HistoricBridges.org - National Bridge Inventory Data Sheet

2010 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 Info	ormation														42-05-35 =	075-55-01 = -
New York [36]		Broome	Broome County [007]			Bir	Binghamton [06607]			CITY OF BINGHAMTON			42.093056	75.916944		
2226140		Н	Highway agency district 91			0	Owner City or Municipal Highway Agency [04] Maintenance responsibility					ibility	City or Municipal	Highway Agency [04]		
Route 0			R	RIVERS	SIDE DR.		Toll On free road [3] Features intersected CHENANG					ENANGO	RIVER			
Design - main 5	Concrete [[^] Arch - Decl	-			Design - approach 0	Other [00]		Kilometerp Year built	•							
								Skew angl Historical s						RHP. [2]		
Total length 143.2 m = 469.8 ft Length of maximum span				um span 2	8.6 m = 93.8 ft		Deck wid	lth, out-to	-out 19 r	m = 62.3 f	ft Bri	idge roadv	way width, curb-to-	curb 13.4 m = 44.0 ft		
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 13.4 m = 44.0 ft				1.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left 2.7 m =			8.9 ft		Cur	rb or sidev	valk width - right	2.7 m = 8.9 ft			
Deck structure type Not applicable [N]			[N]													
Type of wearing surface Integral Concrete			te (separa	separate non-modified layer of concrete added to structural deck) [2]												
Deck protection Not applicable			applies only to structures with no deck) [N]													
Type of membrane/wearing surface																
Weight Li	mits															
Bypass, detour length 0.3 km = 0.2 mi Bridge posting			etermin	e inventory	rating	No rating analysis performed [5]				Inventory rating 32.6 metric to		etric ton =	35.9 tons			
			hod to de	nod to determine operating rating			No rating analysis performed			(Operating	g rating	93 metri	ric ton = 10	02.3 tons	
			ng Eo	qual to or al	loads [5]	; [5]			Design Load MS 18 / HS 20 [5]							

Functional Details		
Average Daily Traffic 16407 Average daily tr	uck traffi 6 % Year 2009 Future average daily traffic 2047	78 Year 2029
Road classification Minor Arterial (Urban) [16]	Lanes on structure 4	pproach roadway width 13.4 m = 44.0 ft
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5]	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 vertical clearanc 0 = N/A	Navigation horizontal clearance 0 = N/A	
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift brid	dge Minimum vertical clearance o	ver bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature	eature not a highway or railroad [N]	
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 99.9 = Unlin	nited Minimum lateral underclearance	e 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]	
Widening of existing bridge with deck rehabilitation or replacement. [34]	Bridge improvement cost 6756000 Roadway improvem	nent cost 3933000
	Length of structure improvement143.2 m = 469.8 ftTotal pr	oject cost 10689000
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2009	
	Border bridge - state Border br	idge - 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]								
Condition ratings - superstructur	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]								
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]								
Condition ratings - deck	Very Good [8]	deck geometry									
Scour	Bridge foundations determined	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [8]									
Channel and channel protection		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	sy Somewhat better than minimu in place as is [5]	um adequacy to tolerate be	being left Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2]								
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 71.9								
Culverts Not applicable. Used i	if structure is not a culvert. [N]										
Traffic safety features - railings											
Traffic safety features - transition	IS										
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail											
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends											
Inspection date September 2	008 [0908] Designated inspe	ection frequency 24	Months								
'	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspecti									
'	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical inspection date									
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspec	ection date								