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 Info	rmation							28-03-42.87 =	082-46-46.71
Florida [12]	<u>.</u>]	Pinellas County [10	03]	Palm Harbor [54350]	0.5MI. WEST OF ORA	NGE ST.		28.061908	= -82.779642
154100		Highway age	ncy district: 7	Owner County Highwa	ay Agency [02]	Maintenance r	esponsibility	County Highway A	gency [02]
Route 0		SHO	ORE DRIVE	Toll On f	ree road [3] Fe	eatures intersect	ed SHORE DE	RIVE CANAL	
main	Concrete [1] Arch - Deck		Design - approach	her [00]	Year built 1923	1	onstructed N/A	[0000]	
		. ,		. ,	Skew angle 0 Historical significance	Structure Fla		e for the NRHP. [3]	
Total length	h 15.2 m =	= 49.9 ft L	ength of maximum	span 15.2 m = 49.9 ft	Deck width, out-to-ou	7.2 m = 23.6 f	Bridge roa	dway width, curb-to-c	6.1 m = 20.0 ft
Inventory R	Route, Total	Horizontal Clearan	ce $6.4 \text{ m} = 21.0 \text{ f}$	Curb or sidewalk	width - left $0 \text{ m} = 0.0 \text{ ft}$		Curb or sid	ewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck struct	ture type		Not applicable [N]						
Type of we	aring surfac	ce	Other [9]						
Deck prote	ection		Not applicable (ap	oplies only to structures with n	o deck) [N]				
Type of me	embrane/we	aring surface	Not applicable (ap	oplies only to structures with n	o deck) [N]				
Weight Lin	nits								
7.	etour length	Method to deter	rmine inventory rat	ing Load and Resistan	ce Factor(LRFR) [3] Inve	entory rating	27.5 metric ton	= 30.3 tons	
0.3 km = 0).2 mi	Method to deter	mine operating rat	Load and Resistan	ce Factor(LRFR) [3] Ope	erating rating	45.8 metric ton	= 50.4 tons	
		Bridge posting	Equal to or above	/e legal loads [5]	Des	sign Load			

Functional Details									
Average Daily Traffic 1100 Average daily to	ruck traffi 2 % Year 2015 Future average daily traffic 1909 Year 2037								
Road classification Local (Urban) [19]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 5.6 m = 18.4 ft								
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	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 br	idge 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 Sufficiency									
Structure status Open, no res	striction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Equal to present minimum criteria [6]						
Condition ratings - superstructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Better than present minimum criteria [7]						
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]		Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]						
Condition ratings - deck	Not Applicable [N]								
Scour	Bridge with "unknown" found	Bridge with "unknown" foundation that has not been evaluated for scour. [U]							
Channel and channel protection		Bank protection is in need of minor repairs. River control devices and embankment protection have a little minor damage. Banks and/or channel have minor amounts of drift. [7]							
Appraisal ratings - water adequac	Better than present minimum	Better than present minimum criteria [7]			Functionally obsolete [2]				
Pier or abutment protection					74.3				
	if structure is not a culvert. [N]								
Traffic safety features - railings Traffic safety features - transition									
Traffic safety features - approach									
Traffic safety features - approach									
Inspection date September 2	2017 [0917] Designated inspe	M	lonths						
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ction date						
Fracture critical inspection	Not needed [N]	eeded [N] Fracture critical in							
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	ed [N] Other special inspection date							