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 Information

New York [36]	Broome County [007]	Triangle [75319]	0.1 MI WEST OF LISLE	42-23-48 = 42.396667	075-57-35 = -75.959722

3349680	Highway agency district: 91	Owner: County Highway Agency [02]	Maintenance responsibility: County Highway Agency [02]		
Route: 0		UPPER LISLE ROAD	Toll: On free road [3]	Features intersected: OTSELIC RIVER	
Design - main: Steel [3]		Design - approach:		Kilometerpoint: 0 km = 0.0 mi	
1	Truss - Thru [10]	0	Other [00]	Year built: 1902	Year reconstructed: 1992
				Skew angle: 0	Structure Flared:
				Historical significance: Bridge is eligible for the NRHP. [2]	

Total length: 55.4 m = 181.8 ft	Length of maximum span: 55.4 m = 181.8 ft	Deck width, out-to-out: 4.8 m = 15.7 ft	Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb: 4.5 m = 14.8 ft				
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance: 4.5 m = 14.8 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left: 0 m = 0.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - right: 0 m = 0.0 ft					
Deck structure type: Open Grating [3]							
Type of wearing surface: Other [9]							
Deck protection:							
Type of membrane/wearing surface:							

Weight Limits

Bypass, detour length	Method to determine inventory rating: Load Factor(LF) [1]		Inventory rating: 11.8 metric ton = 13.0 tons		
3.2 km = 2.0 mi	Method to determine operating rating: Load Factor(LF) [1]		Operating rating: 18.1 metric ton = 19.9 tons		
	Bridge posting: 20.0 - 29.9 % below [2]		Design Load:		

Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	354	Average daily truck traffi	6 %	Year	2009	Future average daily traffic	419
Year	2029						
Road classification	Minor Collector (Rural) [08]	Lanes on structure	1	Approach roadway width	4.2 m = 13.8 ft		
Type of service on bridge	Highway [1]	Direction of traffic	One lane bridge for 2 - way traffic [3]	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	3.51 m = 11.5 ft				
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature	Feature not a highway or railroad [N]						
Minimum lateral underclearance on right	99.9 = Unlimited	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

Widening of existing bridge with deck rehabilitation or replacement. [34]

Work done by	Work to be done by contract [1]		
Bridge improvement cost	670000	Roadway improvement cost	400000
Length of structure improvement	55.4 m = 181.8 ft	Total project cost	1070000
Year of improvement cost estimate	2009		
Border bridge - state		Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state	
Border bridge - structure number			

Inspection and Sufficiency

Structure status	Posted for load [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]
Condition ratings - superstructur	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]
Condition ratings - substructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]		
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	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]	Status evaluation	Functionally obsolete [2]
Pier or abutment protection		Sufficiency rating	31.7
Culverts	Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]		
Traffic safety features - railings			
Traffic safety features - transitions			
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail	Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]		
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends	Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]		

Inspection date	September 2009 [0909]	Designated inspection frequency	12	Months
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspection date	June 2006 [0606]	
Fracture critical inspection	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical inspection date	September 2009 [0909]	
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date		