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							27-59-14.11 =	082-47-21.68
Florida [12] Pinellas County [103]			Clearwater [12875] 0.2MI S OF SUNSET PT. RD			27.987253	= -82.789356	
155509 Highway agency district: 7		Owner City or Municipa	Owner City or Municipal Highway Agency [04] Maintenan		responsibility	City or Municipal Highway Agency [04]		
Route 0 OVERBROOK AVENUE			Toll On fr	ee road [3]	eatures intersec	ted STEVENSO	ON CREEK	
Design - Concrete [1] main Culvert [19]		Design - approach 0 Othe	r [00]	Kilometerpoint 0 km Year built 1926 Skew angle 49	m = 0.0 mi Year rec Structure FI	onstructed N/A	[0000]	
Tatallanath (2m)	20.2.4		20.2 #	Historical significance			e for the NRHP. [3]	h 0 0 0 ft
Total length 6.2 m = 2		ength of maximum space 10.7 m = 35.1 ft	Curb or sidewalk ν	Deck width, out-to-ou			dway width, curb-to-cu	
Inventory Route, Total Deck structure type	HOHZOHIAI CIEAFAH	Not applicable [N]) IL	Cuip of Sig	ewalk width - right	1.7 m = 5.6 ft
Type of wearing surface Not applicable (appli		es only to structures with no	deck) [N]					
Deck protection Not applicable (appl		es only to structures with no	deck) [N]					
Type of membrane/we	aring surface	Not applicable (appli	es only to structures with no	deck) [N]				
Weight Limits								
Bypass, detour length 0.2 km = 0.1 mi Method to determine inventory rating Method to determine operating rating		Load Factor(LF) [1] Inve		entory rating	24.5 metric ton	1.5 metric ton = 27.0 tons		
		Load Factor(LF) [1]		erating rating	40.9 metric ton	= 45.0 tons		
	Bridge posting	Equal to or above	egal loads [5]	Des	sign Load M 1	3.5 / H 15 [2]		

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 500 Average daily to	ruck traffi 5 % Year 2015 Future average daily traffic 868 Year 2037							
Road classification Local (Urban) [19]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 7.3 m = 24.0 ft							
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2] Bridge median							
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure								
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 0 m = 0.0 ft Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft								
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature F	eature not a highway or railroad [N]							
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 0 = N/A	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	Work done by							
	Bridge improvement cost 0 Roadway improvement cost 0							
	Length of structure improvement 0 m = 0.0 ft Total project cost 0							
	Year of improvement cost estimate							
	Border bridge - state Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state							
	Border bridge - structure number							

Inspection and Suf	fficiency							
Structure status	Posted for ot	her load-capacity restriction [R]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]				
Condition ratings -	dition ratings - superstructure Not Applicable [N]		Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Better than present minimum criteria [7]				
Condition ratings - :	Condition ratings - substructure Not Applicable [N]		Appraisal ratings -	N/A [N]				
Condition ratings -	Not Applicable [N]		deck geometry					
Scour		Bridge with "unknown" foun	dation that has not been ev	valuated for scou	ur. [U]			
Channel and chann	nel protection	There are no noticeable or	noteworthy deficiencies whi	ich affect the co	ndition of the chanı	nel. [9]		
Appraisal ratings - water adequacy		Better than present minimu	Better than present minimum criteria [7]					
Pier or abutment protection				S	sufficiency rating	89.7		
	couring at curta	disintegration, minor chloride conta ain walls, wingwalls or pipes. Meta						
Traffic safety featu	ıres - railings							
Traffic safety featu	ıres - transition	IS						
Traffic safety featu	ıres - approach	n guardrail						
Traffic safety featu	ıres - approach	n guardrail ends						
Inspection date	January 199	9 [199] Designated ins	pection frequency 24	Mor	nths			
Underwater inspection Every		Every two years [Y24]	Underwater inspe	ction date	December 2018	[1218]		
Fracture critical inspection Not no		Not needed [N]	Fracture critical in	spection date				
Other special inspection Not ne		Not needed [N]	Other special insp	ection date				