)	CRESCENT WASH	1959	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 549	Grand	218.699	I-70 (SR-70) EBL	COTTONWOOD WASH	1958	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Iron

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
021015F	Iron	0	COUNTY ROAD	RIGHT HAND FORK CREEK	1993	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2064	Iron	96.822	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	FREMONT WASH	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 762	Iron	61.905	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	NICHOLS CANYON ROAD	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 762	Iron	61.916	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	NICHOLS CANYON ROAD	1965	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Millard

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1376	Millard	134.089	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	COVE CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 260	Morgan	1.194	SR-167	DRY CREEK	1927	Concrete slab

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 424	Morgan	6.197	SR-66	EAST CANYON CREEK	1978	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 645	Morgan	106.172	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	CO.ACCESS RD.,INT X-ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 661	Morgan	103.901	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 662	Morgan	103.333	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 667	Morgan	102.289	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	MORGAN FARM ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 676	Morgan	98.219	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	PETERSON FARM ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 677	Morgan	100.439	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	STODDARD FARM	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 30	Morgan	96.504	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	CO.RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 645	Morgan	106.172	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	CO.ACCESS RD.,INT.X-ROAD	1960	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 661	Morgan	103.901	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 662	Morgan	103.334	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	SR-66, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 667	Morgan	102.289	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	MORGAN FARM ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Morgan

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 676	Morgan	98.219	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	PETERSON FARM ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 677	Morgan	100.439	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	STODDARD FARM	1964	Concrete continuous slab

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 29	Morgan	96.504	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	CO.RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035038C	Salt Lake	0	8660 SOUTH STREET	EAST JORDAN CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035050F	Salt Lake	0	9400 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	2010	Concrete frame

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035053F	Salt Lake	0	8710 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN & SALT LAKE CANAL	2007	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035097F	Salt Lake	0	500 SOUTH STREET	JORDAN RIVER	1968	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035127F	Salt Lake	0	3900 SOUTH STREET	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	c.1966	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
035143D	Salt Lake	0	FRONTAGE ROAD	BRIGHTON CANAL	1932	Concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 369	Salt Lake	118.185	I-80 (SR-80)	200 SOUTH STREET	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1200	Salt Lake	303.895	I-15 (SR-15)	MILL CREEK	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1201	Salt Lake	302.114	I-15 (SR-15)	BIG COTTONWOOD CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1324	Salt Lake	26.734	I-215 (SR-215)	DRAINAGE CANAL	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1445	Salt Lake	294.111	I-15 (SR-15)	DRY CREEK	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0F 7	Salt Lake	118.536	I-80 (SR-80)	JORDAN RIVER	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 390	Salt Lake	0	RP.900 W.TO I-15NB	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1E1322	Salt Lake	25.554	INTCHG.CONNT R.ROAD	DRAINAGE CANAL	1964	Concrete culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Salt Lake

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 47	Salt Lake	122.714	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	HIGHLAND DRIVE	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 50	Salt Lake	126.126	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	2000 EAST STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 51	Salt Lake	126.781	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	SR-195NB,RAMP TO I-80WB	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 424	Salt Lake	126.659	RP.I80WB TO I2155S	I-80 (SR-80) EBL & WBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 50	Salt Lake	126.126	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	2000 EAST STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 51	Salt Lake	126.804	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SR-195NB,RAMP TO I-80WB	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

San Juan

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 173	San Juan	109.308	US-191 (SR-191)	BIG MULE SHOE WASH TUN.	1940	Other culvert

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V2104	San Juan	3.5	SR-491	Vega Wash	1955	Other culvert

Rationale:	Result/Determination:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.	Not evaluated

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Sevier

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041002A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041003A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	1978	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041004A	Sevier	0	CITY STREET	SEVIER VALLEY CANAL	2006	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041013A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041015A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2003	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041024A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	2004	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041028C	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	DENMARK WASH	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041030A	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1935	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
041042F	Sevier	0	COUNTY ROAD	SEVIER RIVER	1982	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 764	Sevier	190.341	US-89 (SR-89)	CLEAR CREEK	1967	Prestressed concrete box beam or girders - multiple

Rationale: This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination: Not evaluated

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043002C	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	2NDARY.CHAN.WEBER RIVER	1945	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043012F	Summit	0	COUNTY ROAD	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	c.1971	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043031F	Summit	0	200 NORTH STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	c.1945	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043044C	Summit	0	MILLRACE RD.OAKLEY	WEBER RIVER	1987	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
043047F	Summit	0	100 WEST STREET	WEBER-PROVO DIV. CANAL	2007	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 232	Summit	178.149	INTCHG.ACCESS RAMP	ECHO CREEK & UPRR	1954	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2106	Summit	187.26	I-80 (SR-80)EB&WB	ECHO CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E2108	Summit	186.391	I-80 (SR-80)EB&WB	ECHO CREEK	1962	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 652	Summit	187.766	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ACCESS ROAD INT. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 654	Summit	191.218	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ECHO CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2D 666	Summit	155.702	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	WEBER RIVER	1963	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2E1180	Summit	190.144	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	ECHO CREEK	1940	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2F 20	Summit	154.996	I-80 (SR-80) EBL	SR-32	1963	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 652	Summit	185.42	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	ACCESS ROAD INT. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Summit

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4D 666	Summit	155.712	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	WEBER RIVER	1963	Concrete frame

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4F 20	Summit	154.977	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SR-32	1965	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Tooele

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 238	Tooele	70.985	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	DELLE DRAINAGE CHANNEL	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 239	Tooele	72.774	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	SKULL VALLEY DRAIN	1948	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 308	Tooele	62.185	I-80 (SR-80) WBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1959	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:

In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:

Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Uintah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047009A	Uintah	0	1500 S. ST. NAPLES	ASHLEY CREEK	1923	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047020A	Uintah	0	1500 WEST ST. -CO.	STEINAKER CANAL	1960	Timber stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
047025C	Uintah	0	COUNTY ROAD	DRY GULCH CREEK	1960	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049032C	Utah	0	PETEETNEET BYPASS	HIGHLINE CANAL	1925	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049047C	Utah	0	CO. RD.-400 W. ST	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
049051C	Utah	0	PAYSON CANYON RD.	HIGHLINE CANAL	1935	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 351	Utah	274.714	200 NORTH STREET	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0C 381	Utah	158.751	US-6 (SR-6)	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1933	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 686	Utah	277.315	I-15 (SR-15)	AMERICAN FORK CREEK	1961	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 340	Utah	282.311	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	US-89 (SR-89),INT.X-ROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 341	Utah	281.645	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 342	Utah	281.327	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 343	Utah	279.969	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 345	Utah	277.911	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 346	Utah	277.153	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	100 EAST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 352	Utah	273.205	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-114 & UPRR	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 353	Utah	272.767	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-241, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 356	Utah	267.83	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	2000 SOUTH STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 357	Utah	266.773	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 358	Utah	266.67	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 359	Utah	266.069	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PROVO RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 360	Utah	265.853	SR114WB.R.TO I15NB	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 363	Utah	265.588	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 9	Utah	280.805	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	900 NORTH STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 13	Utah	271.669	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-52, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 14	Utah	271.163	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	400 NORTH STREET	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 15	Utah	270.659	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CENTER STREET IN OREM	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 16	Utah	270.162	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	400 SOUTH STREET	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1F 17	Utah	266.547	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	820 North Street Provo	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 361	Utah	265.411	SB.RP.TO SR-114EB	UPRR & 12TH WEST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 364	Utah	0.949	SB.RP.to SR-114EB	I-15 (SR-15) NBL & SBL	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 340	Utah	282.291	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	US-89 (SR-89),INT.X-ROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 341	Utah	281.615	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 342	Utah	281.302	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	300 WEST ST. in LEHI	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 343	Utah	280.014	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	US-89 (SR-89) & UPRR	1965	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 345	Utah	277.929	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	300 WEST STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 346	Utah	277.132	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	100 EAST STREET	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 352	Utah	273.177	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-114 & UPRR	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 353	Utah	272.796	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-241, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 356	Utah	267.85	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	2000 SOUTH STREET	1963	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 357	Utah	266.796	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 358	Utah	266.698	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 359	Utah	266.074	I-15 (SR-15)SBL	PROVO RIVER	1961	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 362	Utah	265.828	RP I15SB - SR114EB	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3C 363	Utah	265.605	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-114 (PROVO CENTER ST)	1964	Steel stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 9	Utah	280.805	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	900 NORTH STREET	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 13	Utah	271.669	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-52, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 14	Utah	271.163	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	400 NORTH STREET	1961	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Utah

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 15	Utah	270.659	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CENTER STREET IN OREM	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 16	Utah	270.162	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	400 SOUTH STREET	1962	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3F 17	Utah	266.547	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	820 North Street Provo	1964	Prestressed concrete stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Wasatch

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 404	Wasatch	17.995	SR-189	DEER CREEK DAM SPILLWAY	1939	Concrete slab

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Non-extant

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
053003F	Washington	0	ST.GEORGE CITY ST.	FT. PIERCE WASH	1982	Prestressed concrete continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 627	Washington	31.113	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	SOUTH ASH CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1128	Washington	40.857	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	DRY CREEK	1959	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1209	Washington	37.221	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	ASH CREEK RES. SPILLWAY	1960	Concrete culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0E1329	Washington	11.794	I-15 (SR-15)NB&SB	MILL CREEK	1964	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1C 333	Washington	5.299	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	VIRGIN RIVER	1961	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 523	Washington	33.168	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	LEAP CREEK	1949	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 555	Washington	19.414	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1956	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 628	Washington	31.861	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 630	Washington	27.47	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-17, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 632	Washington	42.159	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	NEW HARMONY RD.,INT.X-RD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 633	Washington	40.253	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	PARK ROAD-INTER X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 644	Washington	36.763	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	CO. RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 664	Washington	1.664	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	ATKINSVILLE WASH	1962	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 673	Washington	5.637	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SANTA CLARA RIVER	1961	Concrete continuous frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 680	Washington	23.703	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-228, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 724	Washington	15.908	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	SR-9, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1D 738	Washington	11.995	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	WASHINGTON MAIN STREET	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
1E1081	Washington	20.168	I-15 (SR-15) NBL	HARRISBURG CREEK	1956	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 628	Washington	31.861	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO. RD. INT. X-RD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 630	Washington	27.47	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-17, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 632	Washington	42.159	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	NEW HARMONY RD.,INT.X-RD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 633	Washington	40.253	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	PARK ROAD-INTER X-ROAD	1959	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 635	Washington	33.179	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	LEAP CREEK	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 644	Washington	36.763	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	CO. RD., INTCHG. X-ROAD	1959	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Washington

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 680	Washington	23.703	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-228, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1962	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 724	Washington	15.888	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	SR-9, INTCHG. X-ROAD	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3D 738	Washington	12.014	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	WASHINGTON MAIN STREET	1964	Concrete continuous tee beam

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3E1296	Washington	20.168	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	HARRISBURG CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
3E1301	Washington	19.018	I-15 (SR-15) SBL	COTTONWOOD CREEK	1963	Concrete continuous culvert

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

H. List of Excluded Bridges by County

Weber

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057041F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	OGDEN RIVER	c.1994	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
057042F	Weber	0	COUNTY ROAD	OGDEN RIVER	1997	Prestressed concrete tee beam

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0D 763	Weber	89.2	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	U.P.& L.CO.PENSTOCK	1964	Concrete frame

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
0V 910	Weber	348.805	24 IN. METAL FLUME	US-89(SR-89)	1965	Steel culvert

Rationale:
This bridge was excluded from the historic bridge inventory because it was found to be non-extant, a non-bridge structure, or the results of data collection concluded it was constructed after 1965.

Result/Determination:
Not evaluated

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
2C 476	Weber	90.868	I-84 (SR-84) EBL	WEBER RIVER AND UPRR	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Bridge Number	County:	Mile Post	Facility:	Feature Intersected:	Year Built:	Bridge Type:
4C 476	Weber	90.855	I-84 (SR-84) WBL	WEBER RIVER AND UPRR	1965	Steel continuous stringer/multi-beam or girder

Rationale:
In accordance with Section 6007 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), this bridge within the right-of-way of the interstate system is not eligible for the National Register since it was not included on FHWA's Final List of Nationally and Exceptionally Significant Features of the Federal Interstate Highway System. Therefore, it was not reevaluated as part of this inventory project.

Result/Determination:
Not eligible

Appendix A. National Bridge Inventory

Appendix A

National Bridge Inventory – Coding Guide for Structure Type (Items 43A and 43B)

Material

Code	Description
1	Concrete
2	Concrete continuous
3	Steel
4	Steel continuous
5	Prestressed concrete *
6	Prestressed concrete continuous *
7	Wood or timber
8	Masonry
9	Aluminum, Wrought Iron or Cast Iron
0	Other
99	Miscoded data

* Post-tensioned concrete coded as prestressed concrete

Design

Code	Description
01	Slab
02	Stringer/Multi-beam or girder
03	Girder and floorbeam system
04	T-beam
05	Box beam or girders - Multiple
06	Box Beam or girders - Single or Spread
07	Frame
08	Orthotropic
09	Truss - Deck
10	Truss - Thru
11	Arch - Deck
12	Arch - Thru
13	Suspension
14	Stayed girder
15	Movable - Lift
16	Movable - Bascule
17	Movable - Swing
18	Tunnel
19	Culvert
20	Mixed types
21	Segmental box girder
22	Channel beam
00	Other
99	Miscoded data

Appendix B. Related Historic Contexts and National Register Areas of Significance

Appendix B

Related Historic Contexts and National Register Areas of Significance

Utah Historic Bridge Inventory: Volume I – Historic Bridge Context, Settlement-1965 establishes state-level themes under *Criterion A: Transportation.* Additional related historic contexts and National Register Areas of Significance that may be considered for bridges if site-specific research is completed in the future and an association is identified include:

- Economic development – relates to bridges whose construction stimulated economic development and significantly affected commerce and industry in a region or city during the subject period. The context shows that national, state, and regional highway networks, including the Interstate Highway System, had impacts on economic development in Utah.

- Community planning and development – relates to bridges that were designed and constructed as a component of a regional, community, or city plan during the subject period. Post-World War II population growth and the expansion of suburbs in urban areas influenced roadway and bridge construction. Transportation solutions (including bridge construction) specifically designed to address areas of rapid population growth may possess significance under the theme of community planning and development.

- Social history – relates to structures directly associated with significant social programs and issues of the subject period. Bridges located on metropolitan highways that divided communities and caused social disruption of longstanding neighborhoods could possess significance related to the theme of social history.

- Politics and government – relates to structures associated with the enactment and administration of laws and policies governing a political jurisdiction or activities related to the political process. This context deals with other state and national policy and legislation not considered in the transportation context.

- Transportation – Additional research from UDOT District Offices, county highway departments, or at the local level may reveal additional sub-themes not identified as part of this effort. If additional sub-themes are identified and developed, bridges may require re-evaluation under *Criterion A* to evaluate if a direct association exists under Transportation.

Appendix C. Examples of Railing Types

Appendix C

Examples of Railing Types

Review of available bridge plans and bridge inspection files indicates standard railing designs were established by UDOT and widely applied to reinforced concrete and steel bridge types. These railings are characterized as modest metal railings that extend between concrete end posts and concrete railing with an open balustrade.

Bridge 035154D, Salt Lake County

Bridge 0D 548, Cache County

057048D, Weber County

Bridge 0C 147, Box Elder County

Bridge 003046D, Box Elder County

Bridge 0D 740, Weber County

Bridge 019030D, Grand County