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	ormation									37-40-51 =	122-05-38 = -
California [06]		Alameda County [001]		Unknow	Unknown [00000]		NE OF MISSION BLVD			37.680833	122.093889
33C0205 Highwa		Highway age	ency district 4	Owner	Owner County Highway Agency [02]		!]	Maintenance responsibility		County Highway Agency [02]	
Route #Num! GROVE WAY				Toll On fre	ee road [3]	F	eatures interse	cted SAN LORE	NZO CREEK		
Design - main	Concrete [1 Stringer/Mu] Iti-beam or girder [(Design - approach D2] 0	Other [00]		Kilometerp Year built Skew angle Historical s	1915 e 0	Structure F		[0000] NRHP. [2]	
Total length 19.2 m = 63.0 ft Length of maximum span 18.3 m = 60.0 ft Deck width, out-to-out 13 m = 42.7 ft Bridge roadway width, curb-to-curb 7.6 m = 24.9 ft											
Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance 7.6 m = 24.9 ft Deck structure type Concrete Cast-in-Place				arb or sidewark w	idili - icit	1.5 111 – 4.) I(Curb or side	waik widin - right	1.5 111 – 4.5 11	
Type of wearing surface Bituminous [6]											
Deck prote	ection										
Type of m	embrane/we	earing surface									
Weight Li	mits										
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory rating			ating Loa	Load Factor(LF) [1]		Inv	entory rating	78.4 metric ton	= 86.2 tons		
0.3 km = 0.2 mi Method to determine operating rating Bridge posting Equal to or above le			rating Loa	Load Factor(LF) [1]		Ор	erating rating	99.8 metric ton = 109.8 tons			
			ove legal loads	gal loads [5]		De	Design Load				

Functional Details							
Average Daily Traffic 7500 Average daily tr	uck traffi 2 % Year 1978 Future average daily traffic 8643 Year 2029						
Road classification Major Collector (Rural) [07]	Lanes on structure 2 Approach roadway width 11.6 m = 38.1 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway-pedestrian [5]	Direction of traffic 2 - way traffic [2] Bridge median						
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]						
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 bri	Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 328.1 ft						
Minimum lateral underclearance reference feature	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 Work to be done by contract [1]						
Other structural work, including hydraulic replacements. [38]	Bridge improvement cost 249000 Roadway improvement cost 49000						
ropidosmento. [00]	Length of structure improvement 19.2 m = 63.0 ft Total project cost 418000						
	Year of improvement cost estimate 2010						
	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	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]						
Condition ratings - superstructur	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of corrrective action [3]						
Condition ratings - substructure	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - deck geometry	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]						
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]								
Scour	Bridge foundations determine	Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. [8]							
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 adequac	Superior to present desirable	criteria [9]	Status evaluation	Functionally obsolete [2]					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating	61.2					
·	if structure is not a culvert. [N]								
Traffic safety features - railings									
Traffic safety features - transitions									
Traffic safety features - approach Traffic safety features - approach									
Inspection date November 2	<u> </u>	ection frequency 24	Months						
	Not needed [N]	pection frequency 24 Months Underwater inspection date							
·	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical in							
·									
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	eded [N] Other special inspection date							