# **Inspection Report with SI&A Data**

Structure Description: 377.95 Foot - 2 Span Steel continuous Stringer/Multi-beam or Girder

**2 District:** 06 **3 County:** Boone **16 Latitude:** 38°59'32.00" **7 Longitude:** 84°38'43.00"

7 Facility Carried I-75 RAMP Milepoint: 180.540

6A Feature Intersected: WEST RMP KY18 TO I75SB

9 Location: SB MALL RMP @ WEST RAMP

NBI	Χ
Element	Χ
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	

	NBI CONDITION RATINGS										
58	Deck:	6	61 Channel:	N							
<b>59</b>	Superstructure:	7	62 Culvert:	N							
<b>60</b>	Substructure:	7	Sufficiency Rating:	85.3							

60 Su	ıbstructure:	7	Sufficiency Rating: 85.3				
			DESIGN				
Subst	andard:		No				
Fractu	ıre Critical:		No FC Details				
43A	Main Span Ma	terial:	(4) Steel Continuous				
43B Main Span Design: (02) Stringer / Girder							

45 Number of Spans Main: 2
 44A Approach Span Material: Not Applicable
 44B Approach Span Design: Not Applicable

46 Number of Approach Spans: 0

**107 Deck Type:** (1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place **108A Wearing Surface:** (1) Monolithic Concrete

**108B Membrane**: (0) None

**108C Deck Protection:** (1) Epoxy Coated Reinforcing

Overlay Y/N: No
Overlay Type: None
Overlay Thickness: -1.000 in

**Overlay Date:** 

	APPRA	NISAL
36A	Bridge Railings:	(1) Meets Standards
36B	Transitions	(1) Meets Standards
36C	Approach Guardrail:	(1) Meets Standards
36D	Approach Guardrail Ends:	(1) Meets Standards
71	Waterway Adequacy:	(N) Not Applicable
<b>72</b>	Approach Alignment:	(6) Equal Minimum Crit
113	Scour Critical:	(N) Not over Waterway
Reco	mmended Scour Critical:	(N) Not over Waterway

		LOAD RATINGS
63	Operating Type:	(1) Load Factor (LF)
64	Operating Rating:	110.0 tons
65	Inventory Type:	(1) Load Factor (LF)
66	Inventory Rating:	110.0 tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type I:	tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type II:	tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type III:	tons
Trucl	k Capacity Type IV:	tons

	GEOMETRIC DATA							
48	Max Length Span:	186.024 ft						
49	Structure Length:	377.953 ft						
32	Approach Roadway:	25.919 ft						
33	Median:	(0) No Median						
34	Skew:	0°						
35	Flare:	No Flare						
50A	Curb/Sidewalk Width L:	1.490 ft						
50B	Curb/Sidewalk Width R:	1.490 ft						
47	Horiz. Clearance:	25.919 ft						
51	Width Curb to Curb:	25.919 ft						
<b>52</b>	Width Out to Out:	29.199 ft						
48	Max Length Span:	186.024 ft						
	ADMINIST	RATIVE						
27	Year Built:	1990						
106	Year Reconstructed:	0						
42A	Type of Service On:	(1) Highway						
42B	Type of Service Under:	(1) Highway						
37	Historical Significance:	(5) Not Eligible						
21	<b>Maintenance Responsibility</b>	:(01) State Hwy Agency						
22	Owner:	(01) State Hwy Agency						
101	Parallel Structure:	(N) No II Structure Exists						

29.199 ft

99.999 ft

99.999 ft

(N) Feature not hwy or RR

(H) Hwy beneath struct.

**CLEARANCES** 

Width Out to Out:

Vert. Clearance:

54A Vert. Under Reference:

55A Lateral Under Reference:

Field Postings Type IV:

Min. Vert. Clearance Over:

54B Min. Vert. Underclearance: 16.909 ft

55B Min. Lat. Underclearance R: 18.701 ft56 Min. Lat. Underclearance L: 9.843 ft

POSTINGS									
41 Posting Status:	(A) Open, No Restriction								
Signs Posted Cardinal:	No								
Signs Posted Non-Cardinal:	No								
Field Postings Gross:	-1 tons								
Field Postings Type I:	-1 tons								
Field Postings Type II:	-1 tons								
Field Postings Type III:	-1 tons								

# Inspection Report with SI&A Data

12: Re Concrete Deck												
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4			
SQ.FT	11,036.02	10,936.02	99%	100	1%	0	0%	0	0%			

#### Deck~

Deck wearing surface area was found to have a minor loss of texture throughout wheel track locations.

Note that new concrete was placed along the rear abutment backwall since last inspection.

Random areas throughout deck surface at or near the forward expansion joint device was found to have surface scaling and spalling conditions.

Hairline transverse cracking was found randomly throughout deck surface.

See Photos

520: Conc Re Prot Sys											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
SQ.FT	11,036.02	11,036.02	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

Conc Re Prot Sys~

Protection system was found to be performing as design.

1080: Delamination/Spall/Patched Area											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
SQ.FT	1	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

### Patch/Spalls~

Note that new concrete was placed along the rear abutment backwall since last inspection.

Random areas throughout deck surface at or near the forward expansion joint device was found to have surface scaling and spalling conditions.

(See Photos)

**Inspection Report with SI&A Data** 

107: Steel Opn Girder/Beam										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
FT	1,512	1,512	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

#### Girders~

Note that all steel girder elements throughout structure were repainted during project performed in September of 2010. Paint system was found to be thin on bottom side of both girder elements in span #2 over KY-18 ramp and in bottom side of random steel diaphragm elements throughout both spans #1 and #2. Areas of thin protective coating detected on bottom flanges of girders in span #2 now have random areas of light surface rusting conditions.

Note that steel girder elements were found to have minor distortion typical throughout web sections along bays in between areas of vertical stiffeners.

Note that a small area of traffic impact damage was found in bottom flange of girder #1 in span #1, directly over local service road (small gravel lane), which now has surface rusting conditions.

Statement from 2009 inspection report: (Note that pigeons are living and nesting on bottom flanges of structural steel members.) See Photos

515: Steel Protective Coating											
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4		
FT	8,065.01	8,065.01	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		

Protective Coating~

Note that superstructure had a total paint project in the year of 2010. Paint system was found to be performing as design. (See Photos)

205: Re	Conc Column								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
EACH	2	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier Columns~

Pier column elements throughout structure were found to be performing as designed at this time.

(See Photos)

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

215: Re	Conc Abutment								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	74.17	70.17	95%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%

#### Concrete Abutment~

Both the rear and forward abutment elements were found to have minor dark staining in random locations throughout (breastwalls and backwalls), due to seepage from expansion joint seal failures above. Abutment backwalls were also found to have random areas of rust staining throughout fascias.

Hairline vertical cracking was found in random concrete bearing pedestals at abutment seat locations.

The top portion of the rear abutment backwall was found to have a large concrete spall/pothole, approximately 4 feet long with exposed rusting reinforcing steel.

See Photos

1080: Delamination/Spall/Patched Area										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
FT	4	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	

#### Spall~

The top portion of the rear abutment backwall was found to have a large concrete spall/pothole, approximately 4 feet long with exposed rusting reinforcing steel.

218: Oth	her Abutments								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	57	47	82%	10	18%	0	0%	0	0%

#### MSF Abutment~

Both the rear and forward abutment elements were found to have minor dark staining in random locations throughout, due to seepage from expansion joint seal failures above.

Minor settlement of MSE panels were noted at the forward abutment with a minor loss of sand backfill material.

Moderate erosion at end of the left forward drainage system on topside of MSE wall and a minor opening of 3/4 inch at top edges of concrete paved gutter should be sealed to prevent water from entering area of sand backfill. Loss of sand will seriously damage this system.

Minor bulging conditions were found in MSE panels at the forward abutment fascia, which should remain closely watched.

Vertical misalignment was noted in the MSE coping in the center of the forward abutment breastwall.

See Photos

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

234: Re	Conc Pier Cap								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	27	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier Caps~

Pier cap elements throughout structure were found to be performing as designed at this time.

302: Compressn Joint Seal										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
FT	58.34	21.34	37%	17	29%	0	0%	20	34%	

Expansion Joints~

Expansion joint devices throughout structure are of Compression Seal design.

Note that compression seal material throughout both the rear and forward expansion joint devices were found to be failing at this time. A mixture of both roadway dirt and debris buildup forcing seals downward under traffic flow and expansion throughout structure squeezing seal material upward into direct line with traffic flow has and continues to accelerate failure throughout joint seals. As joint seals become forced upward, traffic flow impacts material and cause ripping damages.

Both the rear and forward expansion joint devices need to be replaced as soon as possible to prevent seepage to elements below. Note that armored edge material throughout expansion joints were found to have random areas of impact damage from what appears to be snow plow equipment. Joint at the rear abutment was found to have two sections of armored material that have been broken completely off, which is located at or near center line of joint device. Broken and missing sections of armor material are approximately 5.0 foot in length. Joint at the forward location has random areas of strikes throughout. See Photos

2320: S	eal Adhesion								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	15	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	15	100%

Seal Adhesion~

Expansion joint devices throughout structure are of Compression Seal design.

Note that compression seal material throughout both the rear and forward expansion joint devices were found to be failing at this time. A mixture of both roadway dirt and debris buildup forcing seals downward under traffic flow and expansion throughout structure squeezing seal material upward into direct line with traffic flow has and continues to accelerate failure throughout joint seals. As joint seals become forced upward, traffic flow impacts material and cause ripping damages.

Both the rear and forward expansion joint devices need to be replaced as soon as possible to prevent seepage to elements below.

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

314: Po	t Bearing								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
EACH	12	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

### Bearings~

Bearing devices throughout structure are of Steel Painted Pot design.

All bearing devices throughout structure were repainted during September of 2010, with all found to be performing as designed at this time.

Due to newer paint coating system movement in devices could not be detected.

See Photos

515: Steel Protective Coating										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
EACH	1.11	0	0%	1.11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	

#### Protective Coating~

Paint system throughout pot bearing devices underwent a paint project back in 2010. Paint system was found to be performing as design.

(See Photos)

331: Re Conc Bridge Railing										
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4	
FT	756	756	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	

# Bridge Railing~

Concrete bridge railing system throughout structure is of New Jersey Barrier Wall design.

Note that railing system was found to have a minor loss of protective coating system throughout, along with hairline vertical flexure cracking at random spacing ft.s throughout system.

Note that there are roadway lighting poles mounted to the top side of the left side bridge railing.

See Photos

Inspection Report with SI&A Data

851: Tra	ansitions								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%

#### Transitions~

Both the rear and forward approach roadway transitions to structure were found starting to show break down conditions in asphalt pavement material.

860: Erd	osion Ctrl/Prt								
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Erosion Control~

Erosion control protection system was found along the rear abutment embankment slope. Rip rap material was found to be performing as design.

(See Photos)

#### STRUCTURE NOTES

Structure Stamped 1989

## **INSPECTION NOTES**

\*Structure was inspected by Craig Bresch with Greg Cady

Action: 1047 - Joints-Replace

Generated by user "cbresch" on 6/17/2015

-Replace both compression seals at both the rear and forward most ends.

-Replace armored edge along the rear most end, due to impact.