.

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations of eligibility for individual properties or districts. See instructions in Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, styles, materials, and areas of significance, enter only the categories and subcategories listed in the instructions. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900a). Type all entries.

storic name St. Francis River Bridge wher names/ste number HAER No. AR-20 2. Location 2. Classification 2. District 2. public-fool 2. district 2. district 3. district 3. bisted 2. district 3. district	historic name St. Francis			
sher names/site number HAER No. AR-20 2. Location iteet a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River inter a number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the standards for River R	insight fighte oct frameworker	River Bridge		
Location	ther names/site number HAER	No. AR-20		
Iteret & number U.S. Highway 70, spanning the St. Francis River Inot for publication N/A ity, town Madison IX Vicinity itte Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 Joint St. Category of Property Number of Resources within Property public-local Interface	2. Location .		A1	
ity, town Madison X vicinity tate Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 123 zip code 7235 code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 123 zip code 7235 code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 123 zip code 7235 code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 123 code 123 zip code 7235 code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansas code 123 code 123 code 123 zip code 7235 code 123 zip code 7235 itate Arkansa code 123 code 133 code 133<	street & number U.S. Highwa	ay 70, spanning the St. Fr.	ancis River	not for publication N/A
tate Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 State Arkansas code 05 county St. Francis code 123 zip code 7235 State Arkansas code 0735 Category of Property Number of Resources within Property Dutliching Noncontributing Noncontributing <td< td=""><td>sity, town Madison</td><td></td><td></td><td>X vicinity</td></td<>	sity, town Madison			X vicinity
State Category of Property Number of Resources within Property private building(s) Contributing Noncontributing public-local district	state Arkansas co	ode_05 county St. Fr.	ancis code 123	zip code 72353
Demenship of Property Category of Property Number of Resources within Property private building(s) Contributing Noncontributing public-State site	3. Classification			12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
private building(s) Contributing Noncontributing public-local district	Ownership of Property	Category of Property	Number of Rese	purces within Property
public-local district buildings sites site site sites public-Federal Structure 1 structures objects	private .	building(s)	Contributing	Noncontributing
Image: State site site site Image: State Image: State site site Image: State Image: State Image: State site Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State Image: State As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1965, as amended, I hereby certify that this Image: State Im	public-local	district		buildings
public-Federal Image: Structures in the structures intervention in the structure in the structures intervention in the structures intervention interex interventeries intervention interventerex intervent	X public-State	site		sites
Image: Control object Image: Control objects Image: Control object in the National Historic Disservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Number of contributing resources previously As the designated authority under the National Historic Disservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Image: Control object in the National Register N/A As the designated authority under the National Historic Disservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Image: Control object in the National Historic Disservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Mathematic Discourses for designating Disservation Context of Signature of Historic Discourse and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 38 CFR Part 80. Image: Context and the CFR Part 80. Signature of certifying official Date Date Arkansas Historic Preservation Program. Date Signature of commenting or other official Date State of Federal agency and bureau Image: Context agency and bureau In my opinion, the property is: Image: Context agency and bureau Ister of Federal agency and bureau Image: Context agency and bureau In my opinion, the property is: Image: Context agency and bureau Ister of Federal agency and bureau Image: Context agency and bureau Ister of Federal agency and bureau Image: Context agency ag	public-Federal	🔀 structure	1	structures
Image: State of Federal agency and bureau State o		Object		objects
Name of related multiple property listing: Number of contributing resources previously listed in the Netional Register N/A Istat/Federal Agency Certification As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this importance of determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this importance of determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Preservation Procedural and professional requirements set forth in 38 CFR Part 80. In my opinion, the property importance in the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet. Signature of cartifying official Date State or Federal agency and bureau Date In my opinion, the property is: See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau Date State or Federal agency and bureau			1	Total
Historic Bridges of Arkansas listed in the National Register N/A Istate/Federal Agency Certification As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this Image: A state/Federal Agency Certification Image: Addition of the communication of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Piaces and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets indoes not meet the National Register oriteria. See continuation sheet. Signature of certifying official Date Arkansas Historic Preservation Program Date State or Federal agency and bureau Date In my opinion, the property meets indoes not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau Date State or Federal agency and bureau State or Federal agency and bureau In my opinion, the property is: Date generating or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau State or Federal agency and bureau In my opinion, the property is: Date generation in the National Register. See continuation sheet. G	Name of related multiple property	v listina:	Number of cont	ributing resources previously
i. State/Federal Agency Certification As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Immodel in the request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, i hereby certify that this Immy opinion, the property immets and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 80. In my opinion, the property immets is does not meet the National Register offeria. Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Preservation Program State or Federal agency and bureau In my opinion, the property immets indoes not meet the National Register criteria. Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau In my opinion, the property is: entered in the National Register. Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau In the National Register. entered in the National Register. gest continuation sheet. determined eligible for the National Register. entered in the National Register. gest continuation sheet. determined not eligible for the National Re	Historic Bridges of Ar	kansas	listed in the Nat	Ional Register N/A
As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this Immoniation request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth In 36 CFR Part 80. In my opinion, the property Immeets Ges not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet. Signature of certifying official Date Arkansas Historic Preservation Program Date State or Federal agency and bureau Date In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official Date Date State or Federal agency and bureau Example Example is. National Park Service Certification Example Example hereby, certify that this property is: See continuation sheet. See continuation sheet. Gesermined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet. See continuation sheet. Getermined eligible for the National Register. Ex				
Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Preservation Program Date State or Federal agency and bureau	In my apinion, the preparty X	aces and meets the procedural and p	roreasional requirements	set forth in 38 CFR Part 80.
State or Federal agency and bureau In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau	In my opinion, the property X	meets does not meet the National	rotessional requirements I Register criteria See	set forth in 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet.
In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official	In my opinion, the property X Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro	eservation Program	roressional requirements Register criteria Sea	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date
In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria See continuation sheet. Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau State or F	In my opinion, the property X Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro	eservation Program	roressional requirements I Register criteria Sea	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date
Signature of commenting or other official Date State or Federal agency and bureau	In my opinion, the property X Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure	eservation Program	roressional requirements	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date
State or Federal agency and bureau hereby, certify that this property is: entered in the National Register. See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the National Register. determined not eligible for the National Register. removed from the National Register. other (explain)	In my opinion, the property X Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property	eservation Program au	roressional requirements I Register criteria See I Register criteria See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet.
	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa	roressional requirements I Register criteria Sea I Register criteria Sea	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet. Date
hereby, certify that this property is: entered in the National Register. See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the National Register. determined not eligible for the National Register. removed from the National Register.	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official	i Register criteria. See	Set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet. Date
entered in the National Register. determined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet. determined not eligible for the National Register. removed from the National Register.	In my opinion, the property Signature of cartifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official au	Register criteria.	Set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet. Date
Image: See continuation sheet.	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification	i Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet. Date
determined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet. determined not eligible for the National Register. removed from the National Register. other (explain)	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro- State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure 5. National Park Service Cert , hereby, certify that this property	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification y is:	i Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date continuation sheet. Date
Gottaminion onglish for the relational Register. See continuation sheet, determined not eligible for the National Register. removed from the National Register. other. (evolution)	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro- State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure 5. National Park Service Cer , hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa eu meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification y is: ter.	Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Date
determined not eligible for the National Register.	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pres State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure 5. National Park Service Cer , hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist See continuation sheet.	eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification y is: ter.	i Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Cate continuation sheet. Date
National Register.	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pre State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure 5. National Park Service Cer I, hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the Na Register	Acces and meets the procedural and p meets does not meet the Nationa au meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification y is: ter.	roressional requirements I Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Coate continuation sheet. Date
removed from the National Register.	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro- State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bures 5. National Park Service Cert I, hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the Na Register. See continuation s	Inces and meets the procedural and procedura and procedura and procedura and procedural and proc	roressional requirements I Register criteria. Sea	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Coate Continuation sheet. Date
	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pre State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure 5. National Park Service Cer , hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the Na Register. See continuation s determined not eligible for the National Register.	Indees and meets the procedural and procedura and procedural and procedural and procedura and procedural and p	roressional requirements I Register criteria. Sea	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Cate Continuation sheet. Date
	In my opinion, the property Signature of certifying official Arkansas Historic Pro- State or Federal agency and bure In my opinion, the property Signature of commenting or other State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure State or Federal agency and bure to be a state of the state of the state of the state hereby, certify that this property entered in the National Regist See continuation sheet. determined eligible for the Na Register. See continuation s determined not eligible for the National Register.	access and meets the procedural and p meets does not meet the Nationa eservation Program au meets does not meet the Nationa official au rtification y is: ter. tional heet. a oglster.	Register criteria. See	set forth In 38 CFR Part 80. continuation sheet. Cate continuation sheet. Date

Historic Functions (enter categories from instructions)	Current Functions (enter categories from instructions)
Transportation/Road-Related	Transportation/Road-Related
7. Description	
Architectural Classification (enter categories from instructions)	Materials (enter categories from instructions)
	foundation concrete
Other: Swing through truss	walls <u>stee1</u>
	roof
	other

Describe present and historic physical appearance.

w

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number __7 Page __1___

SUMMARY

The Madison Bridge is a steel, four span bridge of 921 foot length, comprised of three Parker through trusses of 162 feet each, the center-bearing swing span 230 feet long, and two I-beam approaches of 107 feet, one on each end. Spanning the St. Francis River in a southwest to northeast direction, the Parker truss swing span is the third span. When the bridge is turned, two channels one hundred feet wide are opened for river traffic.

ELABORATION

The twelve panel swing span and the eight panel fixed spans have single diagonal bracing with additional horizontal members at mid-panel height, as seen in the plan drawings. The two center panels of each fixed span has two diagonal braces. The members in the four spans are built-up from channels, angles, batten plates, continuous plates, or lacing bars riveted together. All members are rigidly connected to each other with rivets. The bottom chord is made of two channels connected by batten plates, staggered from the top to the bottom of the chord at three foot intervals. The bottom chord of the swing span is cambered so that the ends are one half inch below grade when the span is open. The top chord, made of two channels with a continuous top plate and lacing bars, reaches a maximum height of 32 feet in the swing span and 29 feet in the other three. The vertical and web members are I-sections with the web oriented transverse to the longitudinal direction of the bridge. The web members in the center two panels of the swing span are two channels with lacing on either side.

The floor system and lateral bracing are essentially the same for the two types of span. Ten I-beam stringers run longitudinally, connecting twenty inch deep I-beam girders at each panel point. The original floor deck, laminated timber with asphalt planks, was replaced in 1953 with a concrete slab deck and refloored again in 1983. Lateral bracing is achieved in three ways. Two angles laced together span panel points diagonally between the top chords of the trusses, and double angles laterally brace the floor. Sway bracing is formed at each panel point by three foot deep, double intersection Warren trusses.

The center two panels of the swing span are supported on the center-bearing pivot made of cast steel and phosphor-bronze and hardened tool steel discs. The four balance wheels revolve on a 24 foot diameter reinforced concrete pier. The swing span was turned by two men operating a six foot hickory handle that keyed into a shaft near the center of the floor deck. This first shaft was short and operated a small gear, less than one foot in diameter. This gear engaged a larger gear, of three foot diameter. A shaft from the second gear transmitted the torque down to another small gear on a gear track on the top of the pier. This track travels quarterway around the pier and allowed the bridge to swing 90 degrees clockwise. The combination of the two small gears and one large decreased the number of turns the operator had to make to open and close the bridge.

Before the bridge was turned, the operator released four wedges at the ends, two wedges at the center, and latches at the ends of the span with a captain's wheel near the hickory handle. The sedges direct the bridge back into place when it is closed. Manganese-bronze was applied to the sliding faces of the wedges to reduce friction between the moving parts involved. The latches held the swing span closed.

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number <u>8</u> Page <u>1</u>

SUMMARY

The bridge over the St. Francis River on U.S. 70, constructed by the Wisconsin Bridge and Iron Company, was part of a 1930's highway and development project. Built during the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department Era: 1923-1939, the route development involved a new bridge location, which caused some public disapproval, though the design itself was not subjected to public objections. Comparable with the Black River Bridge at Pocahontas (HAER NO. AR-8) the St. Francis River Bridge differs in its historical context and in its structural details. It is, with the bridge at Pocahontas, one of three swinging road bridges in the state. As such, it is nominated under Criteria A and C with statewide significance.

ELABORATION

MEMPHIS TO LITTLE ROCK

"The first mail route established between Little Rock and Memphis commenced operation in 1824 over practically the exact route of the present (1936) U.S. Highway 70," This route known as the "Trail of Tears" is the route used in moving the Cherokee Indians from their lands east of the Mississippi to those in the west".

U.S. Highway No. 70, part of which formed the historic link between Memphis, Tennessee and Little Rock, Arkansas, was developed in the early decades of this century as one of the most important routes in the State of Arkansas.² Its informal title, "The Broadway of America" registered its national importance. Highway 70, between these two cities, formed a part of the route from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, and its historic development characterized it as one of the most interesting overland routes in the State.

The earliest development of the route between Little Rock and Memphis took place in 1821 when, by an act of Congress passed in that year, "a road from Memphis to Fort Smith via Little Rock was authorized"³ Its development was further stimulated by its establishment as a mail route in 1824. The road, later referred to as the Bankhead Highway, was already among the most important in the state.

It was the railroad, however, which first contributed to the real improvement of the route between Little Rock, and Memphis, an improvement further stimulated by the increasing importance of Little Rock. The Memphis and Little Rock Railroad Company, incorporated on January 10, 1853, and later absorbed into the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Company, was the first to develop the overland route between the cities. It has been noted that:

"On February 20, 1862, that company advertised that trains were operating between DeValls Bluff and Little Rock and it was already operating between the West Bank of the Mississippi River and Madison, Arkansas."⁴

Its development faced the same two problems that characterized the development of Highway 70, the river crossings at Madison, over the St. Francis River, and DeValls Bluff, over the White River.

The passage between DeValls Bluff and Madison, interrupted by the rivers, was by steamer and coach. At this period the Memphis and Little Rock Railroad Company could advertise as an attraction "Only twelve hours staging between Little Rock and Memphis."⁵ The costly and complex river crossings at DeValls Bluff and

NPS Form 10-900-a. (8-86)

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _8 Page _2

Madison, and the railroute between these towns, was completed by 1871. By 1936 the travel time between Little Rock and Memphis was reduced to two hours and forty-five minutes.⁶

The road route between Memphis and Little Rock, designated in the 1920's as State Highway 70 under the State Highway System, faced similar obstructions from the White River and the St. Francis River. The development of a modern vehicular route between Memphis and Little Rock involved, as an essential prerequisite, the bridging of these rivers. Highway 70, following a similar route to that established by the Memphis and Little Rock Railroad Company, crossed the White River and the St. Francis River at locations near the railroad crossings, at DeValls Bluff and at Madison.

THE NEW SITE

The redevelopment of Highway 70 between Forrest City, St. Francis County, and West Memphis was a project undertaken by the Arkansas State Highway Department from the late 1920's.⁷ An essential part of this project was the bridging of the St. Francis River near Madison. In July of 1929, L.N. Edwards, Senior Highway Bridge Engineer submitted a report on the proposed new site for the bridge over the river.⁸ The new site was required due to the improved routing of No. 70, and its projected location was "about one and three quarter miles upstream from the old bridge."⁹

The new bridge was to cross the St. Francis River "at about the mid-length of a straight length of river about 1 mile in length."¹⁰ The advantages of this new site were many, not only was it in keeping with the new and improved road line, but it also provided an ideal point for crossing the river.

As the river was considered a navigable river at this stage of its course, consideration had to be made of any river traffic that might occur. The new site did not endanger any river traffic as:

"The distance of one third to one half mile of distance from either of the curves will provide ample sight distance for navigation, as well as water area in which a river craft may maneuver, in the event of delays or difficulties arising in the operation of the movable span of the bridge."¹¹

The new site was also ideal with respect to the new line of the highway. The projected Highway 70 route leading to this site:

"avoided the construction of the highway across several small lakes and sloughs, likely to involve considerable cost for bridges and embankments"¹²

During the public hearings on the projected bridge, held in 1932, objections were voiced by concerned parties regarding the new location of the bridge. It was felt, by local people, that the new site and its new highway route would unnecessarily remove trade from the town. However, the suitability of this site, with respect to the crossing and to the new highway route, was to prevail over these objections.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER

The St. Francis River in the region of Madison was considered a navigable water by the War Department. Consequently a legislative and legal process, involving a special act of Congress and specific War Department approval, was required to be undertaken by any person or persons intending to build a bridge over

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _8 Page _3

such waters.¹³ The object of this process was to ensure the free passage of river traffic during and after the construction of the bridge.

In a letter of January 12, 1931, Dwight H. Blackwood, Chairman of the State Highway Commission, requested Congressman W.J. Driver to pass an act in Congress granting permission to

"the Arkansas State Highway Commission and their successors and assigns to construct a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Madison, Arkansas, on State Highway Number 70."¹⁴

This was submitted to the House of Representatives as a bill, H.R. 16419, on January 21, 1931, and approved by the 71st Congress as Act 823 on March 3, 1931.¹⁵

Despite the passing of the act it was noted by the Highway Department in a letter of March 14, 1931, that "although an Act of Congress to construct this bridge has been secured I do not believe that bids will be asked for the construction of this bridge this year. We have not started on the plans as yet."¹⁶ According to the Congressional act of 1906 regarding bridge building over navigable waters it was required to commence bridge construction within one year of the passing of any act granting permission, unless otherwise specified.¹⁷ The bridge over the St. Francis River was not commenced within the required time and, consequently, a new congressional act was required.

On February 10, 1932, Blackwood contacted Driver, once again, asking him to submit a bill granting an extension in time.¹⁸ This bill was submitted to the House of Representatives as H.R. 9264 on February 12, 1932. In Act 81 of the 72nd Congress, approved on April 15, 1932, permission was given to the State Highway Commission allowing for this extension in time.¹⁹

WAR DEPARTMENT

With Congressional approval to build a bridge over the St. Francis River grant ed, further permission was required from the War Department and the Chief of Engineers. Application was made to the War Department on August 30, 1932 and approval received on October 31, 1932.²⁰ However, two complications arose prior to the granting of that approval. First, the War Department was concerned about the status of the old bridge after its decommissioning and required that the responsibility for the old bridge be returned to the county with the opening of the new bridge. The second problem faced by the Highway Department was a degree of public objection to the new location of the projected bridge. Both of these questions had to be solved prior to receiving approval for the new bridge from the War Department.

OWNERSHIP OF OLD BRIDGE

It was recorded in a letter of September 5, 1932, that the War Department required a court order from St. Francis County specifically stating that the county would "resume ownership" of the old St. Francis River bridge and "maintain said bridge in connection with the County Highway System."²¹

The required court orders stating that the county would "resume ownership" of the old bridge was granted on September 5, 1932 and immediately forwarded to the War Department by the State Highway Department.

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 4

The court order recognized that the old bridge "must be torn down when the new bridge is constructed and the present bridge is abandoned by the State Highway System, unless proper provision is made for its maintenance."²² It further recognized that "The value of this existing bridge to the county will be too great to permit its being demolished."²³

PUBLIC OBJECTIONS

Public opposition to the new bridge over the St. Francis River was founded in an objection to the new route of Highway 70. This route, selected in 1929, involved the construction of a highway parallel to the old Route 70. The new route was to bypass the old, thereby making it redundant.²⁴

As essential part of the new route was the crossing of the St. Francis River, some two miles from the previous crossing. Those who opposed the new routing of Highway 70 felt that if the projected crossing could be brought nearer the original crossing, the old road could be retained and developed. The War Department hearing on the citing of the projected bridge, it was hoped, might provide a suitable platform for voicing objections. The hearing, scheduled for October 4, 1932, was primarily intended to establish the effect the bridge might have on navigating the river. However the local paper reported that:

"it is understood that a number of people who are desirous that the bridge be constructed at a point near the present bridge will attend the hearing and will make a plea for the abandonment of the proposed new location."²⁵

The Highway Department also anticipated public objections at the hearing.²⁶ To "expedite the transactions" they requested that the War Department hold the hearing on the St. Francis River Bridge in conjunction with hearings on the Black River Bridge and the St. Francis River Bridge at Lake City.²⁷ This was intended to promote a smooth passage of the Route 70 bridge at the hearings.

The public objections raised at the hearing were over-ruled by the War Department engineers on the grounds that the hearing was concerned with navigation only. The rejection was reported in the local newspaper as follows:

"At the public hearing held by the U.S. Engineers at West Memphis, yesterday, the protests...on the proposed change of the location of the bridge to a point two miles North of Madison was presented by C. W. Norton. The engineers, however, declined to interfere with the location question, ruling that the hearing being conducted by them for the War Department was solely as to the effect the bridge would have upon navigation."²⁸

CONTRACT AND CONSTRUCTION

With approval from the War Department, the State Highway Department could proceed with the bridge on November 15, 1932, the contract for the new bridge over the St. Francis river was let with an estimated cost of \$213,905.20. The winner of the contract, with a low bid of \$183,105.86, was the Missouri Valley Bridge and Iron Company.²⁹

Construction was immediately commenced but, inconvenienced by floods, progressed erratically. By April, 1933, it was reported that "the steel work has been placed on the east side of the river, three of the

NPS Form 10-900-a

United States Department of the Interior National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 5

concrete piers having been completed, one in the river and two on land."³⁰ Construction crews were "working night and day in order to complete construction as speedily as possible.³¹

OPENING

The bridge was completed by August and on September 2, 1933, the <u>Daily Forrest City Times Herald</u> published the program for the official opening and dedication of the new bridge. A whole day, Monday, September 4, was to be devoted to the bridge opening.³²

Festivities began at 12 noon, with the "Stuttgart Girls Drum and Bugle Corps Drill" opening the day. Water sports, speeches and parades provided further entertainment for the ten thousand visitors to the bridge. The climax of the evening was the bridge dedication ball, begun at 10 o'clock, which "brought the evening to a close at 3 a.m."³³

The speech dedicating the bridge, originally to have been given by Governor J. Marion Futrell, was given by County Judge Miles, as the Governor could not attend due to illness. The bridge was then christened by the bridge queen, Miss Nana Jones, who "arrived with her eleven attendants on a prettily decorated barge."³⁴

Perhaps the proudest moment of the day was when Senator Norfleet read a telegram from F.O. Mackey of Arizona President of the Broadway of American Association who wrote:

"On behalf of the Broadway of American Association, kindly convey to your Governor and people of the State of Arkansas sincere thanks and deep appreciation of their wonderful efforts in completing this link of the Broadway, the St. Francis River Bridge. Wishing you every success in your celebration and only regret I cannot be with you at the fish fry."³⁵

The people of St. Francis County were re-affirmed as members of the inter-state elite who lived and worked by Route 70, part of the Broadway of America.

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number <u>8</u> Page <u>6</u>

ENDNOTES

1. Murray, J.C. "State's Fine Transportation Facilities." Arkansas Centennial 1836-1936. Arkansas Democrat, 1936, p.64.

2. ibid., p. 65

3. ibid., p. 64.

4. ibid.

5. ibid.

6. ibid., p. 65.

7. c.f. Arkansas State Highway Commission, Ninth Biennial Report, 1930.

8. <u>Bridge Memorandum</u>, L.N. Edwards, Senior Highway Engineer, July 31, 1929, pp.2-3. AHTD Microfilm Files.

9. ibid.

10. ibid., p. 3.

11. ibid., p. 2.

. 12. ibid.

13. HAER Report AR-9: "Black River Bridge." Historic American Engineering Record, 1988.

14. Dwight H. Blackwood, Chairman State Highway Commission, to W.J. Driver, Congressman, First District; January 12, 1931. AHTD Microfilm Files.

15. On file in AHTD Microfilm Files.

16. R. Archibald, Assistant Bridge Engineer, to Virginia Bridge and Iron Co.; March 14, 1931, AHTD Microfilm Files.

17. HAER Report AR-9: "Black River Bridge." Historic American Engineering Record, 1988.

18. Blackwood to Driver; February 10, 1921, AHTD Microfilm Files.

19. On file AHTD Microfilm Files.

20. On file AHTD Microfilm Files.

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number _8 Page _7

21. N.B. Garver, Bridge Engineer, to W.G. Huxtable, District Engineer, Forest City; September 5, 1932. AHTD Microfilm Files.

22. Court order enclosed by Garver to Brehon Somervell, District Engineer, U.S. Engineer Office; September 12, 1932. AHTD Microfilm Files.

23. ibid.

24. c.f. Forrest City Times Herald. May, 1929. Particular reference may be made to "New Route 70 to Memphis Selected", loc.cit., May 9, 1929, p.1 and "Proponents of New Road to Memphis Waging Strong Fight", loc.cit., May 30, 1929, p.1.

25. Daily Forrest City Times Herald, Monday, October 3, 1932, p.1.

26. Garver to Huxtable; September 29, 1932, AHTD Microfilm Files.

27. Garver to Somervell; September 2, 1932, AHTD Microfilm Files.

28. "Immediate Construction of Bridge Favored by State Highway Commission" Daily Forrest City Herald, October 5, 1932.

29. Bridge No. 1391, Card Index. AHTD.

30. "Work on Madison Bridge Progressing", Daily Forrest City Times Herald, April 10, 1933, p.1.

31. ibid.

32. "Program Daily Forrest City Times Herald, September 2, 1933, p.1.

33. "Bridge Dedication Ceremonies Witnessed by Large Crowd", Daily Forrest City Times Herald, September 5, 1933. p.1.

34. ibid.

35. ibid., and "Colorful Rites at Bridge Dedication", Arkansas Gazette, September 5, 1933.









8. Statement of Significance	and the second
Certifying official has considered the significance of this property nationally X sta	in relation to other properties: atewide locally
Applicable National Register Criteria XA B XC]0
Criteria Considerations (Exceptions)	
Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions)	Period of Significance Significant Detes 1933–1939 1933
Engineering	
	Cultural Affiliation N/A
Significant Person · N/A	Architect/Builder Architect: Arkansas Highway & Transportat
	Builder: Wisconsin Bridge & Iron Company

State significance of property, and justify criteria, criteria considerations, and areas and periods of significance noted above.

9. Major Bibliographical References

See Historic Bridges of Arkansas, Multiple Property Nomination, Section H.

	See continuation sheet
Previous documentation on file (NPS): preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested previously listed in the National Register previously determined eligible by the National Register designated a National Historic Landmark recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # X recorded by Historic American Engineering Becord # HAER No. AR=20	Primary location of additional data: State historic preservation office Other State agency Federal agency Local government University Other Specify repository: L.S. Library of Congress
10. Geographical Data	
Acreage of property Less than one acre	
UTM References A 1.5 70.86.35 3.8791.60 Zone Easting Northing C .	B 1 5 7 0 8 8 6 0 3 8 7 9 3 4 5 Zone Easting Northing D 1 See continuation sheet
Verbal Boundary Description	
Beginning at a point approximately 8280 feet and State Highway 50, the St. Francis River continues east across the St. Francis River at the east abutment.	north of the intersection of U.S. Highway 70 Bridge starts here at the west abutment, then for approximately 921 feet, where it terminates
	See continuation sheet
Boundary Justification The boundary includes the main turn span, se historically associated with this property.	condary spans, piers and abutments that are
Concerning and Concerning	See continuation sheet
11. Form Prepared By	

The repared by		
name/title Michael Swanda, Survey Coordinator		
organization Arkansas Historic Preservation Program	date February 5.	1990
street & number 225 East Markham Street	telephone (501) 371-	2763
city or town Little Rock	state Arkansas	zip code72201

•