

SUMMARY OF METAL TRUSS BRIDGE RE-EVALUATION: 9/4-5/08 & 10/15/08

Kara Russell, PennDOT	Deb Suciu-Smith, FHWA
Gerry Kuncio, Skelly & Loy	Susan Zacher, PHMC
Cheryl Nagle, PHMC	Carol Lee, PHMC
Brian Kreider, PennDOT	Jennifer Horn, Preservation PA
Lance Savant, PennDOT (9/4 am)	Jonathan Daily, PennDOT
Jean Herst, Preservation Pa	Andrea MacDonald (9/4 am)
Derek Constable (10/15)	

The review committee met on September 4-5, and October 15, 2008 to re-evaluate Pennsylvania's metal truss bridges for their National Register eligibility.

The following metal truss bridge designs and/or types were reviewed on a state-wide basis:

Warren Truss (pony and thru- regional based review more than statewide)
Parker Truss (pony and thru)
Pennsylvania Thru Truss
Baltimore Thru Truss
Deck Truss

NOTE: See the notes following the district lists below (which are primarily focused on the Pratt trusses) for the results of the review of Warrens, Parkers, Pennsylvania, Baltimore, & Deck trusses. Following the District lists is also a discussion and review of the transition to riveting for all designs/types (most particularly focused on Warrens but also including other types including Pratt).

The review committee reviewed the metal trusses bridges by PennDOT District, by type and then by design. It was agreed by the review committee that, in general, regional significance would be gauged using the PennDOT engineering district as the basis. Generally the specifically reviewed bridges (listed in the pages which follow) constitute the remaining 19th century truss bridges as well as the early 20th century truss bridges (reviewed particularly to establish bridges that might be significant as representing the transition to riveting-Criterion C). Additional bridges were generally reviewed only either 1) at the request of the District or 2) when there was a difference in opinion between the Lichtenstein recommendation and the expert panel (which made the official determinations for the bridge survey in 2001).

District 1-0

Pony Truss District 1: 46 in survey with 9 eligible/listed; 9 of 46 have been lost; 4 National Register (NR) eligible/listed bridges lost. 19th Century Bridges: 24 bridges in 1996 (9 eligible), 4 lost; 20th Century Bridges: 22, 5 lost

Pratt Pony:

20720107763002: Built 1895: Determination: Eligible (CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally considered ineligible due to some alterations (new eyes and welded diagonals; some rivets replaced by modern bolts) and the opinion that there are better and more complete examples. Suggestion made that in this case the bridge is one of the earliest pony trusses in the district and should be considered eligible despite the alterations. It has a definite build date of 1895; the length is normal for a pony truss bridge. How many pratt ponys with early constructions dates are eligible? That is the comparison we have to make. In terms of pratt pony trusses in the 19th century anything with a definite construction date that retains integrity should be eligible. The team decided to consider them all potentially eligible and to review/discuss them (thereafter the team did review all remaining 19th century trusses).

For the following bridges, absent a firm construction date some committee members felt it is hard to say they are eligible based only on integrity. There may be a lot of undated bridges statewide; there are only five other eligible bridges in District. Suggestion was to flag such bridges and evaluate them on a statewide level in context of all the other districts.

20720607513008: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Does not have a firm construction date

20720905173011: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Does not have a firm construction date

20722208693027: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Does not have a firm construction date

20722506894001: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Does not have a firm construction date; altered

20720608413009: ca. 1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously Determined Not Eligible)

**60740203723017: built 1889: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

The bridge was found ineligible previously because, at the time of the evaluation, there was a better/more complete example, but that example has been demolished. Bridges from the 1880s are very rare. It has integrity and a firm construction date. Hard File not found.

60720505874001: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously determined Not Eligible)
Does not have a firm construction date

60721306284001: 1904: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously determined Not Eligible)
The bridge is unaltered but by the early 20th century the pratt pony truss bridge is common; not much is known about the Rochester Bridge Company; they were not a major bridge builder in PA and not a significant innovator; they built a standard bridge design.

60720703040003: ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously Not Eligible)

20720107433001 ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously determined Not Eligible)

60721306284001 ca.1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: previously determined Not Eligible)

Thru Truss District 1: 56 thru truss bridges in survey; 39 remaining of which 21 are NR Eligible/listed.

Parker Thru: No re-evaluation needed for Dist. 1 Parkers (see statewide Parker discussion hereafter)

All the parker trusses in district were built in the early 1930s; there were very common by then; committee did not see a need to re-evaluate.

Pratt Thru:

20722308033030: Built 1894: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 2-0

Pony Truss District 2: 32 in survey; 16 extant, and only 3 NR eligible/listed extant.

Pratt Pony:

18721505370005: ca.1900: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally considered ineligible only because of existence of earlier examples which are now gone. Agree eligible as a remaining unaltered early example.

14201100100209: Built 1938: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously determined not individually eligible but contributing)

17005300801764: Built 1940: Determination: Not Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Eligible)

Previously determined eligible because it has two spans. Flaw in original evaluation based on it being the longest remaining bridge. Concern expressed about precedent; we said we would not re-evaluate the eligible bridges; however, the question of length is not relevant and there are other longer bridges. The original evaluation was based on erroneous information (longest bridge of this type). There was a discussion about sending it back to the district to re-survey and take it thru the public participation process. However, based upon recent photos illustrating changes, and in consideration of the bridge in relation to others in the population, the committee agreed the bridge is not eligible; nothing technologically important; a 1932 2-span, however long, is not important. Change eligibility but when bridge project goes through Section 106 the district has to consider public participation in the process.

42721203730005: ca.1900: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally ineligible because of alterations and there were better examples. File doesn't show alterations. If the pins are welded it no longer functions as a pin connected bridge, which is a significant change. A concern was expressed about the issue of replacing pins and integrity, in connection with the problem of bridge safety and current maintenance ability; we can replace pins but if we do will it make the bridge no longer eligible? It will be an adverse effect.

Thru Trusses in District 2: 28 in survey; 20 extant; lost 8.

Pratt Thru:

42721104140005: ca.1900: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally ineligible because there were many others. Unaltered but no date of construction and no bridge company associated with it; some felt there are better examples with documented date of construction and builder. Decision based on degree of loss of other bridges and level of integrity of this one decision is eligible. There is a big jump to the 1930s after this bridge.

District 3-0

Pony Truss District 3-0: 55 in survey with 4 NR eligible/listed; 37 extant with 2 NR eligible/listed.

Pratt Pony:

**19720905360089: Built 1896: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

New loops and I-bars welded; a large but in-kind alteration. Not many eligible in the district; Relatively early remaining example with minimal alterations; 3 earliest in region were lost.

08721003260014: Built 1894: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally ineligible due to alterations but file doesn't show this. Discussion centered around whether the alterations were "just to stabilize the structure". Photos don't show alterations. Queried the universe of pratt pony trusses in the late 19th century—there are 75 left out of 107 ten years ago. Committee decided to stay with the expert panel recommendation; did not see a justification to change.

49720606390117: Built 1896: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Altered so that the truss no longer carries the load

49721804540121: built 1897: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant Alterations

49721904300124: Built 1897: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant Alterations

19720503280009: Built ca.1900: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant Alterations

Thru Truss District 3-0: 26 in survey, 7 were NR eligible/listed; 17 extant, 4 NR eligible/listed.

Pratt Thru:

08721203280017: Built 1905: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Still not eligible even if it is pin-connected; later example of a common bridge type

49722004800167: Built ca.1900: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Considered ineligible because there were many others in the region; it is intact but no firm construction date or maker. There are earlier examples. "A nice looking bridge" but not significant.

District 4-0

Pony Truss District 4-0: 37 in survey with 14 NR eligible/listed; 26 extant with 12 NR eligible/listed.

Pratt Pony:

57740104800113: Built 1887: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significantly Altered; better, more complete examples exist, such as 57722104980130. Welded repairs and I- bars are substantial changes. Even though it is wrought iron and increasingly rare-there are still many more wrought iron bridges (although the surveyors did not carefully identify metals in the survey).

35720204450101: Built 1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Not Eligible due to poor condition; lacks integrity
63720206030105: Built 1901: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Not Eligible)
Earlier examples extant

57740104800113: Built 1887: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Thru Truss District 4-0: 30 in survey with 9 eligible/listed; 19 extant with 5 NR eligible/listed.

Pratt Thru:

65720704130114: Built ca.1900: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant alterations
63300500500000: Built 1903: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Late example of a pin-connected

District 5-0

Pony Truss District 5-0: 15 in survey with 7 NR eligible/listed; 11 extant with 5 eligible/listed.

Pratt Pony:

06723207949632: Built 1905: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Late example pin-connected

Thru Trusses in District 5-0: 19 in survey with 12 eligible/listed; 16 extant with 11 eligible/listed.

Pratt Thru:

39032901300882: Built 1933: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Expert Panel Determined eligible, reversing AGL recommendation; remains eligible)

(Old BMS# 39032901400000)

One of the earliest extant state designed trusses in region/district

Lichtenstein recommendation reversed by expert panel on the basis that it is one of only three state highway department designed pratt thru truss bridges east of the Susquehanna. No justification for changing the expert panel determination.

06721507879467: Built 1904: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Expert Panel Determined eligible; reversing AGL recommendation; remains eligible)

The expert panel reversed the Lichtenstein recommendation because it was one of two examples of its type in the county. Expert panel based the decision on a county context. We agreed not to use the county as the frame of reference but also agreed not to reverse previously determined eligible; do not have reason to reverse expert panel opinion; however, if there is a project we could re-evaluate.

3973010000902023: Built 1902: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 6-0

Pony Truss District 6-0: 64 in survey with 27 NR eligible/listed; 50 left with 21 NR eligible/listed; 31 from the 19th century.

Bowstring Truss:

09700904270183: Built 1876: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Expert panel considered ineligible because it was significantly altered in 1933. Only part of the original bridge remaining is the upper curve. 1876 is early even if the bridge was changed. Of the four in the state this is the only one not listed or eligible. One bridge is dismantled and in storage; two others have been moved. However, it was determined that the bridge does not possess integrity of design and is not eligible.

Pratt Pony Truss:

46400500502256: Built 1895: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Bolted connections, significant alterations
Not in the listed part of the park. .

09700903760150: Built 1887: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Thru Truss District 6-0: 24 bridges in survey; 24 extant.

46704602300147: Built 1896: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant alterations

46402000303504: Built 1888: Determination: Listed
Expert panel found bridge NE; Committee finds no reason to De-List

District 8-0

Pony Truss District 8-0: 46 bridges in survey with 21 NR eligible/listed; 25 extant with 12 NR eligible/listed.

Pratt Pony:

50721004033013: Built 1905: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant Alterations

50300900201815: Built 1899: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant Alterations

664032004200000: Built 1893: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
(old BMS# 66403200401983)
UPDATE: Truss collapsed when struck by a vehicle on 11/23/08

Thru Truss District 8-0: 30 in survey; 27 extant with 16 NR eligible/listed.

66405101200000: Built 1889: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Determined Not Eligible in 1995)

66405101101260: Built 1889: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Determined Not Eligible in 1995)

66721207733064: Built 1893: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 9-0

Pony Truss District 9-0: 28 extant

05720604193017: Built 1871: Determination: Not Eligible (demolished)
Burr truss bridge East Providence Twp, Bedford County, NR listed, burned down in 1988.

Pratt Pony:

31722503683012: Built 1889: Determination: Eligible (CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally determined NE due to alterations; deck and stringers were replaced/better examples. There are only two pony trusses left in the county. These aren't significant alterations. There are only four 19th century pony trusses left in District 9. It has a steel beam stringer instead of wood stringers. Replacement of stringers does not affect the truss's technological significance or function (hardly any bridges have wooden stringers left). It has a firm construction date but no builder; it is a relatively early remaining example; the changes are not fatal to integrity. Need to verify if it still functions as truss based upon recent work done—bridge inspection records? Change to eligible but if J. Daily discovers recent alterations affecting integrity it will revert back to NE.

55202100200000: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Thru Truss District 9-0: 30 in survey; 22 extant

07721405123048: Built 1898: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Significant alterations.

District 10-0

Pony Truss District 10: 38 in survey; 19 extant

Pratt Pony:

32402600500000: Built 1900: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

03722603960028: ca1900: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Alterations-welded connections.

Thru Truss District 10: 15 in survey; 9 extant

No change to any evaluations for Pratt Thru trusses (see statewide design evaluations)

District 11-0

Pony Truss District 11: 13 in survey; 10 extant

-No change to any evaluations for pratt pony trusses (see statewide design evaluations)

Thru Truss District 11: 46 in survey; 35 extant

37721004857017: Built 1890: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Significant alterations. Changing the end post is significant; not sure it really is the Pittsburgh Bridge Co. Not as complete as 372005004000000

District 12-0

Pony Truss District 12: 68 in survey; 43 extant

30721004472056: Built 1893: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Only a few 19th century bridges left; some minor welds at connections. Changes not important. Significant losses of trusses in District 12-bridge is now a complete and early example of its type in the region.

26721403111047: Built 1898: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Originally NE because were many examples in region; now only 7 left in the county; change to Eligible based on losses of other bridges in District; complete and early remaining example of type and design in region.

62720606084007: Built 1895: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Substantial alterations; doesn't function as truss bridge anymore.

Thru Truss District 12: 35 in survey; 27 extant; 12 NR eligible/listed

62740190004001: Built 1888: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Cover plate welded to upper chord and sidewalk added to one side but not particularly important alterations. Change to Eligible based on losses of other bridges. Welded on repairs/strengthening is less significant than replacement of members.

Transition from Pin to Rivet Connections:

Discussion of rivet connections; transition from pin to rivets. Capture the change in technology and when it occurred in PA. Early examples of riveted bridges; assumed transition occurred last decade of 19th century but, based on the PA population, it looks like it actually occurred in the first decade of the 20th century.

Warren Pony:

107 total warren trusses in survey; 73 extant

93 total riveted warren trusses in survey; 68 extant

Note: Committee decided to examine riveted Warren pony trusses built before 1910 on a regional level with a basis of eastern PA, central PA, and Western PA

Warren trusses statewide were examined and evaluated for the transition from pin connected to rivet connected.

Warren trusses date from the 1880s; they came in more commonly with the switch from pin to rivet trusses. By the teens they were very common although not as common as pratt trusses. Question arose on how many warren trusses remain in the statewide population (Answ:73; primarily riveted). Also, we are only looking at highway bridges—what about RR bridges (question that cannot be answered here). If there are any pin connected warren trusses bridges they would be very rare. We haven't lost any warren pony truss bridges so some suggested we don't need to re-evaluate.

Recommended that we look at warren pony trusses on a statewide basis-early examples with documented builder should be reconsidered. Lichtenstein approach was to consider any warren pony truss built before 1908 that retained integrity to be eligible.

Further discussion related to Warren trusses: Discussion of whether there anything significant about the bridge companies (related to the early 1900s warren bridges) Decision was, no, based upon available information. Discussion about bridge length? Decision was it is not relevant. Discussion about whether there are post-1908 bridges that were determined eligible? Answ: a few were determined eligible including a 1911 bridge significant for illustration of transition from pin connected to riveted bridges (however, there are many earlier riveted bridges. If Lichtenstein called bridges from the 1910s significant as transitional then earlier bridges should be re-evaluated in that light.)

District 1:

61721903064003: Built 1907: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Intact and early example of transition to riveted technology in PA; oldest intact warren riveted truss in region; firm date of construction. This is a genuine example in an area of the state that doesn't have any others. Some reviewers were not concerned about the abutment changes, which are not relevant to the design and construction of the bridge. Only two (warrens) left from the 19th century and a few from the early 20th century. This is a 1907 bridge considered NE by Lichtenstein because they decided the transition to rivets was a decade earlier.

District 3:

**08723307510037: Built 1908: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Earliest example in central portion of state of a riveted warren pony with integrity

58720704020004: Built 1917: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

Expert panel member felt significant as a remaining example from Phoenix Bridge Co. This is a standard bridge; by this time Phoenix was just building standard bridges; no engineering innovations. However, decision was to not change expert panel determinations.

District 4:

35720503450101: Built 1907: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

57740910140002: Built 1913: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

40723003887307: Built 1907: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

40723003367305: Built 1907: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 5:

39101400400503: Built 1908: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 6:

23730103401428: Built 1899: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Replacement of rivets with bolts at upper chords; welded deck cover; lower chord and diagonals at lower chord connection have complete section loss; concrete encasement of lower chords.

09700904810221: Built 1905: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

No documented builder; altered example with more complete examples in region

District 8:

66742030003274: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

01720206463118: Built 1911: Determination: Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

District 10:

03721703460001: Built 1913: Determination: Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

Appears to have been considered eligible because one expert panel member felt significant for Farris Bridge- Pgh based Co that mostly built concrete bridges—didn't build a lot of truss bridges; standard design. However, no justification to change eligibility.

District 11:

**02730100003081: Built 1903: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Unusual/Distinctive lower chord; girder instead of gusset plates; no alterations and repairs; also a good example of early riveted technology in PA. Need to evaluate at the time of a project for contributing to PRR. Not evaluated individually because it was already contributing to the PRR. Lichtenstein didn't look at it in terms of its technology but committee decided we should look at it for individual eligibility. This is over an active railroad- Lichtenstein couldn't see what was underneath but this bridge to establish integrity but appears to have been heavily repaired, and raised in height. Lichtenstein notes it has "unusual detail". Some reviewers were uncomfortable with changing the eligibility without clear information regarding the integrity of the bridge. The survey form doesn't mention changes. Ultimately committee decided bridge is individually eligible based upon rarity of design detail.

**02730100003118: Built 1903: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Unusual/Distinctive lower chord; girder instead of gusset plates; no alterations and repairs; also a good example of early riveted technology in PA. Need to evaluate at the time of a project for contributing to PRR. Both PRR bridges are similar design; they are both massive/heavy; Determination that if the bridges merit individual eligibility they should be designated. The expert panel might have said yes, but since they already contributed to RR a separate evaluation was not done. Committee determined bridge individually eligible.

02730100003022: Built 1907: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Significantly Altered

Warren thru (rivet transition): 13 in survey, 10 extant

District 6:

09722499910005: Built 1904: Determination: Not Evaluated
(No Change: Previously not evaluated for individual eligibility since a contributing component of an historic district (HD))

Contributes to Washington Crossing HD. While an early example in extant state population decision was to not evaluate for individual eligibility since it's already a contributing component of an existing HD. Decision: No change; contributes to district.

District 9:

55302500100244: Built 1912: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Oldest remaining in district; however not an early or transitional example for state. Earliest example in state is already determined eligible; this 1912 bridge is the second oldest one left- the others are very late; however, Warren thru trusses are not an important trend in PA. What is an early example in PA? If PA had earlier examples that no longer exist a later example can't substitute for an earlier example. By 1910 warren thru truss was very common in RR design and technology. A lot of RR bridges are Warren thru truss; we don't know the universe of these; we had the same conversation about Baltimore trusses. Decision was that bridge is not eligible.

OTHER DESIGNS-TRANSITION TO RIVETING:

Pratt rivet thru truss:

District 6:

15701504380111: Built ca.1905: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

Pratt rivet pony truss:

District 9:

55202100200000: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Late example of pin-connected

District 10:

03722001500007: ca.1895: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

District 12:

62721003074022: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

62721203464002: Built 1902: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Early example; intact; confirmed date and builder. Discussion centered around the fact that there are 2 earlier; however, committee overall felt that all within the transition period that all complete bridges are significant; there is a definite transition in the technology. We are basing our statement of significance on the parameters of the technology related to the type of bridge construction; we need to look at the bridges based on integrity if they meet the test of significance.

**62722408214028: 1903: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Complete and early example of a riveted Pratt pony truss; demonstrates transition to riveting technology in region.

62722405064011: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
No documented builder; loss of integrity.

62722308394013: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Some alterations; bolts suggest a member was changed.

62721208594004: Built 1904: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Alterations including change of rivet connections to bolts.

Parker Trusses-Statewide

Parker Pony Truss (statewide): There were 50 bridges in survey, now 37, only 2 eligible left.

District 3:

**19048705800000: Built 1930: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Now the oldest extant example of a design the state bureau of roads found useful- Rolled H-section for verticals and diagonals; should now be eligible.

District 12:

30720103322102: Built 1919: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

2nd oldest extant bridge of this type. Question-what about all the WPA bridges-significant trend in the 1920s/30s? Concern expressed about calling out a funding source as a reason for significance-vague. It was simply a popular design for a replacement bridge in the 20s and 30s when the state became responsible for much road and bridge building in the 20s. Since the expert panel identified a lost bridge as the oldest remaining example of a state constructed bridge then we should look at the next oldest that retains integrity.

30001803001890: Built 1930: Demolished

Parker Thru Truss (statewide):

District 3:

49730200100172: Built 1916: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Contributing to Susquehanna Historic District)
Not individually significant; 1983 determination of eligibility- contributes to
Susquehanna Mills HD. Not altered but there are 11 earlier examples.

District 4:

**40301400202380: Built 1905: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Minor changes; anything early 20th century before 1910 should be considered eligible.
This is an early example of a Parker (Camelback) truss in a diminished population;
although lack of documented builder was a concern the bridge is now a rare type.

District 6:

46704605100156: Built 1904: Determination: Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible per expert panel determination)
File missing-No explanation from expert panel why they found eligible.
1904 Parker would be early in any district. This is the only Parker in district 6; no
reason to change finding without further information; re-evaluate when/if bridge becomes
a project.

District 9:

11305500200036: Built 1936: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible—but contributes to Johnstown Historic
District)
Cannot evaluate for individual eligibility without more information; if there is a project
revisit.

Pennsylvania Thru Trusses-Statewide:

There were 18 in survey, 9 eligible, and 1 NR listed; 13 extant, 8 eligible and 1 NR listed.
Not many Pennsylvania thru trusses built for highways; we already have 8 eligible.
Pennsylvania Thru truss was not a significant trend in highway design in PA; however
the earliest examples on a statewide basis are significant.

District 1:

20000609000114: Built 1901: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 4:

40730202040002: Built 1914: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)
Was believed to be the longest PA Thru Truss in the state; however committee found
longer extant example (see 62 1022 0010 0036)

District 5:

48730299920010: Built 1937: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

Agree with survey evaluation-longest example in state and pushed the simple span truss design to limit.

District 8:

21720605083611: Built 1895: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

District 10:

32300300100000: Built 1937: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

District 11:

0220820010014: Built 1909: Determination: **TABLED**

Hulton Bridge Oakmont, Allegheny Co. SR 2082

Needs evaluated for Criterion A, first bridge built by Allegheny County engineers

Determined that bridge does not contribute to Allegheny River Blvd. 1st built in the county bridge program over the Allegheny. There is not an engineering reason to make this bridge eligible (not eligible under Crit. C). If there is a Criterion A reason it should be addressed. If it is the 1st county bridge that might be significant. Phone discussion with Susan Cabot of ASC Group (consultant on bridge as the bridge is an active project): Cabot says not innovative; there were many earlier bridges built by the county; it was just the first across the Allegheny by the county. ASC recommends ineligible. The county would have contracted the design out because the county engineering department was almost nothing in 1909. There weren't geared up for their own construction until the 1920s. Based on database, it is the oldest extant bridge over the Allegheny. A committee member felt that this is a locational issue; we have not used it (crossing) as a criterion for any other bridges (looked at by this committee). It was used as a factor in Danville (a previous DOE not part of the historic bridge survey) and we haven't looked at other big rivers (in this review committee). We looked at bridges over the Monongahela; why it was built, when, and who built it.

Decision was to table Criterion A for consideration by BHP NR committee as a PHRS form was completed recently and about to be submitted by District CRP for consideration). Not eligible under Criterion C.

District 12:

62102200100036: Built 1906: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Eligible)

Baltimore Truss (statewide):

8 Extant; 2 eligible, 2 listed, 1 demolished since survey

Reviewed Baltimore truss bridges statewide; relatively few built for highway; designed to handle railroad freight—long spans with a lot of vibrations. A third of the extant are in District 3. All the ineligible bridges are from the 1930s. There are older examples—numerous railroad bridges of this type. Not a significant part of the highway system but oldest in state would be significant.

District 3:

19404900201442: Built 1934: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

Erroneously listed as a King Post (actually a Baltimore)

District 4:

40001107901610: Built 1929: Determination: Not Eligible

(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)

1985 box beams replacing trusses; later altered example.

Deck Trusses Evaluated-Statewide:

There were 39 in the survey, 8 NR listed. There are now 26 left, 5 NR listed.

District 5:

39101400400744: Built 1908: Determination: Not Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Determined Eligible-Expert panel 2001).

No justification in expert panel notes. Altered; heavy repairs. There is no information to explain the finding. Not even a large example of a deck truss. Might have been that expert panel was looking at combination spans? However, combination spans are utility issues rather than design innovations. Not the oldest. In the absence of documentation committee decided it can't just accept the panel opinion. There are earlier Pratt deck trusses.

District 11:

02730100003024: Built 1898: Determination: Eligible

(No Change: Expert panel determination of eligible Crit. A& C-not correctly entered in d-base/GIS)

Associated with the City Beautiful Movement. d-base appears to have incorrect decision; should have been recorded as eligible. Review committee finds bridge eligible A& C

02730100003109: Built 1930: Determination: Eligible

(CHANGE: Previously Not Eligible)

Cantilevered; AGL (survey): alterations and common technology; unusual construction

detail; riveted connections for the plate. One of the earliest ones left. 2nd oldest—Liberty bridge is older. One of the two earliest specifically made by the city to span long distances. In the framework of what was being done in Pittsburgh and the county to span the rivers and the engineering of the time- eligible. Criterion A more than C but there are good engineering features (Crit. C). One reviewer opined that “projects like this on put Pittsburgh on the map”.

**02100500200000: Built 1940: Determination: Eligible
(CHANGE: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Eligible- Crit. A Civil Engineering Landmark nomination points to this theme as well: part of a regional bridge building campaign.

**022048005000000: Built 1941-2: Determination: Not Eligible
(No Change: Previously Determined Not Eligible)**

Discussion centered on having all of the major river spans associated with the county bridge program considered eligible-especially all the bridges built before the war. The project changed the landscape of the region. There is also a Civil Engineering Landmark nomination for Pittsburgh bridges. This bridge, however, has significant alterations.