The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportion departments to the Federal Highway Administration in coded format.

Form Interface Design: www.historicbridges.org. Data Conversion Assistance By www.bridgehunter.com. None of the involved parties make any guarantee of accuracy.

Basic Info	ormation									36-58-42 =	089-08-54 = -
Mississippi Coun		ınty [133]	Ohio [5	Ohio [54128]		S 19 T 27 N R 18 E			36.978333	89.148333	
6006		Highway	agency district 10	Owner	Other State Age	ncies [21]		Maintenance	e responsibility	Other State Agen	cies [21]
Route 60	0		US 60 W		Toll On fre	e road [3]	F	eatures interse	cted MISSISSIPI	PI RVR	
Design - main	Steel [3] Truss - Thru	u [10]	Design - approach	Steel [3] Stringer/Multi-b	eam or girder [02]	Skew angle	1929	Structure F			
Historical significance  Bridge is eligible for the NRHP. [2]  Total length  1579.3 m = 5181.7 ft  Length of maximum span 213.4 m = 700.2 ft  Deck width, out-to-out 6.5 m = 21.3 ft  Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 6.1 m = 20.0 ft  Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance  6.1 m = 20.0 ft  Curb or sidewalk width - left  O m = 0.0 ft  Curb or sidewalk width - right											
Deck structure type  Type of wearing surface  Concrete Cast-in-Place  Monolithic Concrete (c				ntly placed with str	uctural deck)	[1]					
Deck protection Epoxy Coated Reinfor			Reinforcing [1]								
Type of membrane/wearing surface											
Weight Li	mits										
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating			rating Al	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]		Inve	entory rating	8 metric ton = 8.8 tons			
2.9 km =	2.9 km = 1.8 mi  Method to determine operating rating			g rating Al	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]		Оре	erating rating	ing rating 31 metric ton = 34.1 tons		
Bridge posting Equal to or above le			above legal loads	jal loads [5]		Des	Design Load MS 18 / HS 20 [5]				

Functional Details	
Average Daily Traffic 2787 Average daily tr	uck traffi 38 % Year 2010 Future average daily traffic 3901 Year 2031
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 7.3 m = 24.0 ft
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2]  Bridge median
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5]	Lanes under structure 0 Navigation control Navigation control on waterway (bridge permit required). [1]
Navigation vertical clearanc 18.8 m = 61.7 ft	Navigation horizontal clearance 205.7 m = 674.9 ft
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift brid	Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 5.38 m = 17.7 ft
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature F	eature not a highway or railroad [N]
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 0 = N/A	Minimum lateral underclearance on left 0 = N/A
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A	Minimum vertical underclearance reference feature Feature not a highway or railroad [N]
Appraisal ratings - underclearances N/A [N]	
Don't and Don't arranged Disco	
Repair and Replacement Plans	
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by contract [1]
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 60769000 Roadway improvement cost 6076000
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 157.9 m = 518.1 ft Total project cost 91153000
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2011
	Border bridge - state Unknown [175] Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state 50
	Border bridge - structure number 2000500887

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status New struct	ure not yet open to traffic	[G] Appraisal ratings - structural	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]					
Condition ratings - superstructu	r Serious [3]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in is [5]			t in place as		
Condition ratings - substructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intole					
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]	deck geometry						
Scour	Bridge foundation	ons determined to be stable for the ass	essed or calculate	ed scour conditior	n. [8]			
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning to slump. River control devices and embankment protection have widespread minor damage. There is minor stream bed movement evident. Debris is restricting the channel slightly. [6]						
Appraisal ratings - water adequ	Equal to preser	nt minimum criteria [6]	Stat	tus evaluation	Structurally deficient [1]			
Pier or abutment protection	In place and fur	In place and functioning [2]		ficiency rating	6			
Culverts Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]								
Traffic safety features - railings	i .	Inpected feature meets currently acce						
Traffic safety features - transiti	ons							
Traffic safety features - approa	ch guardrail	Inpected feature meets currently acce						
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends								
Inspection date April 2010	[0410] Des	signated inspection frequency 12	d inspection frequency 12 Months					
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspe	ction date August 2010		310]			
Fracture critical inspection	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical in		pection date April 2010 [0410]				
Other special inspection	Unknown [Y06]	Other special insp	ection date	December 2010 [1210]				

## HistoricBridges.org - National Bridge Inventory Data Sheet

The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportion departments to the Federal Highway Administration in coded format.

Form Interface Design: www.historicbridges.org. Data Conversion Assistance By www.bridgehunter.com. None of the involved parties make any guarantee of accuracy.

Basic Information							
Illinois [17] Alexander Cour		ty [003]	Cairo [10383]			36-59-10 = 36.9 089-09-00 = -89.1	
2000500887	Highway a	gency district 9	Owner State Highway	Agency [01]	Maintenance responsibility	State Highway Agency [01]	
Route 60 US		S 60 & 62	Toll On fr	ree road [3]	Features intersected MISSISSIP	PI R	
Design - Steel continuous [4]		Design - Steel	[3]	Kilometerpoint 88	3.5 km = 54.9 mi		
main				Year built 1929	Year reconstructed 198	3	
2 Truss - Thru [10]		38 Othe	r [00]	Skew angle 0	Structure Flared		
				Historical significance	Bridge is eligible for the I	NRHP. [2]	
Total length 1577.9	n = 5177.1 ft	Length of maximum sp	pan 213.7 m = 701.1 ft	Deck width, out-to-c	out 6.9 m = 22.6 ft Bridge roa	dway width, curb-to-curb 6.1 m = 20.0 ft	
Inventory Route, Tota	Horizontal Cleara	ance 6 m = 19.7 ft	Curb or sidewalk v	width - left $0 \text{ m} = 0.0$	ft Curb or side	ewalk width - right 0 m = 0.0 ft	
Deck structure type		Concrete Cast-in-Pla	ice [1]				
Type of wearing surface Monolithic Concrete (o			(concurrently placed with st	tructural deck) [1]			
Deck protection Epoxy Coated Reinfor			orcing [1]				
Type of membrane/we	earing surface						
Weight Limits							
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory			Load Factor(LF) [1]	In	ventory rating 0 metric ton = 0	.0 tons	
4 km = 2.5 mi  Method to determine operating ra			Load Factor(LF) [1]	Oį	perating rating 0 metric ton = 0	.0 tons	
	Bridge postin	g		De	esign Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]		

Functional Details	
Average Daily Traffic 4850 Average daily tr	uck traffi 24 % Year 2011 Future average daily traffic 5029 Year 2032
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 13.4 m = 44.0 ft
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2]  Bridge median
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5]	Lanes under structure 0 Navigation control Navigation control on waterway (bridge permit required). [1]
Navigation vertical clearanc 18.8 m = 61.7 ft	Navigation horizontal clearance 205.7 m = 674.9 ft
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift brid	Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 5.44 m = 17.8 ft
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Fe	eature not a highway or railroad [N]
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 0 = N/A	Minimum lateral underclearance on left 0 = N/A
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A	Minimum vertical underclearance reference feature Feature not a highway or railroad [N]
Appraisal ratings - underclearances N/A [N]	
Repair and Replacement Plans	
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by contract [1]
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 15444000 Roadway improvement cost 1544000
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 1577.9 m = 5177.1 ft Total project cost 23166000
	Year of improvement cost estimate
	Border bridge - state Unknown [297] Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state 50
	Border bridge - structure number #Num!

Inspection and Sufficiency									
Structure status Bridge close	d to all traffic [K]	Appraisal ratings - structural							
Condition ratings - superstructur	Serious [3]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Somewhat be is [5]	etter than minimun	being left in place as				
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -							
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]	deck geometry							
Scour	Bridge foundatio	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [8]							
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning to slump. River control devices and embankment protection have widespread minor damage. There is minor stream bed movement evident. Debris is restricting the channel slightly. [6]							
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Better than pres	ent minimum criteria [7]	St	tatus evaluation	Structurally deficient [	[1]			
Pier or abutment protection	None present bu	t re-evaluation suggested [5]	Sı	ufficiency rating	6				
Culverts Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]									
Traffic safety features - railings		Inpected feature meets currently acce	d feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - transition	ns .	Inpected feature meets currently acce							
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail	Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]							
Traffic safety features - approach									
Inspection date January 201	2 [0112] Des	gnated inspection frequency 12	pection frequency 12 Months						
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspec	April 2011 [0411]						
·	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical ins	•	January 2012 [0112]					
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date						