September 7, 1956

BRIDGES: Maintenance
Supplementary Bridges Used in Place
Bridge W-404, Take-Over No. 1
Station 92+05.13
Route VV, Macon County

Mr. F. D. Harris:

An inspection has recently been made on a structure located 2.7 miles northeast of Hart over the Santa Fe Railroad. This structure consists of 7-20' creosoted timber spans and 1-60' steel plate girder with timber handrail, concrete floor on the plate girder span and creosoted timber floor with mat coat on the 20' creosoted timber spans. The width of roadway is 20'0". The substructure consists of creosoted pile bents.

The entire structure is in good condition except there is a sagged place in the concrete floor where water stands 1" to 2" deep. The bituminous mat coat is rough. There is a long sloping bank from the face of the abutment down to the ditch along side of the railroad tracks and this fill is washing badly and sliding down to fill the ditches, especially at all four corners of the structure. A long pipe had been placed at one corner to take care of this condition and it has washed out and is not now effective.

This structure has been built by the railroad company and was designed for an H2O loading. The alignment is fair with a curve beginning a short distance from each end of the structure. The grades, visibility and rail crossing are good.

It will be satisfactory to use this structure in place when the adjacent roadwork is placed under contract, with the structure to remain the property of the railroad company and to be maintained by them. It will be necessary that the road plans provide for a better way to handle drainage from the road ditches.

However, if the railroad company desires that we take the structure into our supplementary system and maintain, it will be satisfactory provided that the railroad paints the handrail from the hubguard up with two coats of paint,
preferably that the top coat be aluminum. Place a pre-mixed bituminous mat over the entire floor and raise grade over the concrete floor so that water will drain. Also provide better drainage along the cut slopes to prevent erosion of the railroad back slopes through this section of the cut, both from drainage off of the structure and from the side ditches.

Bridge Engineer

cc: Mr. B. F. Leslie
    Mr. R. C. Johnson
August 28, 1956

BRIDGES: Maintenance
Supplementary Bridges Used in Place
Bridge No. W-404, T. O. No. 1, Sta. 92+05
Route WV, Macon County

Mr. B. F. Leslie:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter
of August 24, together with the used in place report for
the AT&SF Railroad Crossing on the above mentioned route.

We will arrange to make an inspection of this
structure at an early date, and we will see what we can
do to eliminate water ponds on the span.

Bridge Engineer

file
SJW:aja
SUBJECT: BRIDGES: Surveys
A.T. & S.F. Railroad Crossing
Route WW, Macon County
W-404
T.O. # 1

TO: Mr. J. A. Williams

Attached please find copy of a U.I.P. Bridge Report for the crossing of the A.T. & S.F. Railroad at Station 92+05.13 on the above mentioned route. Also attached is a set of plans for this structure furnished by the Railroad.

In connection with this bridge it has been noted that after a rain the center or main span ponds 1½ inches of water. We would like for the Railroad to lay a new mat on this section of the bridge in order to eliminate this ponding of water.

A check of this structure, in order to determine if it can be used in place, will be appreciated and may be done at your convenience.

B. F. Leslie
District Engineer

Enc.
Macon, Missouri
June 4, 1957

SURVEYS & PLANS: Overhead Crossing
A.T. & S.F. Railroad
Route W, Macon County

Mr. C. P. Owens

Attention: Mr. Roy C. Johnson

On August 24, 1956, we forwarded a UIP Bridge Report for the above crossing to Mr. Williams, to determine whether the existing overhead crossing would be suitable for use in place. It is listed under "Supplementary Bridges Used in Place" as Bridge W-404 T,0. #1, Station 92+05.

The bridge was inspected by Mr. White, and a report was made to Mr. Harris under date of September 7, 1956. In the 4th paragraph of this letter the statement was made that it would be satisfactory to use the structure in place when the adjacent road work is placed under contract with the structure to remain the property of the railroad company and to be maintained by them. However, Mr. William's letter further states, in the 5th paragraph, that if the railroad company desires that we take the structure into our supplementary system and maintain it, that would be satisfactory provided that the railroad company paints the handrail from the hubguard up with two coats of paint. Also, that the railroad company places a premixed bituminous mat over the entire floor and raises the grade over the concrete floor so that water will drain. Further, that it will provide better drainage along the cut-slopes through this section of cut, both from drainage off the structure and from the side ditches.
We have no information that this matter was ever taken up with the Santa Fe. We have placed this project on our current construction program and hope to place the work under contract sometime this summer.

All of the right-of-way has been cleared now with the exception of the arrangements to be made with the railroad company and also with the Sinclair Pipe Line Company.

We would be agreeable to taking this structure over for maintenance provided the railroad company would agree to take care of the items set out in Mr. Williams's letter, and, since our plans will be completed within the next week, would like to suggest that the necessary arrangements with the railroad company and pipeline people be completed as soon as possible.

When we fieldchecked this route it occurred to us that it might be desirable to require the railroad to do certain other things in connection with our taking over and assuming maintenance of the overhead structure, in addition to Mr. Williams's recommendations. These would include:

1. Realigning and repairing the handrails.

2. Retiring the railroad fence within the limits of the easements and reconstructing same in the location shown in red on the attached prints.

Our design will permit drainage from the east end of the overhead structure to flow east in the road ditches. It will, of course, correct to a great extent, the washy condition on the east cut slope of the railroad. On the west side our plans call for handling the drainage in the same manner as it is presently being handled, that is, the ditch water from both sides of the highway will be carried to a drop inlet near the northwest corner of the overhead structure, thence through an existing 12" corrugated metal pipe under the west cut slope.

Our contract with the railroad, we believe, should provide for continued maintenance by the railroad company of this drop inlet and pipe, as well as the back slopes in the railroad cut under the bridge.
We note from correspondence in our files that negotiations are under way with the pipe line company for the adjustment of the pipes on the east side of the Santa Fe Railroad right-of-way.

B. F. Leslie
District Engineer

cc: J. W. Williams
Fred Harris
March 6, 1957

SURVEYS & PLANS
Pipeline Crossing
Route SVV, Mason County, near Hart

Mr. Fred A. Crane, Ass't. Supt.
Right of Way Department
Sinclair Pipe Line Company
Independence, Kansas

Dear Mr. Crane:

Attached are two prints each of road information on the improvement of an existing road as a part of our Supplementary Road System.

At the east end of the Santa Fe overhead near this location the drainage from the side road ditches has caused and is now causing considerable trouble at each corner of the railroad structure. In order to eliminate this trouble the plan provides for reversing the existing road grade so that the water will be carried back to the east. At the point where this improvement crosses your pipeline the side road ditch can be eliminated, which will require less pipeline work.

The prints referred to above are sections of our road plans and a special sheet showing the proposed roadway grade from the Santa Fe structure back east. Under this plan it will be necessary to lower your pipeline some three feet at the point of crossing, and inasmuch as this improvement occupies an existing public road we must ask your company to lower this line at its expense.

We should be glad to have you investigate this matter as soon as possible and advise us if you can handle as outlined as we have this improvement scheduled for an early letting.

Very truly yours,

cc: Mr. H. E. Wilson
    Mr. J. A. Williams
    Mr. E. F. Leslie

Chief Engineer

DG:hh
BRIDGE REPORT
ON STRUCTURES USED IN PLACE
THIS REPORT TO BE FILLED IN WITH INK OR TYPEWRITER

COUNTY: MASON  PROVINCE: B.V.V.  STA. NO.: 92405.13  BRIDGE NO.: 354.3  DESIGN NO.: W-404

*ON ROAD FROM NORT EAST TO SOUTH TO GOLDAVEN: 2.7 MILES N.E. OF NORT


REPORTED BY: R. Walker  DATE: March 1954

*GIVE ADJACENT TOWNS, EACH WAY, NOT TERMINAL POINTS OF ROUTE.

SUPERSTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>See plans attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| LENGTH OUT TO  | WIDTH BETWEEN | WIDTH OF | DISTANCE GRADE | DISTANCE GRADE | DISTANCE GRADE |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUT OF FLOOR</th>
<th>CURVES</th>
<th>SIDEWALKS</th>
<th>TO LOW CONSTR.</th>
<th>TO HIGH WATER</th>
<th>TO STREAM BED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEARANCE DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>MIN.</th>
<th>MAX.</th>
<th>RAIL</th>
<th>CURB</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF FLOOR DRAINAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL CONDITION: Good

SUBSTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABUTMENTS AND PIERS</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>TOP OF FOOTING TO BRIDGE SEAT</th>
<th>WIDTH OF BRIDGE SEAT</th>
<th>LENGTH OF BRIDGE SEAT</th>
<th>FOUNDATIONS (PILE)</th>
<th>WINGS (LENGTH, ANGLES, ETC.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEST OR NORTH</td>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST OR SOUTH</td>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIER</td>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIER</td>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIER</td>
<td>See plans attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL CONDITION: Good

GENERAL INFORMATION


CAN PLANS BE OBTAINED: Yes  GIVE NAME AND ADDRESS: P.R. plans attached

EXTRA HIGH WATER ELEV.  LOW WATER ELEV.  FLOOR 9460

ALIGNMENT OF STRUCTURE: Straight  SKREW OF STRUCTURE: 30° 38' 11.48

STREAM ALIGNMENT ABOVE STRUCTURE: Below Structure  RIP RAP: CHANNEL PROTECTION

WHAT IS EFFECTIVE WATERWAY UNDER BRIDGE, AT 90° WITH DIRECTION OF FLOW, BELOW EXTREME HIGH WATER: 1000 SQ. FT.

DOES THIS WATERWAY CARRY ENTIRE FLOOD DISCHARGE?

DOES DRIFT PASS SATISFACTORYLY?  DOES BRIDGE BACK UP WATER DURING FLOOD?

IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF EROSION AT PIERS OR ABUTMENTS?

DRAINAGE AREA ABOVE BRIDGE SITE: 50 SQ. MILES  HOW OBTAINED:

CHARACTER OF DRAINAGE AREA: FLAT, ROLLING, HILLY, OR MOUNTAINOUS.
## STEEL BRIDGES

### TRUSSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trusses</th>
<th>Length of Spans—C. to C.</th>
<th>No. of Panels</th>
<th>Length of Panels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PLATE GIRDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length—C. to C. of Bearings</th>
<th>Depth—B. to B. of Flange Angles</th>
<th>Web Thickness</th>
<th>Flange Section at Center of Top and Bottom</th>
<th>Size and Spacing of Rivets in Flange at Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### BEAM SPANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length C. to C. of Bearings</th>
<th>Spacing of Beams</th>
<th>Size and Shape of Inside Beams</th>
<th>Size and Shape of Outside Beams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ARCHES-FRAMES-SUSPENSIONS

(Describe fully)

### FLOOR BEAMS AND CONNECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>'Size—Shape'</th>
<th>Net Section</th>
<th>No. &amp; Size Rivets Floor Beam to Conn.</th>
<th>No. &amp; Size Rivets Conn. to Truss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Floor Beams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Floor Beams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRINGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>No. Lines</th>
<th>Size and Length</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>Flange Width</th>
<th>Web Thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Stringers Rest on Top of Floor Beams</th>
<th>How Framed to Floor Beams</th>
<th>No. and Size Rivets Stringer to Connection</th>
<th>No. and Size Rivets Connection to Floor Beam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are Shelf Angles Used</th>
<th>End Stringers—Length</th>
<th>Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FLOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Inches Thick</th>
<th>Wearing Surface</th>
<th>Inches Thick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Fastened to Stringers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### CONCRETE SLAB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness of slab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCRETE GIRDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width of girder</th>
<th>Depth of girder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCRETE GIRDERS OF ENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness of floor slab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARCHES OR FRAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Slab</th>
<th>Rib</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Clear Span</th>
<th>Rise</th>
<th>Crown Thickness</th>
<th>Spring or Haunch Thickness</th>
<th>Base Thickness</th>
<th>Filling Material</th>
<th>Depth of Fill at Crown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCRETE BOX TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Length Back to Back of Headwalls</th>
<th>Shoulder Width</th>
<th>Fill at Center Line</th>
<th>Floor—Concrete or Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIMBER BRIDGES

### STRINGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Size</th>
<th>Spacing</th>
<th>No. of Lines</th>
<th>Species and Treatment</th>
<th>How Supported</th>
<th>Lapped or Butted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FLOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size or Thickness</th>
<th>Species and Treatment</th>
<th>How Patched to Stringers or Cross Beams</th>
<th>How Laid</th>
<th>Cross Beams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tranv.</td>
<td>long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diag.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grade Separations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Separation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Separation of**
- Maintenance of structure by [ ]
- Maintenance of approaches by [ ]
- Maintenance of drainage by [ ]
- Maintenance of lights by [ ]

**Provision for future R.R. development**

**Additional Information**

**Show below**—by sketch no. of tracks: R.R. and highway alignment; subway clearances—horizontal and vertical.

---

### Stream Crossings

**Describe fully low water bridges, fords or ferry crossings**

---

**Note:** Show structural details under proper heading.
LOCATION SKETCH

NOTES: INDICATE ALIGNMENT 1,000 FT. EACH SIDE; INDICATE CHANNEL 500 FT. UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM. SHOW NORTH POINT. SKETCH TO BE IN INK.

GENERAL REMARKS:
SKETCHES OF STRUCTURE

NOTES: SHOW ELEVATION AND PLAN OF STRUCTURE.
MAKE SKETCHES LARGE ENOUGH TO SHOW SIZES OF EACH MEMBER.
SKETCHES TO BE IN INK.
USE SEPARATE SHEETS FOR STRUCTURAL SKETCHES IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS REQUIRED.
**STRUCTURE INVENTORY & APPRAISAL SHEET**

**COUNTY:** MACON  **BRIDGE NO:** 400  **ROUTE:** WV

### IDENTIFICATION

- **State:** MO
- **Highway Number:**
- **Location:**
- **Facility Carried by Structure:**
- **Structure No.:**
- **Road Section No.:**
- **Bridge Description:**
- **Defensive Milepoint:**
- **Defensive Section Length:**
- **Latitude:**
- **Longitude:**
- **Physical Vulnerability:**
- **By-pass, Detour Length:**
- **Total Bridge:**
- **Custodian:** M.S.H.D.  **Owner:** M.S.H.D.  **F.A.P. No.:**

### CLASSIFICATION

- **Fed. Aid System:**
- **Administrative:**
- **Functional:**

### STRUCTURE DATA

- **Year Built:**
- **Lanes on Str.:**
- **A.D.T. on Str.:**
- **Design Load:**
- **Approx. Width W/S/1:**
- **Br. Median:**
- **Open:**
- **Closed:**
- **Struct: Flared:**
- **Yes:**
- **No:**
- **Traffic Safety Features:**
- **Drainage Area:**
- **Navigation Vertical:**
- **Yes:**
- **No:**
- **Drainage Area:**
- **Horizontal:**
- **Approach:**
- **Total Horz. Clear.:**
- **Max. Span Length:**
- **Structure Length:**
- **Sidewalk At:**
- **Br. Width:**
- **Curb-Curb:**
- **Deck Width (Out-Out):**
- **Vert. Clearance Over Deck:**
- **Under Clearance-Vert.:**
- **Lateral-Right:**
- **Left:**
- **Wearing Surface Type:**

### CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Condition Analysis</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPRAISAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiencies</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS:** Span #5 - Bridge Floor is Conc with Asph overlay  
Spans 1-2-3-4-6-7&8 - Bridge Floor is Timber with Asph Overlay
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Year Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Type of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Type of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Improvement Length Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Design Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Roadway Width Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Number of Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Prop. Rdw Improvement-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Year, Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Estimated Cost of Improvements $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Estimated Cost of Preliminary Engineering $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Estimated Cost to Demolish Existing Structure $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Estimated Cost to Construct Proposed Substructure $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Estimated Cost to Construct Proposed Superstructure $,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Date Structure was Inspected (MM DD YY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Year Remodeled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Structure Plans on Microfilm Roll Exposure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bridges Data on Supplementary Routes Taken Over for Maintenance

**District Two**

**County**: Macon  
**Route**: VV  
**Date**: May 3, 1956  
**Sheet No.**: 1 of 1

**Location**: From Route Z just east of Hart northerly

**Length**: 7 miles  
**Type**: 18-24' GE, Part Ager. Surf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name of Stream</th>
<th>Drain Area</th>
<th>Super Structures</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Sub-Struct.</th>
<th>Rdy. Width</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/4 Mi. North of St. 2</td>
<td>A.T. &amp; S.F. R.R.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Timber Appr.</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>Steel Girder</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Approx. + Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bureau of Bridges**  
Mid-1956
DIVISION OF BRIDGES
BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

COUNTY: Macon
ROUTE NUMBER: W-37
BRIDGE NUMBER: 3
DESIGN NUMBER: W-404

DATE OF INSPECTION: 5-14-56
INSPECTION MADE BY: BVO:OC

SUPERSTR. 36 Timb, 60' Gw, 4020+ Timb. Type of Substr. Timber
Approx. Timber: 0.1, Cem. & Timber

1. TYPE AND CONDITION OF FLOOR AND WEARING SURFACE
   Condition: Good
   Condition of floor beams:
   Condition of joints:
   Condition of main members:

2. CONDITION OF DRAINAGE
   Condition: Good
   Note: flow around timber wall?

3. CONDITION OF RAILING, CURB, ETC.
   Condition: Good

4. CONDITION OF MAIN MEMBERS
   Condition: Good at 90%

5. CONDITION OF FLOOR BEAMS AND CONNECTIONS
   Condition: Good

6. CONDITION OF JOISTS AND CONNECTIONS
   Condition: Good

7. CONDITION OF PAINT AND EXTENT OF CORROSION
   Black - Good, a few spots

EXPANSION DEVICES AND SUPERSTRUCTURE SUPPORTS

8. ARE THEY FUNCTIONING PROPERLY
   Rollers: Yes
   Rockers: No
   Blocks: Yes
   Plates: No
   Cleaning: Yes
   Painting: No
   Oiling: No

9. DO THEY REQUIRE
   W. or N. Abut: Yes
   E. or S. Abut: No

10. IS PROPER EXPANSION SPACE PROVIDED
    W. or N. Abut: Yes
    E. or S. Abut: No

11. DESCRIBE ANY DAMAGE TO STRUCTURE BY COLLISION, OVERLOADING, OR OTHER CAUSES

SUBSTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SETTLING</th>
<th>SLIDING</th>
<th>TILTING</th>
<th>CRACKING</th>
<th>UNDERMINING</th>
<th>DISINTEGRATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. or N. Abutment</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. or S. Abutment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE LOCATION, EXTENT AND CAUSE OF ANY UNSATISFACTORY CONDITION LISTED ABOVE
   - -

20. IF A SKewed STRUCTURE, HAS THE SUPERSTRUCTURE MOVED TRANSVERSELY?
   - -

21. CONDITION OF RIPRAP
   - -

22. DESCRIBE DAMAGE, IF ANY, TO BRICKWALLS AND WINGS
   None

23. ARE PROPER EXPANSION JOINTS PROVIDED
    - -

24. CONDITION OF STREAM CHANNEL AT.
    Above, and below bridge site
    - - A.T.S.F.

25. HAVE THE FOLLOWING REPAIRS, RECOMMENDED LAST YEAR, BEEN MADE?
    A - FG
    G - G
    Y - Q
    C - EE

26. REMARKS
    Get UIP

(See reverse side)
**BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ROUTE NUMBER</th>
<th>BRIDGE NUMBER</th>
<th>DESIGN NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DATE OF INSPECTION:**

**INSTRUCTION MADE BY:**

**TYPE OF SUPERSTR.**

**TYPE OF SUBSTR.**

**REPAIRS RECOMMENDED:**

**T.E.** None

**P.B.** Work by railroadrecommended

*place primed and saturated with and grate
on concrete spans as water worn pool
and then

see page* from that guard up 2 coats of

paint #12 from that guard up 2 coats of

paint preferable alumina for top coat

*due arrangements will have to be made to
take care of water off of structure and
from all sides deleterious remarks*

**TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF REPAIRS RECOMMENDED:**

**REPAIRS TO SUPERSTRUCTURE:**

**ACTUAL COST OF REPAIRS TO SUPERSTRUCTURE:**

**REPAIRS COMPLETED TO SUBSTRUCTURE:**

*We would be letting ourselves into something
without better way to take care of roadway
approach drainage*

**ACTUAL COST OF REPAIRS TO SUBSTRUCTURE:**

**DATE WORK WAS COMPLETED:**

**GRAND TOTAL COST OF WORK COMPLETED:**

**HOW MUCH OF ITEM 33 IS DUE TO FLOOD DAMAGE:**

**HAS ANY MONEY BEEN SPENT IN VALLEY CROSSING FROM SPECIAL FUNDS?**

**AMOUNT SPENT:**

**AFE NO.:**

**HOW MUCH SPECIAL FUNDS WAS SPENT AT BRIDGE ENDS?**

**HOW MUCH WAS SPENT SOME DISTANCE FROM BRIDGE?**

**REMARKS:**

*(SEE REVERSE SIDE)*
SURVEYS & PLANS: Overhead
Route SVV, Macon County
Near Hart

June 20, 1957

Mr. B. F. Leslie

We have your letter of June 4, above subject, recommending that certain things be done on the overhead crossing prior to taking over by the State.

At a conference with Mr. Harris yesterday it was decided to make an exception of the Santa Fe structure on our road plans. The railroad now has an obligation to maintain this structure for vehicular traffic, and due to the drainage troubles existing at each corner of the structure we do not want to do anything which might obligate us for taking over this structure.

In regard to any road work at each end of the structure located upon railroad right of way, some one now has authority to maintain a public road at this location; therefore, we can go ahead with our road work up to the ends of railroad structure without any further handling with the railroad.

C. P. Owens

C. P. Owens
Engineer of Surveys and Plans

cc: Mr. Williams
    Mr. Harris
    RCJ:hh