

The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportation 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**

New York [36]	Chenango County [017]	Sherburne [66894]	1.2 MI SO OF EARLVILLE	42-42-51.86 = 42.714406	075-32-25.28 = -75.540356
3351490	Highway agency district: 92	Owner County Highway Agency [02]	Maintenance responsibility	County Highway Agency [02]	
Route 0	WILLIAMS ROAD	Toll On free road [3]	Features intersected	CHENANGO RIVER	
Design - main 1	Steel [3] Truss - Thru [10]	Design - approach 0	Other [00]	Kilometerpoint 230.1 km = 142.7 mi	Year built 1933 Year reconstructed 1989
				Skew angle 0	Structure Flared
				Historical significance Bridge is not eligible for the NRHP. [5]	
Total length	31.4 m = 103.0 ft	Length of maximum span	30.4 m = 99.7 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	8 m = 26.2 ft
				Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb	7 m = 23.0 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance	7 m = 23.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left	0 m = 0.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck structure type	Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]				
Type of wearing surface	Integral Concrete (separate non-modified layer of concrete added to structural deck) [2]				
Deck protection	Epoxy Coated Reinforcing [1]				
Type of membrane/wearing surface					

**Weight Limits**

Bypass, detour length	Method to determine inventory rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Inventory rating	24.5 metric ton = 27.0 tons
0.6 km = 0.4 mi	Method to determine operating rating	Load Factor(LF) [1]	Operating rating	40.8 metric ton = 44.9 tons
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above legal loads [5]	Design Load	MS 18 / HS 20 [5]

### Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	383	Average daily truck traffi	8 %	Year	2018	Future average daily traffic	386	Year	2038
Road classification	Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure	2	Approach roadway width	6.1 m = 20.0 ft				
Type of service on bridge	Highway [1]	Direction of traffic	2 - way traffic [2]		Bridge median				
Parallel structure designation	No parallel structure 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 bridge		Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway	99.99 m = 328.1 ft						
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature	Feature 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]					
Widening of existing bridge with deck rehabilitation or replacement. [34]	Bridge improvement cost	2056000	Roadway improvement cost	1204000			
	Length of structure improvement	31.3 m = 102.7 ft		Total project cost	3259000		
	Year of improvement cost estimate	2018					
	Border bridge - state		Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state				
	Border bridge - structure number						

## Inspection and Sufficiency

Structure status	Open, no restriction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]
Condition ratings - superstructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]
Condition ratings - deck	Very Good [8]		

Scour

Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [8]

Channel and channel protection

Bank protection is being eroded. River control devices and/or embankment have major damage. Trees and rush restrict the channel. [5]

Appraisal ratings - water adequacy	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]	Status evaluation	
------------------------------------	--	-------------------	--

Pier or abutment protection		Sufficiency rating	56.6
-----------------------------	--	--------------------	------

Culverts

Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]

Traffic safety features - railings	
Traffic safety features - transitions	
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail	
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends	Inspected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]

Inspection date	June 2018 [0618]	Designated inspection frequency	24	Months
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspection date		
Fracture critical inspection	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical inspection date	June 2018 [0618]	
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date		