

The National Bridge Inventory contains data submitted by state transportation 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

Ohio [39]	Summit County [153]	Sagamore Hills [69428]	3.43 MI W OF SR 8	41-19-16.65 = 41.321292	081-35-13.90 = -81.587194
7706871	Highway agency district: 4	Owner State Highway Agency [01]	Maintenance responsibility	State Highway Agency [01]	
Route 82	SR 82	Toll On free road [3]	Features intersected	CUY RIV-B&O RR-BIKE PATH	
Design - main	Concrete [1]	Design - approach	Prestressed concrete [5]	Kilometerpoint	0 km = 0.0 mi
5	Arch - Deck [11]	2	Box beam or girders - Multiple [05]	Year built	1931
				Year reconstructed	1989
				Skew angle	0
				Structure Flared	
				Historical significance	Historical significance is not determinable at this time. [4]
Total length	345.3 m = 1132.9 ft	Length of maximum span	55.2 m = 181.1 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	13.3 m = 43.6 ft
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance	12.2 m = 40.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - left	0 m = 0.0 ft	Curb or sidewalk width - right	0 m = 0.0 ft
Deck structure type	Concrete Cast-in-Place [1]				
Type of wearing surface	Integral Concrete (separate non-modified layer of concrete added to structural deck) [2]				
Deck protection					
Type of membrane/wearing surface					

Weight Limits

Bypass, detour length	Method to determine inventory rating	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]	Inventory rating	32.4 metric ton = 35.6 tons
0.6 km = 0.4 mi	Method to determine operating rating	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]	Operating rating	40.5 metric ton = 44.6 tons
Bridge posting	Equal to or above legal loads [5]	Design Load	MS 18+Mod / HS 20+Mod [6]	

Functional Details

Average Daily Traffic	13610	Average daily truck traffi	3	%	Year	2010	Future average daily traffic	18891	Year	2033
Road classification	Minor Arterial (Urban) [16]		Lanes on structure	2		Approach roadway width	12.2 m = 40.0 ft			
Type of service on bridge	Highway [1]		Direction of traffic	2 - way traffic [2]		Bridge median				
Parallel structure designation	No parallel structure exists. [N]									
Type of service under bridge	Railroad-waterway [7]		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						Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway	99.99 m = 328.1 ft			
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature	Railroad beneath structure [R]									
Minimum lateral underclearance on right	99.9 = Unlimited					Minimum lateral underclearance on left	99.9 = Unlimited			
Minimum Vertical Underclearance	0 = N/A		Minimum vertical underclearance reference feature	Railroad beneath structure [R]						
Appraisal ratings - underclearances	N/A [N]									

Repair and Replacement Plans

Type of work to be performed	Work done by	Work to be done by contract [1]								
Replacement of bridge or other structure because of substandard load carrying capacity or substantial bridge roadway geometry. [31]	Bridge improvement cost	\$4,782,000	Roadway improvement cost	\$405,000						
	Length of structure improvement	357.8 m = 1173.9 ft		Total project cost	\$5,187,000					
	Year of improvement cost estimate	2006								
	Border bridge - state				Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state					
	Border bridge - structure number									

Inspection and Sufficiency

Structure status	Open, no restriction [A]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Better than present minimum criteria [7]
Condition ratings - superstructure	Very Good [8]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Better than present minimum criteria [7]
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]
Condition ratings - deck	Fair [5]		

Scour

Countermeasures have been installed to mitigate an existing problem with scour. [7]

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 adequacy	Better than present minimum criteria [7]	Status evaluation	
------------------------------------	--	-------------------	--

Pier or abutment protection		Sufficiency rating	94.1
-----------------------------	--	--------------------	------

Culverts

Not applicable. Used if structure is not a culvert. [N]

Traffic safety features - railings	Inspected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]
------------------------------------	---

Traffic safety features - transitions	Inspected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]
---------------------------------------	---

Traffic safety features - approach guardrail	Inspected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]
--	---

Traffic safety features - approach guardrail ends	Inspected feature meets currently acceptable standards. [1]
---	---

Inspection date	June 2013 [0613]	Designated inspection frequency	12	Months
-----------------	------------------	---------------------------------	----	--------

Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspection date	
-----------------------	----------------	----------------------------	--

Fracture critical inspection	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical inspection date	
------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------------	--

Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspection date	
--------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------	--