

Maryland Historical Trust

Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties number: WA-I-730

Name: 21013/US 40 OVER FORANCH OF ANTIETAM CREEK

The bridge referenced herein was inventoried by the Maryland State Highway Administration as part of the Historic Bridge Inventory, and SHA provided the Trust with eligibility determinations in February 2001. The Trust accepted the Historic Bridge Inventory on April 3, 2001. The bridge received the following determination of eligibility.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST	
Eligibility Recommended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligibility Not Recommended <input type="checkbox"/>
Criteria: <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D	Considerations: <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> G <input type="checkbox"/> None
Comments: _____ _____ _____	
Reviewer, OPS: <u>Anne E. Bruder</u>	Date: <u>3 April 2001</u>
Reviewer, NR Program: <u>Peter E. Kurtze</u>	Date: <u>3 April 2001</u>

ms

MARYLAND INVENTORY OF HISTORIC BRIDGES
HISTORIC BRIDGE INVENTORY
MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION/
MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST

MHT No. WA-I-730

SHA Bridge No. 21013 Bridge name US 40 over Branch of Antietam Creek

LOCATION:

Street/Road name and number [facility carried] US 40

City/town Hagerstown Vicinity _____

County Washington

This bridge projects over: Road _____ Railway _____ Water X Land _____

Ownership: State X County _____ Municipal _____ Other _____

HISTORIC STATUS:

Is bridge located within a designated historic district? Yes _____ No X

National Register-listed district _____ National Register-determined-eligible district _____

Locally-designated district _____ Other _____

Name of district _____

BRIDGE TYPE:

Timber Bridge _____:

Beam Bridge _____ Truss -Covered _____ Trestle _____ Timber-And-Concrete _____

Stone Arch Bridge _____

Metal Truss Bridge _____

Movable Bridge _____:

Swing _____ Bascule Single Leaf _____ Bascule Multiple Leaf _____

Vertical Lift _____ Retractable _____ Pontoon _____

Metal Girder _____:

Rolled Girder _____ Rolled Girder Concrete Encased _____

Plate Girder _____ Plate Girder Concrete Encased _____

Metal Suspension _____

Metal Arch _____

Metal Cantilever _____

Concrete X _____:

Concrete Arch _____ Concrete Slab _____ Concrete Beam _____ Rigid Frame X _____

Other _____ Type Name _____

DESCRIPTION:**Describe Setting:**

Bridge 21013 carries US 40 over a branch of Antietam Creek in a north/south direction. The creek flows east/west. The bridge is located in Hagerstown, Maryland. The area is heavily developed with many hotels, motels, and restaurants along the road. The bridge is located outside the main business area of Hagerstown.

Describe Superstructure and Substructure:

Bridge 21013 is a reinforced concrete rigid frame bridge with a span length of 30'-0". Its width is 147'-4" out-to-out of parapets. A grassy median divides its four lanes of traffic. The reinforced concrete slab of the superstructure is integral with the reinforced concrete abutments. The parapets are faced with a deftly laid stone veneer. The abutments and wingwalls are also handsomely stone faced. Stones outline the elliptical arch of the span, which is recessed behind the slightly battered abutments, further adding to the aesthetic appeal of the structure. Both abutments and wingwalls rest on reinforced concrete spread footing.

Discuss Major Alterations:

No major alterations have been made to this extremely intact bridge.

HISTORY:

WHEN was bridge built (actual date or date range) 1941

This date is: Actual Estimated _____

Source of date: Plaque _____ Design plans _____ County bridge files/inspection form _____

Other (specify) SHA Files

WHY was bridge built? To provide a reliable crossing of US 40 over a branch of Antietam Creek, to meet local and regional transportation needs via the construction of a modern highway. According to plans, bridge did not replace an earlier structure.

WHO was the designer State Roads Commission

WHO was the builder _____

WHY was bridge altered? [check N/A if not applicable]

Was bridge built as part of organized bridge-building campaign? Yes No _____

This bridge was built by the State Roads Commission as part of the Good Roads Movement and construction of a new Route 40..

SURVEYOR/HISTORIAN ANALYSIS:

This bridge may have National Register significance for its association with:

A - Events **B- Person** _____

C- Engineering/architectural character

Was bridge constructed in response to significant events in Maryland or local history? No Yes
If yes, what event?

This bridge was one of a small number of concrete rigid frame bridges erected in Maryland in the 1930s and 1940s. Its monolithic frame reflects advances in reinforced concrete structural engineering in the early twentieth century. These bridges were built throughout the state, primarily by the State Roads Commission and the city of Baltimore, as part of the Good Roads Movement. This bridge, along with bridges 21015 (1936) and 21016 (1936) in Washington County and 13032 (1939) in Howard County, was erected as part of the construction of U.S. 40 by the State Roads Commission in the 1930s, one of Maryland's early major highway projects.

When the bridge was built and/or given a major alteration, did it have a significant impact on the growth & development of the area? No Yes

U.S. 40, an early major highway project in the state, had a significant impact on residential, agricultural, commercial, and industrial growth in Maryland along its path from Aberdeen through Baltimore and west to Frederick.

Is the bridge located in an area which may be eligible for historic designation? No Yes
Would the bridge add to or detract from historic & visual character of the possible district?

Is the bridge a significant example of its type? No Yes

Concrete bridges are the largest component of Maryland's historic bridges. Their numbers reflect how quickly they became popular after their introduction to the state and the country at the opening of the twentieth century. Many in Maryland are purely functional structures, but their plastic nature made them amenable to graceful curves and ornamental parapets that reflected the influence of the City Beautiful movement during the first part of the twentieth century. The versatility and strength of reinforced concrete bridges, along with their plasticity, made them the preferred choice for bridges by state and county highway departments in Maryland and throughout the country in the 1910s. The standard plans of the State Roads Commission of the teens, twenties, and thirties made their use almost universal during that period.

While concrete bridges as a whole are very common in Maryland, reinforced concrete rigid frame bridges make up one of the smallest groups of historic bridge types in the state. There are probably only about a dozen such structures standing in the state under county or state control that were erected prior to 1945. The rigid frame bridge, unlike other reinforced concrete spans, is monolithic. It is characterized by a superstructure and substructure, including abutments, designed as a continuous unit. (Concrete balustrades, cast afterwards, are not part of the monolithic design.) The rigid frame was an important engineering advance for reinforced concrete bridges. It was developed by German engineers and Brazilian Emilio Baumgart around 1920, and introduced to the United States primarily through the efforts of New York engineer Arthur G. Hayden in 1922-1923.

Concrete rigid frame bridges became increasingly popular in the 1930s and 1940s. It was during this period that Maryland's few examples of the type were erected. These include bridges 1030 (1937, 1992) in Allegany County; BC-1406 (1938) and BC-3402 (1940) in Baltimore City; 5013 (1936) in Caroline County (1936); 6031 (1934) in Carroll County; 10058 (1941) in Frederick County; 11018 (1937) in Garrett County; 13032 (1939) in Howard County; 21013 (1941), 21015 (1936), and 21016 (1936) in Washington County; and WO-801 (c.1930) in Worcester County. These bridges generally have one or two spans of between 30 and 60 feet; the longest, BC-1406, measures 68 feet. With the exception of WO-801, the history of which remains clouded, they were built by the state or the city of Baltimore.

The stone facing and arches of this bridge, and of fellow Route 40 Washington County bridges 21015 and 21016, are purely decorative elements that provide an architectural character not found at the state's other concrete rigid frame bridges. They were added to these bridges to emulate the appearance and finish of the original nineteenth-century stone-arch bridges of the National Pike.

This bridge essentially falls within the 1910-1940 period of significance for concrete bridges, during which reinforced concrete bridge construction was increasingly standardized in the state and particular subtypes, including the rigid frame, were introduced to the state road network.

Does bridge retain integrity [in terms of National Register] of important elements described in Context Addendum? No _____ Yes X _____

Is bridge a significant example of work of manufacturer, designer and/or engineer? No ___ Yes X _____

The combination of a rigid frame, handsome stonework and articulation, and two similar bridges located on the same route show the sensitivity of state engineers and designers to engineering advances, major parkway design, and aesthetics.

Should bridge be given further study before significance analysis is made? No X Yes _____

It is believed that no further research is necessary to determine the eligibility of this bridge for listing in the National Register. It should be compared with the other concrete rigid frame bridges listed above and a determination should be made whether all of them (excluding 1030 in Allegany County, 13032 in Howard County, and WO-081 in Worcester County, which have lost their integrity) are eligible to the Register because of their rarity and/or good representation of the type, or just the best examples. Additional research, however, which could be conducted as part of any future National Register nomination prepared for the bridge, might provide further information about its history and environs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Bridge inspection reports and files of the Maryland State Highway Administration.

Condit, Carl. *American Building*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

County survey files of the Maryland Historical Trust.

P.A.C. Spero & Company and Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. *Historic Bridges in Maryland: Historic Context Report*. Prepared for the Maryland State Highway Administration, September, 1994.


SURVEYOR/SURVEY INFORMATION:

Date bridge recorded 2/23/95

Name of surveyor David King/Marvin Brown

Organization/Address GREINER, INC., 2219 York Road, Suite 200, Timonium, Maryland 21093-3111


Phone number 410-561-0100 FAX number 410-561-1150



Washington County - Bridge Number 21013
 US 40 over Branch of Antietam Creek, 1941

WA-I-730

Scale 0 1000 2000 feet
 0 0.5 kilometer



RDSON'S
Food
of Dupont
AURANT



WA-I-930

201 - 21093401

19. 2010-10-21

19. 2010-10-21

19. 2010-10-21

19. 2010-10-21

S. H. A

19. 2010-10-21

S. H. A



A-I-730

201340 21000

201340 21000

WASHINGTON


12345

1234

S.F.

SOUTHFIELD

20134



W A-I-730

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555

215+340 = 555



A-1-120 SP# 401340 7.1.13

BE OF AN "E" TYPE

1.2.1.0.0.0.0

1.2.1.0.0.0.0

2.23/95

2.23/95

Highly

4.2=4