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											
Illinois [17	7]	Kane Cou	Cane County [089]			Aurora [03012]		STOLP ISLAND			41-45-30 = 41	.7 088-18-55 = -88.3
0000450	05610319	High	Highway agency district 1			Owner City or Municipal Highway Agency [04] Maintenance responsibility			City or Municipal	Highway Agency [04]		
Route 1	521		GALEN	NA BLVD		Toll On free road [3] Features intersected FOX RIVER,			R, W CHANNEL			
Design - Concrete [1] main 2 Arch - Deck [11]			Design - approach	Other [00]		Kilometerpoint 1074.8 km = 666.4 mi Year built 1926 Year reconstructed 1996 Skew angle 6 Structure Flared Historical significance Bridge is possibly eligible for the NRHP. [3]						
Total length $51.8 \text{ m} = 170.0 \text{ ft}$ Length of maximum span $24.4 \text{ m} = 80.1 \text{ ft}$ Inventory Route, Total Horizontal Clearance $17 \text{ m} = 55.8 \text{ ft}$ Curb or sidewalk v						Deck wid		18.6 m = 61.	0 ft Bridge road		12.6 m = 41.3 ft 1.8 m = 5.9 ft	
Deck structure type Not applicable [N] Manalithia Congreta (a					rently placed with str	nctural dock	. [1]					
Type of wearing surface Deck protection Monolithic Concret			crete (concui	Territy placed with sit	uctural ucck,							
Type of membrane/wearing surface												
Weight Li	imits											
Bypass, (detour lengtl 0.1 mi	Wictioc		etermine inventory rating etermine operating rating		Allowable Stress(AS) [2] Allowable Stress(AS) [2]			entory rating erating rating	24.3 metric ton 33.3 metric ton		
Bridge posting			posting E	Equal to or above legal loads [5]				Des	Design Load M 13.5 / H 15 [2]			

Functional Details								
Average Daily Traffic 12300 Average daily tr	uck traffi 8 % Year 2006 Future averag	e daily traffic 21195 Year 2021						
Road classification Minor Arterial (Urban) [16]	Lanes on structure 3	Approach roadway width 13.2 m = 43.3 ft						
Type of service on bridge Highway [1]	Direction of traffic 1 - way traffic [1]	Bridge median						
Parallel structure designation No parallel structure	e exists. [N]							
Type of service under bridge Waterway [5]	Lanes under structure 0 Naviga	tion control						
Navigation vertical clearanc 0 = N/A	Navigation horizontal clearance	e 0 = N/A						
Minimum navigation vertical clearance, vertical lift bridge Minimum vertical clearance over bridge roadway 99.99 m = 320								
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]								
Danais and Danlessmant Dlans								
Repair and Replacement Plans	w							
Type of work to be performed	Work done by							
	Bridge improvement cost 0	Roadway improvement cost 0						
	Length of structure improvement $0 \text{ m} = 0.0 \text{ ft}$	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 - superstructur	Good [7]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]						
Condition ratings - substructure	Very Good [8]	Appraisal ratings -	Meets minimum tolerable limits to be left in place as is [4]						
Condition ratings - deck	Very Good [8]	deck geometry							
Scour		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 pres	ent desirable criteria [9]	Status evaluation						
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 74.7						
Culverts Not applicable. Used	if structure is not a culve	ert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - railings									
Traffic safety features - transition	าร	Inpected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail	Inpected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Traffic safety features - approach	n guardrail ends	Inpected feature meets currently acce	eptable standards. [1]						
Inspection date May 2008 [0	508] Des	ignated inspection frequency 24	Months						
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspe	ection date						
Fracture critical inspection	Not needed [N]	Fracture critical inspection date							
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	eded [N] Other special inspection date							