

Bridge Name:	Upton Road Bridge		
Bridge Trip Ordering Number:		Inspection Date:	9-17-2010

# www.historicbridges.org

## **General Bridge Information and Conditions**

Facility(s) Carried:	Feature(s) Intersected:			
Upton Road (Abandoned Alignment)	Maple River			
Surface Type: ☐Gravel/Dirt ☐Hard ☐	Railroad			
Main Span Type: Pin-connected Parker thru		Approach Span Type:		
truss. Main Span #:	Approach Span #:			
☑1 □2 □3 □4 □5 □6 □7 □8 □9 □10 □More:		☑ None □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 □6 □7 □8 □9 □10 □ More:		
uperstructure Condition:   Failed (Bridge Collapsed)   Partial Failure / Portions Standing   Critical/Risk of Failure   Poor   Fair   Good   Like New   Dites: Isolated areas of poor-critical condition.    Substructure Condition:   Failed (Bridge Collapsed)   Partial Failure (Partially Hollage)   Critical/Risk of Failure   Poor   Fair   Good   Like New   Notes: All above-water portion abutments appear go		ons of	Deck Condition:  ☐ Deck Removed ☐ Failed ☐ Critical/Risk of Failure ☐ Poor ☐ Fair ☐ Good ☐ Like New Notes:	
Bridge Roadway Width (Lanes/Tracl  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6  ☐ More: Appears: ☑ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient		Roadway Width Leading Up To Bridge (Lanes):  1 1 2 3 4 5 6  More:  Appears: Sufficient Insufficient		
Sidewalks: Number:  ☑ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ Other: ☐ Cantilevered ☐ Integrated Appears: ☑ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient		Apparent Bridge Ownership:  ☑ Public: Government ☐ Public: Non-Profit Organization ☐ Private, No Public Access ☐ Private, Public Access ☐ Railroad ☐ Toll Bridge		
Railing/Guardrail: Present: ☑ Original ☐ Non-Original Are Any Crash-Resistant? ☐ Yes ☑ No		Bearing Type: ☑ Roller Nest   ☐ Other/Unkno	☐ Rocker ☐ Not Observed	

Historic Bridge Inspection Report: Condition: Do Any Protect The Superstructure? ☐ Clean ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☑ Significant Dirt Buildup Sidewalk Bridge Railings Present: ☑ Significant Dislocation ☐ Original ☐ New/Modern ☐ Unknown/Not Observed Specific Conditions (When Applicable) Observed Concrete Conditions: **Observed Metal Conditions:** ☐ Minor Section Loss: ☑ Spalling: ☑ Isolated □ Widespread □ Splash ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash Zone Zone ☑ Major Section Loss: ☐ Cracking: ☑ Isolated □ Widespread □ Splash Zone ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash ☑ Minor Pack Rust: Zone ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash Zone ☐ Delaminating: ☐ Major Pack Rust: ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash Zone Zone ☐ Observed Fatigue Cracks: Location: ☐ Efflorescence: No fatigue crack inspection conducted. ☐ Isolated ☐ Widespread ☐ Splash Zone Movable Bridge: Miscellaneous Features: Notes: ☐ Operating ☐ Not Operating ☐ Cast Iron Structural Elements ☐ Machinery Removed ☐ Beams With Pin and Hanger System ☐ Original Electrical/Mechanical Systems ☐ Jack-Arch Deck In Use Unreinforced Concrete Observed ☐ Original Bridgetender Building Melan or Marsh Reinforcing Observed ☐ Bridgetender Building Shows Heavy Alterations **Metal: Paint Condition: Fastener:** Primary/Connection Type: ☐ Welds ☐ Rivets ☐ Bolts ☐ Threaded New ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ None Rod & Nut Possible Lead Paint Risk (Paint Age): ☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown Secondary/Beam Fastener Type: Lead Paint Confirmed By Testing ☐ Welds ☐ Rivets ☑ Bolts ☐ Threaded Rod & Nut Altered Fastener Type: ☐ Welds ☐ Rivets ☐ Bolts ☐ Threaded Rod & Nut Noted Impact Damage To Bridge: **Moisture Risk Assessment:** ☐ Portal. Notes: ■ No Problems Observed ☐ Railing. Notes: ☐ Drainage Blocked. Notes: ☑ Superstructure. Notes: Very minor ■ No Drainage/Drainage Needed ☐ Substructure. Notes: ☑ Dirt Buildup □ Other. Notes: ☐ Plants Growing In Deck Truss Bridge Features: Elements Beyond Repair: ☑ Eyebars: ☑ Loop-Forged ☑ Up-Set ☐ Entire Bridge ☐ Large Percentage ☐ Medium Percentage ☐ Small Bottom Chord Connection Quality: Percentage \( \Boxed{\omega} \) None ☐ Severe Loss ☐ Moderate/Average Notes / Replication Recommendations: Loss ☑ Little/No Loss

Major Alterations:

Floor beams: ☐ All ☐ Some

Connections: □All □Some

Short term: Clean and weld plates over severe 100% section loss

on endposts. Replace bearings and shoe assemblies. Medium

term: Replace deck. Long-term: Clean and repaint structure.

Address section loss at base of vertical members.

Historic Bridge Inspection Report: Turnbuckles: □ All □ Some Verticals: ☐ All ☐ Some Diagonals: ☐All ☐Some Sway/Portal Bracing: ☐ All ☐ Some End Posts: ☐ All ☐ Some Top/Upper Chord: □ All □ Some Bottom/Lower Chord: ☐ All ☐ Some Notes: Sufficiency / Demolition Risk Assessment Risk of NBI Functionally Obsolete Determination: Risk of NBI Structurally Deficient **Determination:** □ Low □ Medium □ High □ Confirmed □Low □ Medium □High □ Confirmed Correction Feasibility (Current Use): Correction Feasibility (Current Use): □ Low □ Medium □ High □Low □ Medium □ High Evidence of Repair/Replacement Plans: **Traffic Volume:** ✓ None ☐ Closed: Abandoned, Overgrown ☐ Pink Flags ☐ Inspection Marks ☐ Nearly None ☐ Construction On Bridge Low ☐ Construction Next To Bridge ☐Medium ☐ Signage  $\square$  High ☐ Recent Bridge Closure ☐ Congested (Traffic Backed Up At Or On ☐ Flagged/New Weight Limit Signs Truck Traffic Observed: ☐ None ☐ One - Some, □Heavy Vertical Clearance: Weight Limits: ☐ Posted Weight Limit Lowest Posted Value (In Tons/Tonnes): ☑ Not Posted ☐ Posted ☐ Headache Bar □1-3 □3-10 □10-20 □20-30 □30-40 □ ☐ Posted 10 Feet (3 Meters) Or Less Over 40 **Conditions With Feature(s) Intersected:** Water Adequacy: ☐ Navigable Waterway: ☐Scour Observed Vertical Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient  $\square$  Pier(s)  $\square$  Abutment(s) Horizontal Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient ☐ Evidence Of Floodwater Reaching Bridge ☐ Active Railroad: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient ☐ Bridge Has Flood Damage Notes: Vertical Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient Horizontal Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient Bridge crosses river at reservoir next to ☐ Active Highway: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient dam. Vertical Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient Horizontal Clearance: Appears ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient Caretaking (Preventative Maintenance): Approach Roadway Alignment: ☑ Horizontal Problems ☐ Trivial ☑ Significant ☐ Bridge shows signs of care/maintenance. □ Vertical Problems □ Trivial □ Significant ☐ Paint ☐ Deck ☐ Super/substructure ☐ Substructure ☐ Other ☐ Comprehensive Rehab/Restoration □No Problems Notes: ☑ Bridge shows signs of neglect. ☐ Paint ☐ Deck ☐ Super/substructure ☐ Substructure ☐ Patching ☐ Other ☐ As-Built (No Work

Done)

maintenance/repairs.

☐ Bridge in excellent condition even without evidence of

## **Historic Significance / Integrity**

Design Features:	Setting Assets:
	-
☐ Innovative/Prototypical Design	☐ Bridge has gateway function.
Distinctive Details	☐ Location in pristine natural setting.
Unusual Structure Type	☐ Historical structures/setting nearby.
Unusual Structure Configuration	Contributes to a group of historic bridges.
Once-Common Rare Surviving Example	
☐ Standard Plan	
Representative Example	
Superstructure Alterations Observed:	Substructure Alterations Observed:
☐ None ☑ Historically Sensitive ☐ Insensitive	☑ None ☐ Historically Sensitive ☐ Insensitive
☐ Reversible ☐ Irreversible	☐ Reversible ☐ Irreversible
☑ Metal Added ☐ Insensitive Welds ☐ Rivets Replaced With	Notes:
Bolts	
☐ Floor Beams Replaced ☐ Widened ☐ Some Spans Replaced	
☐ Other	
Notes:	
Bridge Plaques:	Bridge Still Functions As Originally Designed:
☐ Commissioner ☐ Builder ☐ State Standard ☐ No Plaques.	☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Some Spans
☑ Missing Plaques/ Plaque Scars.	Notes:
□ Repair/Rehab Plaques Present.	
Surrounding Area:	Remains of Previous Bridge(s):
☐ Confirmed Historic District	☐ Present: Integrated
☐ Contains Historic District Qualities	☐ Present: Beside Bridge
Possibly Contains Historic District Qualities	Unknown/Possible. Notes:
☑ No Historic District Qualities	☑ None Observed
Location:	Aesthetics:
☑ Appears To Be Original. Notes:	Structurally Functional Aesthetic Architectural
☐ Possibly Relocated. Notes:	Elements
☐ Proof of Relocation. Notes:	☐ Non-Structural Decorations/Ornamentation

#### **Conclusions**

Note: Field observation is usually the first step in a multi-step historic bridge assessment process. These initial recommendations may be based only on field observations and may change upon further consultation and research following the field observation.

Local Historic Significance Rating Recommendation:  □0 □1 □2 □3 □4 □5 □6 □7 ☑8 □9 □10	National Historic Significance Rating Recommendation: 0123456789 10
Work Priority/Needs:	Initial Recommended Use/Reuse:

storic Bridge Inspection Report:			
☐ Full Restore/Rehabilitation Immediately ☐ Continue Maintenance and Plan Future Full Restore/Rehabilitation ☐ Continue/Begin Maintenance ☐ Paint Needed: ☐ Splash Zone Only ☐ Traffic Control: ☐ Stop ☐ Yield ☐ Signalize ☐ Clearance Control (Headache Bar) ☐ Full Restore/Rehabilitation Immediately Notes:	☐ Continued Vehicular Use. ☐ Relocate For Lighter Vehicular Use. ☐ Restored For Non-Motorized Use. ☐ Relocate For Non-Motorized Use. ☐ Bypass/Restore For Non-Motorized Use. ☐ Non-Functional Exhibit. ☐ Retrofit or render structure decorative. ☐ Abandon completely: Leave standing, do not demolish. ☐ Salvage: Non-bridge reuse, or use of portions of bridge. Notes: A few low-cost repairs would keep bridge standing for a long time.		
Re-Inspection Required: ☐Yes ☑No ☐Bridge Obstructed By Foliage ☐Areas Inaccessible: ☐Repairs In Progress: ☐Poor Weather ☐Better Sun Position Needed (☐AM ☐Noon ☐PM) ☐Other: Notes:	National Register Eligibility:  □ Listed □ Eligible □ Appears Eligible □ Appears Not Eligible □ Not Eligible □ Unknown Criterion: □ A (Events) □ B (Persons) ☑ C (Design) Notes:		
*This historic bridge assessment report is not an official NBI bridge inspection report, may not have been completed by a certified engineer/ bridge inspector, and is not intended to be used in any official manner. The authors and owners of this document including HistoricBridges.org assume no responsibility for the information			

contained in this document nor any consequences of its use. Form Version: 3.3