## 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 Informa	nation							29-25-32.69 =	098-29-19.53
Texas [48]	Вє	xar County [0	29]	San Antonio [65000]	0.02 MI N OF CROCK	ETT ST		29.425747	= -98.488758
150150B2799	95001	Highway a	gency district: 15	Owner City or Municipa	l Highway Agency [04]	Maintenance	responsibility	City or Municipal H	ighway Agency [04]
Route 0		N	I PRESA ST	Toll On fre	ee road [3] Fe	atures intersect	ted SAN ANTO	NIO RIVER	
main	eel [3]	01	Design - approach		Year built 1925	km = 6.0 mi Year rec	onstructed N/A	[0000]	
1 Irus	uss - Thru [1	0]	[1 Gird	er and floorbeam system [03]	Skew angle 29	Structure Fla	ared		
					Historical significance	Bridge is	eligible for the N	NRHP. [2]	
Total length	54.3 m = 17	'8.2 ft	Length of maximum s	pan 29.3 m = 96.1 ft	Deck width, out-to-out	t 17.3 m = 56.8	B ft Bridge road	dway width, curb-to-cu	7.3 m = 24.0 ft
Inventory Rout	ute, Total Ho	rizontal Clear	ance $7.3 \text{ m} = 24.0 \text{ ft}$	Curb or sidewalk wi	idth - left 1.7 m = 5.6	ft	Curb or side	ewalk width - right	1.7 m = 5.6 ft
Deck structure	e type		Concrete Cast-in-Pl	ace [1]					
Type of wearing	ing surface		Bituminous [6]						
Deck protectio	on		Unknown [8]						
Type of memb	brane/wearir	ng surface	Unknown [8]						
Weight Limits	te								
Bypass, detour length Method to determine inventory		etermine inventory ratin	Allowable Stress(AS) [2]		Inventory rating 22.7 metric ton = 25.0 tons				
0.2  km = 0.1  r	mı	Method to de	etermine operating ratir	g Allowable Stress(AS)	) [2] Ope	rating rating	32.7 metric ton	= 36.0 tons	
		Bridge postir	Equal to or above	legal loads [5]	Desi	ign Load			

Functional Details										
Average Daily Traffic 2380 Average daily to	uck traffi 0 % Year 2013 Future average daily traf	ffic 4450 Year 2033								
Road classification Local (Urban) [19]	Lanes on structure 2	Approach roadway width 7.3 m = 24.0 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 clearance 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 Feature not a highway or railroad [N]										
Minimum lateral underclearance on right 99.9 = Unlimited 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 9000 Roadwa	y improvement cost 2000								
roplacementer [ee]	Length of structure improvement 54.3 m = 178.2 ft	Total project cost 11000								
	Year of improvement cost estimate									
	Border bridge - state	Border bridge - percent responsibility of other state								
	Border bridge - structure number									

Inspection and Sufficiency								
Structure status Posted for lo	ad [P]	Appraisal ratings - structural	Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]					
Condition ratings - superstructure	Fair [5]	Appraisal ratings - roadway alignment	Equal to present desirable criteria [8]					
Condition ratings - substructure	Satisfactory [6]	Appraisal ratings -	Basically intolerable requiring high priority of replacement [2]					
Condition ratings - deck	Satisfactory [6]	deck geometry						
Scour	Countermeasures have been	Countermeasures have been installed to mitigate an existing problem with scour. [7]						
Channel and channel protection	Banks are protected or well v required or are in a stable con	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	e criteria [9]	Status evaluation Functionally obsolete [2]					
Pier or abutment protection			Sufficiency rating 51.8					
Culverts Not applicable. Used  Traffic safety features - railings	if structure is not a culvert. [N]							
Traffic safety features - transition								
Traffic safety features - approach								
Traffic safety features - approach								
Inspection date August 2017 [0817] Designated inspection frequency 24 Months								
Underwater inspection	Not needed [N]	Underwater inspec	ection date					
Fracture critical inspection	Every two years [Y24]	Fracture critical ins	nspection date December 2017 [1217]					
Other special inspection	Not needed [N]	Other special inspe	pection date					