LEVEL II SCOUR ANALYSIS FOR BRIDGE 40 (BETHTH00230040) on TOWN HIGHWAY 23, crossing GILEAD BROOK, BETHEL, VERMONT

U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-198

Prepared in cooperation with VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION and FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LEVEL II SCOUR ANALYSIS FOR BRIDGE 40 (BETHTH00230040) on TOWN HIGHWAY 23, crossing GILEAD BROOK, BETHEL, VERMONT

By Erick M. Boehmler

U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-198

Prepared in cooperation with VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION and

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

-3 1996Pembroke, New Hampshire

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BRUCE BABBITT, Secretary

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY Gordon P. Eaton, Director

write to: purchased from:

District Chief Chi Pembroke, NH 03275-3718

For additional information **Copies of this report may be**

U.S. Geological Survey **Earth Science Information Center**

361 Commerce Way **Commerse Way** Open-File Reports Section Open-File Reports Section
Box 25286, MS 517 Federal Center Denver, CO 80225

CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

CONVERSION FACTORS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND VERTICAL DATUM

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

In this report, the words "right" and "left" refer to directions that would be reported by an observer facing downstream.

Sea level: In this report, "sea level" refers to the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929-- a geodetic datum derived from a general adjustment of the first-order level nets of the United States and Canada, formerly called Sea Level Datum of 1929.

In the appendices, the above abbreviations may be combined. For example, USLB would represent upstream left bank.

LEVEL II SCOUR ANALYSIS FOR BRIDGE 40 (BETHTH00230040) ON TOWN HIGHWAY 23, CROSSING GILEAD BROOK, Bethel, VERMONT

By **Erick M. Boehmler**

INTRODUCTION

This report provides the results of a detailed Level II analysis of scour potential at structure BETHTH00230040 on town highway 23 crossing Gilead Brook, Bethel, Vermont (figures 1–8). A Level II study is a basic engineering analysis of the site, including a quantitative analysis of stream stability and scour (U.S. Department of Transportation, 1993). A Level I study is included in Appendix E of this report. A Level I study provides a qualitative geomorphic characterization of the study site. Information on the bridge, gleaned from VTAOT files, was compiled prior to conducting the Level I and Level II analyses and can be found in Appendix D.

The site is in the Green Mountain physiographic province of central Vermont in the town of Bethel. The 10.2-mi² drainage area is in a predominantly rural and forested basin. In the vicinity of the study site, the banks have moderately dense woody vegetation coverage.

In the study area, the Gilead Brook has an incised, sinuous channel downstream of the site and a meandering channel upstream, with narrow flood plains and a slope of approximately 0.015 ft/ft, an average channel top width of 47.0 ft and an average channel depth of 2.75 ft. The predominant channel bed materials are gravel and cobble $(D_{50}$ is 94.8 mm or 0.311 ft). The geomorphic assessment at the time of the Level I and Level II site visit on October 14, 1994, indicated that the reach was laterally unstable.

The town highway 23 crossing of Gilead Brook is a 37-ft-long, one-lane bridge consisting of one 34-foot span steel-stringer type superstructure (Vermont Agency of Transportation, written commun., August 24, 1994). The bridge is supported by vertical, concrete abutments with concrete wingwalls. The channel is skewed 25 degrees to the opening and the opening-skew-to-roadway is zero degrees.

A scour hole 1.0 ft deeper than the mean thalweg depth was observed along the downstream right wingwall during the Level I assessment. The scour protection measures at the site were type-2 stone fill (less than 36 inches diameter) on the upstream and downstream right roadway embankments, at the extreme upstream and downstream ends of the upstream and downstream right wingwalls, and along the entire base length of the downstream left wingwall. Additional details describing conditions at the site are included in the Level II Summary and Appendices D and E.

Scour depths and rock rip-rap sizes were computed using the general guidelines described in Hydraulic Engineering Circular 18 (Richardson and others, 1993). Scour depths were calculated assuming an infinite depth of erosive material and a homogeneous particle-size distribution. The scour analysis results are presented in tables 1 and 2 and a graph of the scour depths is presented in figure 8.

Figure 1. Location of study area on USGS 1:24,000 scale map.

Figure 2. Location of study area on Vermont Agency of Transportation town highway map.

LEVEL II SUMMARY

Description of Bridge

Debris accumulation on bridge at time of Level I or Level II site visit:

None.

Describe any features near or at the bridge that may affect flow (include observation date).

Description of the Geomorphic Setting

as of 10/14/94.

Describe any obstructions in channel and date of observation.

Hydrology

Description of the Water-Surface Profile Model (WSPRO) Analysis

end of the left abutment, elev. 500.09.

Cross-Sections Used in WSPRO Analysis

 1 For location of cross-sections see plan-view sketch included with Level I field form, Appendix E. For more detail on how cross-sections were developed see WSPRO input file.

Data and Assumptions Used in WSPRO Model

Hydraulic analyses of the reach were done by use of the Federal Highway Administration's WSPRO step-backwater computer program (Shearman and others, 1986, and Shearman, 1990). Results of the hydraulic model are presented in the Bridge Hydraulic Summary, Appendix B, and figure 7.

Channel roughness factors (Manning's "n") used in the hydraulic model were estimated using field inspections at each cross section following the general guidelines described by Arcement, Jr. and Schneider (1989). Final adjustments to the values were made during the modelling of the reach. Channel "n" values for the reach ranged from 0.050 to 0.060, and overbank "n" values ranged from 0.030 to 0.140. The roughness factor of 0.14 was applied to the downstream left overbank, where flow depths modeled were extremely shallow for the 100-year discharge. This roughness factor was reduced to 0.09 for the 500-year discharge model due to an increased flow depth.

Normal depth at the exit section (EXIT-) was assumed as the starting water surface. This depth was computed by use of the slope-conveyance method outlined in the User's manual for WSPRO (Shearman, 1990). The slope used was 0.015 ft/ft which was estimated from the topographic maps (U.S. Geological Survey, 1980).

The surveyed approach section (APPRO) was moved along the approach channel slope (0.035 ft/ft) to establish the modelled approach section (APPRO), one bridge length upstream of the upstream face as recommended by Shearman and others (1986). This approach also provides a consistent method for determining scour variables. For this case, because the overbank portions of the approach section sloped at a smaller ratio than the channel, the slope indicated above was applied to the channel points only, when moving the cross section.

Although the upstream channel is skewed to the bridge opening, flow was assumed to align with the abutment wall trend when passing through the bridge.

The modeled 100- and 500-year discharges overtop the roadway embankments but not the bridge deck.

Bridge Hydraulics Summary

Average bridge embankment elevation ft Average low steel elevation 499.9 499.5

> 100-year discharge $\frac{2100}{f^{3}/s}$ *Water-surface elevation in bridge opening Road overtopping?* The Discharge over road 142, s *Area of flow in bridge opening* 182 ft^2 *Average velocity in bridge opening ft/s Maximum WSPRO tube velocity at bridge* 496.8 ft 182 10.8 13.0 $\frac{f}{s}$

Water-surface elevation at Approach section with bridge Water-surface elevation at Approach section without bridge Amount of backwater caused by bridge 499.3 498.2 $1.1 \tcdot t$

Water-surface elevation at Approach section with bridge Water-surface elevation at Approach section without bridge Amount of backwater caused by bridge 500.3 498.9 1.4

Amount of backwater caused by bridge

Scour Analysis Summary

Special Conditions or Assumptions Made in Scour Analysis

Scour depths were computed using the general guidelines described in Hydraulic Engineering Circular 18 (Richardson and others, 1993). Scour depths were calculated assuming an infinite depth of erosive material and a homogeneous particle-size distribution. The results of the scour analysis are presented in tables 1 and 2 and a graph of the scour depths is presented in figure 8.

Contraction scour was computed by use of the clear-water contraction scour equation (Richardson and others, 1995, p. 32, equation 20) for the 100-year and incipient roadoverflow discharges. Contraction scour was computed by use of Chang pressure-flow scour equation (Richardson and others, 1995, p. 145-146) for the 500-year discharge, where orifice flow was present at the bridge. Contraction scour at bridges with orifice flow is best estimated by use of Chang pressure-flow scour equation (oral communication, J. Sterling Jones, October 4, 1996). The results of Laursen's clear-water contraction scour equation (Richardson and others, 1995, p. 32, equation 20) was also computed for the 500-year discharge and can be found in appendix F. For contraction scour computations, the average depth in the contracted section (AREA/TOPWIDTH) is subtracted from the depth of flow computed by the scour equation (Y2) to determine the actual amount of scour. In this case, the 100-year discharge model resulted in the worst case contraction scour with a scour depth of 0.1 ft.

Abutment scour for all of the modeled discharges was computed by use of the HIRE equation (Richardson and others, 1993, p. 50, equation 25) because the HIRE equation is recommended when the length to depth ratio of the embankment blocking flow exceeds 25. Variables for the HIRE abutment scour equation include the Froude number of the flow approaching the embankments, the length of the embankment blocking flow, and the depth of flow approaching the embankment less any roadway overtopping.

Because the total scour depths computed for the 500-year discharge are less than those for the 100-year discharge, figure 8 shows total scour depths for the 100-year discharge only.

Scour Results

Rock Riprap Sizing

Figure 7. Water-surface profiles for the 100- and 500-yr discharges at structure BETHTH00230040 on town highway 23, crossing Gilead Brook, Bethel, Vermont.

ELEVATION ABOVE ARBITRARY DATUM, IN FEET

Figure 8. Scour elevations for the 100-yr discharge at structure BETHTH00230040 on town highway 23, crossing Gilead Brook, Bethel, Vermont.

Table 1. Remaining footing/pile depth at abutments for the 100-year discharge at structure BETHTH00230040 on Town Highway 23, crossing Gilead Brook, Bethel, Vermont.

[VTAOT, Vermont Agency of Transportation; --,no data]

^{1.} Measured along the face of the most constricting side of the bridge.

 2 . Arbitrary datum for this study.

17

Table 2. Remaining footing/pile depth at abutments for the 500-year discharge at structure BETHTH00230040 on Town Highway 23, crossing Gilead Brook, Bethel, Vermont. [VTAOT, Vermont Agency of Transportation; --, no data]

^{1.} Measured along the face of the most constricting side of the bridge.

² Arbitrary datum for this study.

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Arcement, G.J., Jr., and Schneider, V.R., 1989, Guide for selecting Manning's roughness coefficients for natural channels and flood plains: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2339, 38 p.
- Barnes, H.H., Jr., 1967, Roughness characteristics of natural channels: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1849, 213 p.
- Benson, M.A., 1962, Factors Influencing the Occurrence of Floods in a Humid Region of Diverse Terrain: U.S Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1580-B, 64 p.
- Brown, S.A. and Clyde, E.S., 1989, Design of riprap revetment: Federal Highway Administration Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 11, Publication FHWA-IP-89-016, 156 p.
- Federal Highway Administration, 1983, Runoff estimates for small watersheds and development of sound design: Federal Highway Administration Report FHWA-RD-77-158
- Hayes, D.C.,1993, Site selection and collection of bridge-scour data in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigation Report 93-4017, 23 p.
- Johnson, C.G. and Tasker, G.D.,1974, Progress report on flood magnitude and frequency of Vermont streams: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 74-130, 37 p.
- Laursen, E.M., 1960, Scour at bridge crossings: Journal of the Hydraulics Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, v. 86, no. HY2, p. 39-53.
- Potter, W. D., 1957a, Peak rates of runoff in the Adirondack, White Mountains, and Maine woods area, Bureau of Public Roads
- Potter, W. D., 1957b, Peak rates of runoff in the New England Hill and Lowland area, Bureau of Public Roads
- Richardson, E.V., and Davis, S.R., 1995, Evaluating scour at bridges: Federal Highway Administration Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 18, Publication FHWA-IP-90-017, 204 p.
- Richardson, E.V., Harrison, L.J., Richardson, J.R., and Davis, S.R., 1993, Evaluating scour at bridges: Federal Highway Administration Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 18, Publication FHWA-IP-90-017, 131 p.
- Richardson, E.V., Simons, D.B., and Julien, P.Y., 1990, Highways in the river environment: Federal Highway Administration Publication FHWA-HI-90-016.
- Ritter, D.F., 1984, Process Geomorphology: W.C. Brown Co., Debuque, Iowa, 603 p.
- Shearman, J.O., 1990, User's manual for WSPRO--a computer model for water surface profile computations: Federal Highway Administration Publication FHWA-IP-89-027, 187 p.
- Shearman, J.O., Kirby, W.H., Schneider, V.R., and Flippo, H.N., 1986, Bridge waterways analysis model; research report: Federal Highway Administration Publication FHWA-RD-86-108, 112 p.
- Talbot, A.N., 1887, The determination of water-way for bridges and culverts.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 1993, Stream stability and scour at highway bridges, Participant Workbook: Federal Highway Administration Publication FHWA HI-91-011.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 1980, Bethel, Vermont 7.5 Minute Series Quadrangle Map: U.S. Geological Survey Topographic Maps, Aerial Photographs, 1973; Field checked, 1975; Scale, 1:24,000; Contour Interval, 20 feet.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 1981, Randolph, Vermont 7.5 Minute Series Quadrangle Map: U.S. Geological Survey Topographic Maps, Aerial Photographs, 1973; Field checked, 1975; Scale, 1:24,000; Contour Interval, 20 feet.

APPENDIX A:

WSPRO INPUT FILE

WSPRO INPUT FILE

T1 U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY WSPRO INPUT FILE beth040.wsp T2 CREATED ON 06-NOV-95 FOR BRIDGE BETHTH00230040 USING FILE beth040.dca T3 Town Highway 23 Bridge Over Gilead Brook in Bethel, VT Q 2100.0, 2700.0, 1624.0 SK 0.015 0.015 0.015 * J3 6 29 30 552 553 551 5 16 17 13 3 * 15 14 23 21 11 12 4 7 3 XS EXIT- -43 0. GR -213.2, 509.50 -197.3, 502.71 -166.1, 502.09 -146.6, 499.83 GR -130.1, 498.54 -118.3, 497.14 -93.1, 496.30 -53.2, 496.41 GR -13.5, 496.11 -2.3, 494.60 0.0, 492.64 13.3, 490.48 GR 17.7, 489.82 21.5, 489.55 26.2, 489.73 31.0, 490.52 GR 35.8, 492.15 48.2, 498.99 80.3, 499.79 100.5, 499.34 GR 111.0, 507.01 * * The n value for the left overbank subarea shown here was used at * the Q100 level. The n value used here for the Q500 was 0.09 * N 0.14 0.060 0.030 SA -13.5 48.2 * XS FULLV 0 * * * 0.0037 * BR BRIDG 0 499.2 0.0 GR 0.0, 499.26 0.1, 493.48 9.0, 491.93 22.5, 490.65
GR 25.0, 489.85 28.1, 489.28 29.3, 489.25 29.5, 490.05 GR 25.0, 489.85 28.1, 489.28 29.3, 489.25 29.5, 490.05 GR 32.6, 489.92 32.6, 490.68 32.6, 499.21 0.0, 499.26 * CD 4 18.3 4.5 499.5 58.3 0.0 N 0.050 * XR RDWAY 9 14.5 2 GR -202.7, 509.50 -186.6, 501.71 -161.0, 500.96 -84.5, 498.07 GR -0.2, 499.96 -0.1, 500.74 0.0, 500.73 32.6, 500.81 GR 32.6, 500.80 34.8, 499.92 79.4, 499.29 110.8, 499.71 GR 127.5, 509.76 * * AS APPRO 51 GR -177.5, 507.13 -141.9, 501.19 -123.8, 498.97 -98.7, 497.89
GR -71.2, 497.15 -49.1, 496.70 -7.8, 497.68 -3.3, 492.12 GR -71.2, 497.15 -49.1, 496.70 -7.8, 497.68 -3.3, 492.12 GR 0.0, 491.85 2.4, 491.43 5.4, 491.41 10.2, 491.66 GR 15.4, 492.16 20.9, 492.39 26.4, 492.63 33.4, 492.45 GR 45.5, 493.28 48.1, 494.97 62.0, 498.15 86.3, 497.77 GR 94.5, 497.77 110.9, 500.11 163.2, 501.04 176.8, 508.16 * N 0.030 0.050 0.055 SA -7.8 110.9 * HP 1 BRIDG 496.82 1 496.82 HP 2 BRIDG 496.82 * * 1958 HP 2 RDWAY 499.16 * * 142 HP 1 APPRO 499.28 1 499.28 HP 2 APPRO 499.28 * * 2100 * * HP 1 BRIDG 499.26 1 499.26

* HP 1 BRIDG 496.21 1 496.21 HP 2 BRIDG 496.21 * * 1624 HP 1 APPRO 498.29 1 498.29 HP 2 APPRO 498.29 * * 1624 * EX ER

21

APPENDIX B: **WSPRO OUTPUT FILE**

WSPRO OUTPUT FILE

1 WSPRO FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION - U. S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY V042094 MODEL FOR WATER-SURFACE PROFILE COMPUTATIONS *** RUN DATE & TIME: 12-12-95 07:48 T1 U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY WSPRO INPUT FILE beth040.wsp T2 CREATED ON 06-NOV-95 FOR BRIDGE BETHTH00230040 USING FILE beth040.dca T3 Town Highway 23 Bridge Over Gilead Brook in Bethel, VT Q 2100.0, 1624.0 *** Q -DATA FOR SEC-ID, ISEQ = 1 SK 0.015 0.015 * J3 6 29 30 552 553 551 5 16 17 13 3 * 15 14 23 21 11 12 4 7 3 1 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: $ISBN = 3;$ SECID = BRIDG; SRD = WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR 1 182 14028 33 44
182 14028 33 44 1.00 0 33 2441 496.82 182 14028 33 44 1.00 0 33 2441 1 HP 2 BRIDG 496.82 * * 1958 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: ISEQ = 3; SECID = BRIDG; SRD = 0. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 496.82 0.0 32.6 182.0 14028. 1958. 10.76 $X \text{ STA.}$ 0.0 4.2 6.7 8.7 10.5 12.2
A(I) 15.2 10.6 9.2 9.1 8.5
6.43 9.21 10.60 10.76 11.52 A(I) 15.2 10.6 9.2 9.1 8.5 V(I) 6.43 9.21 10.60 10.76 11.52 X STA. 12.2 13.7 15.2 16.7 18.1 19.4 A(I) 8.3 8.1 7.9 7.9 7.6 V(I) 11.80 12.10 12.42 12.32 12.82 X STA. 19.4 20.7 21.9 23.1 24.3 25.4 A(I) 7.6 7.5 7.6 7.5 7.6 V(I) 12.90 13.05 12.83 13.02 12.88 X STA. 25.4 26.4 27.5 28.7 30.2 32.6 A(I) 7.7 7.9 8.8 10.6 16.6 V(I) 12.73 12.32 11.18 9.27 5.89 1 HP 2 RDWAY 499.16 * * 142 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: $ISEQ = 4$; SECID = RDWAY; SRD = 9. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 499.16 -113.4 -35.9 42.2 300. 142. 3.36 X STA. -113.4 -99.5 -95.5 -92.7 -90.4 -88.5 A(I) 3.6 2.4 2.0 1.9 1.8 V(I) 1.97 2.97 3.49 3.71 4.02 X STA. -88.5 -86.7 -85.2 -83.7 -82.2 -80.6 A(I) 1.7 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 V(I) 4.24 4.33 4.50 4.48 4.36 X STA. -80.6 -78.9 -77.2 -75.2 -73.1 -70.8 A(I) 1.6 1.7 1.7 1.8 1.9 V(I) 4.34 4.25 4.08 3.87 3.83 X STA. -70.8 -68.1 -64.9 -60.9 -55.1 -35.9 A(I) 2.1 2.2 2.4 2.9 4.1 V(I) 3.44 3.24 2.93 2.48 1.72 1 HP 1 APPRO 499.28 1 499.28 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: ISEQ = 5; SECID = APPRO; SRD = 51. WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR 1 208 15083 119 119 1569 2 465 34895 113 117 5363 499.28 674 49978 231 235 1.00 -125 105 6523 1 HP 2 APPRO 499.28 * * 2100

 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: ISEQ = 5; SECID = APPRO; SRD = 51. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 499.28 -126.3 105.1 673.9 49978. 2100. 3.12 X STA. -126.3 -82.2 -65.3 -52.4 -40.5 -26.9 A(I) 48.3 34.8 30.7 29.5 30.3 V(I) 2.17 3.02 3.42 3.56 3.46 X STA. -26.9 -8.8 -1.4 2.0 5.0 8.1 A(I) 33.2 35.1 25.2 24.3 24.1 V(I) 3.17 2.99 4.17 4.33 4.35 X STA. 8.1 11.4 14.9 18.7 22.8 27.2 A(I) 24.9 25.5 26.7 28.4 29.5 V(I) 4.21 4.12 3.93 3.70 3.56 X STA. 27.2 31.8 36.7 42.5 52.1 105.1
A(I) 31.1 33.1 36.9 47.3 75.0
V(I) 3.38 3.17 2.84 2.22 1.40 A(I) 31.1 33.1 36.9 47.3 75.0 V(I) 3.38 3.17 2.84 2.22 1.40 1 \star * HP 1 BRIDG 499.26 1 499.26 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: ISEQ = 3; SECID = BRIDG; SRD = 0. WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR
1 261 16907 0 81 0 1 261 16907 0 81 0 499.26 261 16907 0 81 1.00 0 33 0 1 HP 2 BRIDG 499.26 * * 1860 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: ISEQ = 3; SECID = BRIDG; SRD = 0. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 499.26 0.0 32.6 260.7 16907. 1860. 7.14 X STA. 0.0 3.5 5.8 7.7 9.5 11.2 A(I) 20.9 14.8 13.6 13.0 12.2 V(I) 4.44 6.29 6.82 7.15 7.60 X STA. 11.2 12.8 14.3 15.8 17.3 18.7 A(I) 12.5 11.7 11.8 11.6 11.5 V(I) 7.45 7.94 7.88 7.99 8.11 X STA. 18.7 20.0 21.4 22.7 24.0 25.2 A(I) 11.3 11.2 11.2 11.3 11.0 V(I) 8.19 8.33 8.27 8.20 8.45 X STA. 25.2 26.4 27.5 28.8 30.3 32.6 A(I) 11.4 11.5 12.1 14.2 21.6 V(I) 8.13 8.11 7.67 6.55 4.30 1 HP 2 RDWAY 500.02 * * 812 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: ISEQ = 4; SECID = RDWAY; SRD = 9. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 500.02 -136.1 111.3 170.0 2552. 812. 4.78 X STA. -136.1 -105.7 -96.6 -90.1 -85.0 -80.3 A(I) 17.5 12.0 10.5 9.4 8.9 V(I) 2.33 3.39 3.87 4.31 4.56 X STA. -80.3 -75.4 -69.8 -63.8 -56.6 -47.7 A(I) 9.0 9.3 9.4 10.1 10.9 V(I) 4.53 4.37 4.31 4.03 3.71 X STA. -47.7 -34.4 49.1 61.9 69.3 75.0 A(I) 12.9 18.1 5.0 3.9 3.6 V(I) 3.14 2.24 8.05 10.38 11.25 X STA. 75.0 79.9 84.8 90.9 98.6 111.3

A(I) 3.4 3.4 3.8 4.0 4.9 V(I) 11.91 11.95 10.80 10.03 8.35 1 HP 1 APPRO 500.32 1 500.32 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: ISEQ = 5; SECID = APPRO; SRD = 51. WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR 1 336 31926 127 127 3103 2 586 49642 119 123 7397 3 1 7 12 12 2 500.32 924 81575 258 261 1.01 -134 123 9871 1 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: ISEQ = 5; SECID = APPRO; SRD = 51. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 500.32 -134.8 122.7 923.9 81575. 2700. 2.92 X STA. -134.8 -95.7 -79.2 -65.8 -54.3 -44.0 A(I) 62.4 44.9 41.9 39.1 36.8 V(I) 2.16 3.01 3.22 3.45 3.67 X STA. -44.0 -32.9 -20.1 -4.8 0.3 4.4 A(I) 37.6 39.5 47.8 40.9 35.9 V(I) 3.60 3.42 2.83 3.30 3.76 X STA. 4.4 8.5 12.7 17.3 22.4 27.7 A(I) 36.1 36.3 38.3 40.4 41.0 V(I) 3.73 3.72 3.53 3.34 3.29 X STA. 27.7 33.4 39.4 46.6 67.2 122.7 A(I) 44.1 46.1 52.0 72.5 90.5 V(I) 3.06 2.93 2.60 1.86 1.49 1 \star HP 1 BRIDG 496.21 1 496.21 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: $ISEQ = 3$; SECID = BRIDG; SRD = 0. WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR 1 162 11791 33 43 2053 496.21 162 11791 33 43 1.00 0 33 2053 1 HP 2 BRIDG 496.21 * * 1624 VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION: $ISEQ = 3$; SECID = BRIDG; SRD = 0. WSEL LEW REW AREA K Q VEL 496.21 0.1 32.6 162.1 11791. 1624. 10.02 X STA. 0.1 4.4 7.0 9.1 10.9 12.6 A(I) 13.3 9.6 8.7 8.1 7.6 V(I) 6.09 8.46 9.37 10.05 10.72 X STA. 12.6 14.2 15.7 17.2 18.5 19.8 A(I) 7.6 7.3 7.2 6.9 6.9 V(I) 10.74 11.07 11.29 11.74 11.82 X STA. 19.8 21.1 22.3 23.5 24.6 25.7 A(I) 6.9 6.6 6.9 6.6 6.7 V(I) 11.78 12.27 11.71 12.33 12.12 X STA. 25.7 26.7 27.7 28.8 30.3 32.6 A(I) 6.7 7.1 7.6 9.3 14.6 V(I) 12.12 11.42 10.75 8.78 5.55 1 HP 1 APPRO 498.29 1 498.29 CROSS-SECTION PROPERTIES: ISEQ = 5; SECID = APPRO; SRD = 51. WSEL SA# AREA K TOPW WETP ALPH LEW REW QCR
1 99 4846 100 100 1 99 4846 100 100 555 2 357 23386 106 110 3720 498.29 456 28233 206 210 1.03 -107 98 3782

1

 +++ BEGINNING PROFILE CALCULATIONS -- 2 XSID:CODE SRDL LEW AREA VHD HF EGL CRWS Q WSEL SRD FLEN REW K ALPH HO ERR FR# VEL EXIT-:XS ****** -106 296 0.99 ***** 497.74 495.56 2100 496.75
-42 ****** 44 17139 1.27 ***** ******* 1.00 7.09 -42 ****** 44 17139 1.27 ***** ******* 1.00 7.09 FULLV:FV 43 -119 399 0.68 0.50 498.23 ******* 2100 497.55 0 43 45 21956 1.57 0.00 -0.02 0.75 5.26 <<<<<THE ABOVE RESULTS REFLECT "NORMAL" (UNCONSTRICTED) FLOW>>>>> APPRO:AS 51 -106 446 0.36 0.37 498.60 ******* 2100 498.24 51 51 98 27361 1.04 0.00 0.00 0.57 4.71 <<<<<THE ABOVE RESULTS REFLECT "NORMAL" (UNCONSTRICTED) FLOW>>>>> ===215 FLOW CLASS 1 SOLUTION INDICATES POSSIBLE ROAD OVERFLOW. WS1,WSSD,WS3,RGMIN = 499.74 0.00 496.47 498.07 ===260 ATTEMPTING FLOW CLASS 4 SOLUTION. <<<<<RESULTS REFLECTING THE CONSTRICTED FLOW FOLLOW>>>>> XSID:CODE SRDL LEW AREA VHD HF EGL CRWS Q WSEL SRD FLEN REW K ALPH HO ERR FR# VEL BRIDG:BR 43 0 182 2.02 0.74 498.84 496.06 1958 496.82 0 43 33 14022 1.12 0.36 -0.01 0.85 10.76 TYPE PPCD FLOW C P/A LSEL BLEN XLAB XRAB 4. **** 4. 0.943 ****** 499.20 ****** ****** ******

 XSID:CODE SRD FLEN HF VHD EGL ERR Q WSEL RDWAY:RG 9. 37. 0.06 0.15 499.38 0.00 142. 499.16 Q WLEN LEW REW DMAX DAVG VMAX VAVG HAVG CAVG LT: 142. 77. -113. -36. 1.1 0.5 3.6 3.4 0.8 2.8 RT: 0. 78. 34. 112. 0.9 0.6 4.4 4.9 1.1 2.9 XSID:CODE SRDL LEW AREA VHD HF EGL CRWS Q WSEL SRD FLEN REW K ALPH HO ERR FR# VEL APPRO:AS 33 -125 674 0.15 0.22 499.43 496.11 2100 499.28

51 37 105 49981 1.00 0.38 0.01 0.32 3.12

 M(G) M(K) KQ XLKQ XRKQ OTEL 0.841 0.533 23148 . -8 . $25.$ ********

 <<<<<END OF BRIDGE COMPUTATIONS>>>>> FIRST USER DEFINED TABLE.

 XSID:CODE XLKQ XRKQ KQ APPRO:AS -8. 25. 23148.

SECOND USER DEFINED TABLE.

===260 ATTEMPTING FLOW CLASS 4 SOLUTION.

 ===220 FLOW CLASS 1 (4) SOLUTION INDICATES POSSIBLE PRESSURE FLOW. WS3,WSIU,WS1,LSEL = 497.67 499.76 499.96 499.20

===245 ATTEMPTING FLOW CLASS 2 (5) SOLUTION.

<<<<<RESULTS REFLECTING THE CONSTRICTED FLOW FOLLOW>>>>>

****** ****** ******** ****** ****** ********

<<<<<END OF BRIDGE COMPUTATIONS>>>>>

FIRST USER DEFINED TABLE.

APPRO:AS ***********************

SECOND USER DEFINED TABLE.

APPENDIX C:

BED-MATERIAL PARTICAL-SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Appendix C. Bed material particle-size distributions for three pebble count transects at the approach cross-section for structure BETHTH00230040, in Bethel, Vermont.

APPENDIX D: **HISTORICAL DATA FORM**