HistoricBridges.org - National Bridge Inventory Data Sheet

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							44-58-50 =	093-14-34 = -
Minnesota [27] Hennepin County [053]			Minneapolis [43000] 0.3 MI N OF WASH AVE				44-36-30 = 44.980556	93.242778
2796 Highway agency district 5			Owner City or Municipa	ner City or Municipal Highway Agency [04] Maintenance responsibility			City or Municipal I	lighway Agency [04]
Route 328 CEDAR (10TH)			Toll On fre	Toll On free road [3] Features intersected MISS R; BN			ISF & STS	
Design - Concrete [1] main Arch - Deck		approach	etressed concrete [5] er [00]	Year built 1929		constructed #Nu	m!	
				Skew angle 0 Historical significant		is on the NRHP. [
Total length 656.2 m =	= 2153.0 ft Ler	ngth of maximum s	pan 88.5 m = 290.4 ft	Deck width, out-to-	out 20.8 m = 68	.2 ft Bridge road	dway width, curb-to-o	turb 16.9 m = 55.4 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 16.9 m = 55.4 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0 m = 0.0 ft Curb or sidewalk width - right 2.4 m = 7.9 ft						2.4 m = 7.9 ft		
Deck structure type	C	oncrete Cast-in-Pl	ace [1]					
Type of wearing surface Low slump Concr		ow slump Concrete	ete [4]					
Deck protection Not applicable (ap		ot applicable (appl	oplies only to structures with no deck) [N]					
Type of membrane/wea	aring surface							
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length	Method to determ	nine inventory rating	g Load Factor(LF) [1]	li li	nventory rating	20 metric ton = 2	22.0 tons	
0.2 km = 0.1 mi	Method to determ	nine operating ratin	g Load Factor(LF) [1]	(perating rating	33.7 metric ton	= 37.1 tons	
	Bridge posting	00.1 - 09.9 % be	low [4]]	esign Load MS	S 18 / HS 20 [5]		

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 24452 Average daily tr	uck traffi % Year 2007 Fu	ture average daily traffic	24452 Year 2029				
Road classification Minor Arterial (Urban) [16]	Lanes on structure 4		Approach roadway widt	h 23.2 m = 76.1 ft			
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5]	Direction of traffic 2 - way tr	raffic [2]	Bridge median				
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]		,				
Type of service under bridge Highway-waterway-rai	road [Lanes under structure 6	Navigation control	Navigation control on water	way (bridge permit required). [1]			
Navigation vertical clearanc 27.4 m = 89.9 ft	Navigation horizon	tal clearance 80.8 m = 265	5.1 ft				
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 30.48 m = 100.0 ft							
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature Highway beneath structure [H]							
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 1.3 m = 4.3 ft Minimum lateral underclearance on left 0 = N/A							
Minimum Vertical Underclearance 4.82 m = 15.8 ft	Minimum vertical und	derclearance reference feat	ture Highway beneath struc	ture [H]			
Appraisal ratings - underclearances Meets minimum	tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]						
Danain and Danie assessed Diago							
Repair and Replacement Plans	Made dans her						
Type of work to be performed	Work done by						
	Bridge improvement cost	Roadway imp	rovement cost				
	Length of structure improvement	To	otal project cost				
	Year of improvement cost estimate						
	Border bridge - state	Bor	der bridge - percent respons	ibility of other state			
	Border bridge - structure number						

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status Posted for lo	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat bet is [5]	tter than minimum adequacy to tolerate bo	eing left in place as				
Condition ratings - superstructur	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Better than pre					
Condition ratings - substructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings -		eing left in place as				
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]	deck geometry	is [5]					
Scour	Bridge is scour critical; field	Bridge is scour critical; field review indicates that extensive scour has occurred at bridge foundations. [2]						
Channel and channel protection		Bank is beginning to slump. River control devices and embankment protection have widespread minor damage. There is minor stream bed movement evident. Debris is restricting the channel slightly. [6]						
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Superior to present desirab	r to present desirable criteria [9]		atus evaluation				
Pier or abutment protection	Navigation protection not re	tion protection not required [1]		fficiency rating 52.1				
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings		re meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - transition		ure meets currently acceptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	ature meets currently acce							
Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends Inpected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]								
Inspection date September 2011 [0911] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months								
Underwater inspection Unknown [Y60]		Underwater inspe		September 2011 [0911]				
·	Unknown [N00]	Fracture critical in	•					
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date					