HistoricBridges.org - National Bridge Inventory Data Sheet

1992 Inventory

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														2 07 00	070.04.07
New York [36] Washington County [115]			Gree	Greenwich [30686] 1.0MI.N OF RT 2			F RT 298	9&HUDSON R			4	3-07-00 = 3.116667	073-34-36 = - 73.576667		
3306380Highway agency district:18			Owr	Owner County Highway Agency [02]			2]	Mainter	nance responsibility County Highway Agency [02]			Agency [02]			
Route 0 CR70 DIX BRIDGERD				RD	Toll On free road [3] Features intersected HUDSON R				N RIVER						
Design - Steel [3] main 3 Truss - Thru [10]				Design - approach 0	Other [00]			Kilometerpoint Year built #Num! Year reconstructed 1960 Skew angle 0 Structure Flared							
					Historical significance Bridge is eligible for the N					ne NRHP.	[2]				
Total length 129.8	Total length 129.8 m = 425.9 ft Length of maximum span $43.9 \text{ m} = 144.0 \text{ ft}$ Deck width, out-to-out $4.9 \text{ m} = 16.1 \text{ ft}$ Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb $4.7 \text{ m} = 15.4 \text{ ft}$														
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 4.7 m = 15.4 ft				4 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left 0 m = 0.0 ft Cur			Curb or s	sidewalk v	vidth - right	0 m = 0.0 ft				
Deck structure type Open Grating [3]				3]											
Type of wearing surface Other [9]															
Deck protection															
Type of membrane/wearing surface															
Weight Limits															
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating				rating				I	nventory rati	ng 9	metric ton =	= 9.9 tons			
1.9 km = 1.2 mi Method to determine operating rating				rating				(Operating rat	perating rating 12.6 metric ton = 13.9 tons					
Bridge posting 20.0 - 29.9 % below				6 below [2]					Design Load						

Functional Details										
Average Daily Traffic 692 Average daily tr	ick traffi 10 % Year 1974	Future average daily traffic	8537 Yea	r 2010						
Productor (Section Least (Dec)) [00]										
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure		Approach roadv	5.8 m = 19.0 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 2 - wa	ay 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 o	n waterway (bridge permit required). [1]						
Navigation vertical clearanc	Navigation horiz	zontal clearance								
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift brid	Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 5.08 m = 16.7 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 right 0 = N/A Minimum lateral underclearance on left 0 = N/A									
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 0 = N/A	Minimum vertical	underclearance reference feat	ture Feature not a h	nighway or railroad [N]						
Appraisal ratings - underclearances N/A [N]										
Danair and Danlagament Diang										
Repair and Replacement Plans										
Type of work to be performed	Work done by Work to be done by c	contract [1]								
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 155000	00 Roadway imp	rovement cost	180000						
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement	148.1 m = 485.9 ft To	otal project cost	2703000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate									
Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state										
	Border bridge - structure number									

Inspection and Sufficiency										
Structure status Posted for loa	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]							
Condition ratings - superstructure	Serious [3]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Meets minimum t	leets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]						
Condition ratings - substructure	Serious [3]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]							
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]	deck geometry								
Scour	Scour calculation/evaluation ha	Scour calculation/evaluation has not been made. [6]								
Channel and channel protection	Banks are protected or well veo required or are in a stable cond	Banks are protected or well vegetated. River control devices such as spur dikes and embankment protection are not required or are in a stable condition. [8]								
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	y Equal to present desirable crite	eria [8]	Status	evaluation Structurally deficient [1]						
Pier or abutment protection			Suffici	ency rating 8.2						
Culverts Not applicable. Used i	if structure is not a culvert. [N]									
Traffic safety features - railings					_					
Traffic safety features - transition	s Not applicable	e or a safety feature is no								
Traffic safety features - approach	guardrail									
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail ends									
Inspection date September 1991 [0991] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months										
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspec	ction date Ju	ıly 1990 [0790]						
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical in:	spection date S	eptember 1991 [0991]						
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date							