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						40-28-03.80 =	074-48-46.40
New Jersey [34]	Hunterdon County [019]	East Amwell [18820]	4 MILES EAST OF NJ	l 31	40.467722	= -74.812889
1e+242	Highway ager	cy district 2	Owner County Highwa	ay Agency [02]	Maintenance responsibility	County Highway A	gency [02]
Route 609	CO 6	09-MANNER'S RD	Toll On fr	ree road [3]	eatures intersected NESHANI	C RIVER	
Design - main		Design - approach		Kilometerpoint 246 Year built 2002	5.2 km = 152.6 mi Year reconstructed N/A	V [0000]	
Box beam [05]	or girders - Multiple	0 Othe	er [00]	Skew angle 0	Structure Flared	1 [0000]	
				Historical significance	Bridge is not eligible for	the NRHP. [5]	
Total length 26.8 m	= 87.9 ft Le	ngth of maximum s	pan 25.6 m = 84.0 ft	Deck width, out-to-or	ut $13.3 \text{ m} = 43.6 \text{ ft}$ Bridge roa	adway width, curb-to-ci	urb 9.8 m = 32.2 ft
Inventory Route, Tota	l Horizontal Clearanc	e 9.8 m = 32.2 ft	Curb or sidewalk v	vidth - left 2.6 m = 8.5	5 ft Curb or sid	dewalk width - right	0.9 m = 3.0 ft
Deck structure type	O	Concrete Cast-in-Pl	ace [1]				
Type of wearing surfa	ce	Monolithic Concrete	(concurrently placed with st	ructural deck) [1]			
Deck protection	I	Epoxy Coated Rein	forcing [1]				
Type of membrane/we	earing surface						
Weight Limits							
Bypass, detour lengtl	h Method to deterr	mine inventory ratin	g Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inv	entory rating 59.9 metric tor	n = 65.9 tons	
0.5 km = 0.3 mi	Method to deterr	mine operating ratin	g Load Factor(LF) [1]	Ор	erating rating 99.9 metric tor	n = 109.9 tons	
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above	legal loads [5]	De	sign Load MS 22.5 / HS 25 or	r greater [0]	

Functional Details						
Average Daily Traffic 1913 Average daily t	ruck traffi 5 % Year 2013 Futur	e average daily traffic	2577 Year 203	3		
Road classification Minor Collector (Rural) [08]	Lanes on structure 2		Approach roadway wid	9.8 m = 32.2 ft		
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffi	ic [2]	Bridge median			
Parallel structure designation No parallel structu						
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5]	Lanes under structure 0	Navigation control				
Navigation vertical clearanc 0 = N/A	Navigation horizontal	clearance 0 = N/A				
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft						
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature F	eature not a highway or railroad [N]					
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 0 = N/A	Mi	inimum lateral underclea	rance on left 0 = N/A			
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A	Minimum vertical under	clearance reference feat	ure 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					
	Bridge improvement cost Roadway improvement cost					
	Length of structure improvement 0 m	= 0.0 ft To	otal project cost			
	Year of improvement cost estimate					
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state					
	Border bridge - structure number					

Inspection and Sufficiency							
Structure status Open, no res	triction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Better than present minimum criteria [7] Equal to present desirable criteria [8]				
Condition ratings - superstructure	Very Good [8]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment					
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings -	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]				
Condition ratings - deck	Good [7]	deck geometry					
Scour	Bridge foundations determin	ned to be stable for the asse	essed or calc	ulated scour condition	ı. [8]		
Channel and channel protection	Bank protection is in need o Banks and/or channel have		rol devices ar	nd embankment prote	ction have a little min	nor damage.	
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Better than present minimum	Better than present minimum criteria [7]		Status evaluation			
Pier or abutment protection				Sufficiency rating	98.6		
Culverts Not applicable. Used i	f structure is not a culvert. [N]						
Traffic safety features - railings	ature meets currently acce	•					
Traffic safety features - transition	ature meets currently accep						
		eature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]					
Traffic safety features - approach	guardrail ends Inpected fe	ature meets currently acce	ptable standa	ards. [1]			
Inspection date May 2013 [05		pection frequency 24		Months			
Underwater inspection Not needed [N]		Underwater inspection date					
•	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical ins	•)			
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspe	ection date				