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 Infor	rmation														42-33-54 =	075-53-00 = -
New York [36]		Cortland County [023]				Ta	Taylor [73220] 2.0 MI NE			IE OF CINCINATTUS			42.565000	75.883333		
2207170 Highway		Highway a	agency	ency district 32		Owner Town or Township Highway Agency [03]			[03] Ma	aintenance	responsib	oility	Town or Townsh	ip Highway Agency [03]		
Route 0 TOW			ΓΟWΝΙ	LINE RD			Toll On f	ree road [3]		Feature	es intersec	ted OTSI	ELIC RI	VER		
Design - Aluminum, Wrought Iron or Ca Iron [9] Truss - Thru [10]		Cast	Design - approach	Other [00)]		Kilometer Year built Skew ano	1920 Ile 0	1920 Year reconstructed N/A [0000]							
Total length 25.3 m = 83.0 ft Length of maximum span 25 m = 82.0 ft Deck width, out-to-out 3.7 m = 12.1 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 3.5 m								-curb 3.5 m = 11.5 ft								
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 3.5 m = 11.5 ft			5 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left 0.1 m = 0.3 ft Curb or				or side	walk width - right	0.1 m = 0.3 ft						
Deck structure type Wood or Timber [8]				er [8]												
Type of wearing surface Wood or T			od or Timber [7]													
Deck protection																
Type of membrane/wearing surface																
Weight Lin																
Bypass, detour length 0.5 km = 0.3 mi Method to dete			etermir	ermine inventory rating						Inventory rating 2.7 metric ton = 3.0 tons						
U.5 KIII = U	J.3 IIII	Me	ethod to de		ne operating						Operatin	ng rating	4.5 metric	c ton = !	5.0 tons	
		Br	idge postir	ng 3	0.0 - 39.9	% below [1]				Design L	_oad				

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 56 Average daily to	ruck traffi 10 % Year 1986 Future average daily traffic 700 Year 2010						
Road classification Local (Rural) [09]	Lanes on structure 1 Approach roadway width 3 m = 9.8 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	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 bri	Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 3.65 m = 12.0 ft						
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature F	eature 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]						
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial	Bridge improvement cost 355000 Roadway improvement cost 41000						
bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Length of structure improvement 43.6 m = 143.1 ft Total project cost 619000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate						
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state						
	Border bridge - structure number						

Inspection and Sufficiency										
Structure status Bridge close	d to all traffic [K]	Appraisal ratings - structural								
Condition ratings - superstructur		Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]							
Condition ratings - substructure		Appraisal ratings -								
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]	deck geometry								
Scour		Scour calculation/evaluation has not been made. [6]								
Channel and channel protection	Banks are protected or we required or are in a stable	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	Equal to present minimum	n criteria [6]	Status evaluation Structurally deficient [1]							
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 18.7							
	if structure is not a culvert. [N]									
Traffic safety features - railings	Not some	Carla and a Cala Carla and Carla	and a service of 1800							
Traffic safety features - transition Traffic safety features - approach	•	cable or a safety feature is no	iocrequirea. [iv]							
Traffic safety features - approach										
Inspection date May 1991 [0		nspection frequency 24	Months							
	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ection date							
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical ins	nspection date May 1991 [0591]							
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspe	pection date							