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 34-19-20.34 = 083-52-47.83																		
Georgia [13] Hall County			County [1	<i>i</i> [139]			Gainesvi	lle [31908]	IN NW GAINESVILLE						34-19-20		083-52-47.83 = -83.879953	
13900200		Highway agency district 1				Owner State Highway Agency [01]			N	Maintenance responsibility State Highway Agency [01]				ncy [01]				
Route 53 SR 53 (WBL				(WBL)	WBL) Toll On free road [3]				Features intersected CHATT RIV (LAKE LANIER)									
main					approach		el continuous [4] nger/Multi-beam or girder [02]		Kilometerp Year built	1956		m = 49.0 Yea		nstructe	ed 1992)		
							.,,,,	a o. g do. [o_]	Skew angle Historical s					ble for t	or the NRHP. [5]			
Total length $\boxed{370.6 \text{ m} = 1215.9 \text{ ft}}$ Length of maximum span $\boxed{79.2 \text{ m} = 259.9 \text{ ft}}$ Deck width, out-to-out $\boxed{9.5 \text{ m} = 31.2 \text{ ft}}$ Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb $\boxed{7.8 \text{ m} = 25.6 \text{ ft}}$																		
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 7.8 m = 25.6 ft Curb or sidewalk width - left 0.5 m = 1.6 ft Curb or sidewalk width - right								0.5 m = 1.6 ft										
Deck structure type Closed Grating [4]																		
Type of wearing surface Epoxy Overlay [5]				[5]														
Deck protection Unknown [8]																		
Type of membrane/wearing surface																		
Weight Limits																		
71	Bypass, detour length 0.1 km = 0.1 mi Method to dete			determi	ne inventory	rating	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]				Invento	Inventory rating		32.4 me	metric ton = 35.6 tons			
0.1 km = 0				determi	ne operating	rating	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]				Operat	ting ratin	ng 4	7.7 me	tric ton	= 52.5 tons		
Bridge posting			ting E	Equal to or above legal loads [5]					Design	n Load	MS 1	8 / HS 2	20 [5]					

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 24810 Average daily t	ruck traffi 0 % Year 2011 Future average daily traffic 37215 Year 2031							
Road classification Other Principal Arterial (Urban)	[14] Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 8.3 m = 27.2 ft							
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 1 - way traffic [1] Bridge median Open median [1]							
Parallel structure designation The left structure of parallel bridges. This structure carries traffic in the opposite direction. [L]								
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5] Lanes under structure 0 Navigation control								
Navigation vertical clearance 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 Feature 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 4751000 Roadway improvement cost 475000							
	Length of structure improvement 0 m = 0.0 ft Total project cost 7127000							
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2013							
	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	Better than present minimum criteria [7]							
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]							
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]	deck geometry								
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	ed to be stable for assesse	ed or calculated scour condition. [5]							
Channel and channel protection		Banks are protected or well vegetated. River control devices such as spur dikes and embankment protection are not required or are in a stable condition. [8]								
Appraisal ratings - water adequad	Superior to present desirable	Superior to present desirable criteria [9] Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2]								
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 78.5							
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culvert. [N]									
Traffic safety features - railings	Inpected fea	ture meets currently acce	ptable standards. [1]							
Traffic safety features - transition	Inpected fea	ture meets currently acce	ptable standards. [1]							
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail Inpected fea	ture meets currently accep	ptable standards. [1]							
Traffic safety features - approach	h guardrail ends Inpected fea	ected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]								
Inspection date June 2012 [Designated inspe	ection frequency 24	Months							
Underwater inspection	Unknown [Y60]	Underwater inspec	June 2012 [0612]							
Fracture critical inspection	Every year [Y12]	Fracture critical ins	spection date June 2012 [0612]							
Other special inspection	Unknown [N00]	Other special inspe	ection date							