TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REPORT

Special Bridge Replacement Program LOCAL ROUTE 0A222 – DOUBLE BRANCH ROAD BRIDGE OVER DOUBLE BRANCH AT LOG MILE 8.62 WAYNE COUNTY PIN: 103985.01



PREPARED BY THE CORRADINO GROUP FOR THE TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION


Approved by Date 11 19 212 Approved by OV Date


Chief of Environment and Planning

Deputy Commissioner and Chief Engineer

Approved by:	Signature	DATE
Transportation Director Project Planning Division	Stur Ola	10-26-12
Engineering Director Design Division	Carelyn Stonecipher	10-29-12
Engineering Director Structures Division	Dayne J. Seger	11-13-12

This document is covered by 23 USC § 409 and its production pursuant to fulfilling public planning requirements does not waive the provisions of § 409.







TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WORKSHEET BRIDGE REPLACEMENT ANALYSIS, NEEDS, AND COSTS

County: Wayne	Route: Double Br	anch Rd. (0A222)	Log Mile:	8.62				
Feature Crossed:	Double Branch	System:	Local Route					
Functional Class:	Rural Local	Bridge ID:	910A2220009					
	EXISTING C	ONDITIONS						
2016 AADT: 8	30 App. Cross Section:	12'/16'/32'	No. Lanes:	1				
Approach Alignment:	Tangent	Year Built:	1960 Load Limit:	5 Tons				
Width (out to out): 12.	42 ft. Sidewalks: Right	Left	Length:	30 ft.				
No. Spans: Approach:	0	Main:	1					
Substructure: S	teel Girder Vertical Clea	arance: 6'6"	Sufficiency Rating:	19.6				
Other: Wood riding surfac	e							
	PROPOSED IM	PROVEMENTS						
	D01-TS- <u>1A</u> Type o							
Design Year: <u>2036</u> Desigr	AADT: <u>100</u> Terrain <u>I</u>	evel ADL (F):	(R):					
Project Length: 385	ft. Bridge Length:	55 ft Approach	165 ft 2 @ 165 ft	= 330 ft.				
Design Speed (MPH): 30 Posted Speed (MPH): None								
Approach Width:* 18'/18'/As Required Bridge Width (O to O): 23.5 ft No. Lanes: 2								
Right-of-Way Required:	3 Tract(s)	Structure Type:	Single Span					
	<u>0.05</u> Acres							
	MAINTENANC	E OF TRAFFIC						
Temporary Detour: 🛛 🔽	Temporary Runaround:	Stage Construc	ot: 🔲					
Alternate Route: <u>Tie Camp</u>	Rd., SR 13, Little Shawntee Creek	Rd., Big Shawntee Cre	ek Rd., Factors Fork Rd					
Remarks: Utilize a pre-fabrica	ated bridge to minimize the constr	uction time. Minimized	construction time is need	led due				
to a low water crossing (con-	crete lined stream bed) downstrea	m of the project. The lo	w water crossing would					
eliminate access to a property	v in a heavy rain event if this bridg	e were closed. Constru	cting on new location is n	ot				
desired due to an undergroun	d fiber optic cable. A short duration	on detour will be require	d with the maximum deto	ur				
length being 15 miles.								
	ESTIMAT	ED COST						
Right-of-Way: \$1	6,000 Approaches:	\$121,000 S	tructure: \$200	,000				
Preliminary Engineering:	\$40,000 Utilities:	\$0 Mis	c./Cont.: \$41,	000				
Mobilization: \$17,000			Total: \$435	,000				
Remarks: The lane width is to	be increased from 12 feet to 18	eet. The proposed alig	nment will remain the sar	me and				
the grade will increase 2 feet.								
Field Investigation by: Glenda Tyus, Lisa Reaney, David Duncan, Terry Arnold, Casey Pounders, Scott Johnson (TDOT)								
Richard Sullivan & Jon Storey	r (Corradino)							

Route:	0A222 (Double Branch Rd.)								
Decorintian	Special Bridge Replacem	Special Bridge Replacement Program							
Description:	L.M. 8.62								
County:	Wayne								
Length:									
Date:	October 19, 2012								
	DESCRIPTION	L	OCAL	STA	TE	F	EDERAL		TOTAL
Right-of-Way		\$	3,000	\$	-	\$	13,000	\$	16,000
Clearing and	Grubbing	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Earthwork		\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,000	\$	2,000
Railroad Cros	ssing or Separation	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Drainage		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Utilities		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Structures		\$	40,000	\$	-	\$	160,000	\$	200,000
Pavement Re	moval	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	•
Paving		\$	4,000	\$	-	\$	16,000	\$	20,000
Roadway and	Pavement Appurtenances	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	•
Retaining Wa	lls	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
Topsoil		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Seeding		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Sodding		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Rip-Rap or S	ope Protection	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Fencing		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Signing		\$	6,000	\$	-	\$	26,000	\$	32,000
Pavement Ma	nrkings	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Lighting	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Signalization		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Guardrail		\$	1,000	\$	-	\$	5,000	\$	6,000
Pav Item Quan	tity Adjustment (15%) ¹	\$	8,000	\$	-	\$	33,000	\$	41,000
Maintenance		\$	5,000	\$	-	\$	20,000	\$	25,000
Mobilization	(5%)	\$	3,000	\$	-	\$	14,000	\$	17,000
	N COST (rounded)	\$	72,000	\$	-	\$	287,000	\$	359,000
	and Contingency (10%)	\$	7,000	\$	-	\$	29,000	\$	36,000
	RUCTION COST (rounded)	\$	79,000	\$	-	\$	316,000	\$	395,000
	ingineering (10%)	\$	8,000	\$	-	\$	32,000	\$	40,000
PROJE	CT COST ^{2, 3} (rounded)	\$	87,000	\$	-	\$	348,000	\$	435,000

¹ For estimating purposes pay items are adjusted for fluctuation of cost based on quantity.
 ² For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of 10% should be applied from the date of this estimate.
 ³ Local agency is responsible for a 20% match (80:20 Funding).

Item	Quantity	Unit	201	1 Unit Cost	Sı	ub-Total	Тс	otal Cost	R	ounded Cost	Description/Quantity Calculation
Right-of-Way											
	0.1	Lump Sum	\$	20,000.00			\$	16,000	\$	16,000	0.05 Acres, 3 Tracts: see separate calculations. \$5,000 per tract for incidentals
Clear and Gru											
201-01	0.0	Acres	\$	1,000.00			\$	-	\$	-	Area inside prop. R.O.W.
Earthwork											
203-01		CY	\$	3.56	\$	-					Excavation (Cut)
203-03	730		\$	2.51	\$	1,832					Borrow (Fill)
		Total					\$	1,832	\$	2,000	
Pavement Ren					1						
202-03.01	0	SY	\$	9.48	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Drainage					-						
607-05.02	0	FT Pipe	\$	56.59	\$	-					24" pipe assumed length of project (C&G)
611-12.02	0	Catchbasins	\$	2,682.51	\$	-					Type 12 CB 4-8' depth, 1 every 300' on each side of the street affected
607-09.02	0	FT Pipe	\$	125.01	\$	-					48" pipe assummed at each stream crossings
611-12.02	0	Medianbasin	\$	2,682.51	\$	-					1 every 800' when have a median, estimate same price as catchbasins
607-03.02	0	Medianpipe	\$	42.17	\$	-					18" pipe every 800', length = 80'
		Total					\$	-	\$	-	
Utilities											
		Lump Sum	N/A		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	See separate calculations
Structures											
	1292.5		\$	150.00	\$	193,875					Estimate for simple bridges
	375	SF	\$	15.00	\$	5,625					Estimate for bridge removal
		Total					\$	199,500	\$	200,000	
Railroad Cros											
		Each	\$	50,000.00		-					common equipment
		FT	\$	200.00	\$	-					per foot runaround
		SF	\$	70.00	\$	-			I		vehicular bridge
		SF	\$	200.00	\$	-					RR bridge
	-	LF	\$	200.00	\$	-					at grade pad
	0	Each	\$	50,000.00	\$	-					gates and signals
		Total					\$	-	\$	-	

Item	Quantity	Unit	20 1	1 Unit Cost	S	ub-Total	То	tal Cost	Ro	unded Cost	Description/Quantity Calculation
Paving											
	0	SF	\$	5.96	\$	-					arterial street asphalt paving - see separate calcs
	5600		\$	3.51	\$	19,654					local street asphalt paving - see separate calcs
		SF	\$	7.44	\$	-					concrete ramp - see separate calcs
		SF	\$	3.17	\$	-					arterial and ramp asphalt shoulder - see separate calcs
		SF	\$	1.94	\$	-					local street shoulder - see separate calcs
		SF	\$	1.24	\$	-					city street overlay - see separate calcs
406-04.02		SY	\$	27.20	\$	-					High friction surface treatment
401-01.02	0	SY	\$	0.95	\$	-					Cold planing (milling) asphalt pavement
		-15% Factor			\$	-					Widening Reduction Factor (if widening, cost = 85% of total paving)
		Total					\$	19,654	\$	20,000	Note: Doubled due to grade change and extra pavement for the lifts.
Roadway and	Pavement	t Appurtenan	ces								
701-01.01	0	SF	\$	2.71	\$	-					4" Sidewalks
702-03	0	FT	\$	189.72	\$						Curb and Gutter concrete cost, 0.06409 CY/LF (DWG RP-
702-03			φ	109.72	φ	-					NMC-10) Unit price in CY
202-03		SY	\$	4.41	\$	-					Removal of Sidewalk
202-08.1	-	LF	\$	2.62	\$	-					Removal of Curb
604-01.01		CY	\$	345.62	\$	-					4" Island
701-02.01	0	SF	\$	16.38	\$	-					Handicap Ramp (Retrofit)
							\$	-	\$	-	
Retaining Wa											
	0	SF					\$	-	\$	-	See pg 41-42 TDOT Retaining Structures Manual
Maintenance											
	1	Each	\$	25,000.00			\$	25,000	\$	25,000	Estimate \$25,000 per existing road crossed
Topsoil											
203-07	0	CY	\$	14.48			\$	-	\$	-	
Seeding											
801-01	0	SF	\$	22.68			\$	-	\$	-	sq. ft to be seeded/1000 x 1.25 = units. Unit price in units

Item	Quantity	Unit	2011	Unit Cost	Sub-	Total	Tot	al Cost	Rour	nded Cost	Description/Quantity Calculation
Sodding											
803-01	0	SY	\$	2.08			\$	-	\$	-	
Signing											
		Mile	\$	2,000.00	\$ 32,0	00.00					\$1000/mile rural or \$2000/mile urban (or \$250/sign for
713-13.02		SF	\$	11.62	\$	-					0.08" Sheeting
713-13.03	-	SF	\$	12.79	\$	-					0.10" Sheeting
713-11.01		LB	\$	2.64	\$	-					"U" Post
713-11.02		LB	\$	3.94	\$	-					"P" Post
713-02.21		LF	\$	4.74	\$	-					Sign post delineation enhancement
713-15.02	0	Each	\$	20.57	\$	-					Remove Existing Signs
							\$	32,000	\$	32,000	
Pavement Ma											
716-13.06		L.M.	\$	1,687.17	\$	-					Edgelines & Centerlines, Spray Thermo 40 mil (4")
716-13.06		L.M.	\$	2,030.80	\$	-					Edgelines & Centerlines, Spray Thermo 60 mil (4")
716-12.01		L.M.	\$	3,274.92	\$	-					Edgelines & Centerlines, Enhanced Flatline Thermo (4")
716-02.05		LF	\$	10.94	\$	-					Stop Lines
716-13.04		LM	\$	2.01	\$	-					4" Dotted Line (Spray Thermo 60 mil)
716-14.01		L.M.			\$	-					Profiled Thermo Audible
716-02.13		SF	\$	9.50	\$	-					Crosswalk
716-02.06		Each	\$	132.99	\$	-					Turn Lane Arrow
716-01.21		Each	\$	25.31	\$	-					Snowplowable Markers (bi-direction)
716-01.22		Each	\$	27.38	\$	-					Snowplowable Markers (mono-direction)
713-02.14		Each	\$	31.22	\$	-					Flexible Delineator (white)
713-02.20		SF	\$	14.00	\$	-					Roadside Obstacle Delineation
713-02.21	0	Each			\$	-					Delineation of Utility Poles
							\$	-	\$	-	
Lighting											
714-08.09	0	Each	\$	7,768.86			\$	-	\$	-	
Signalization											
	0	Each	\$	100,000.00			\$	-	\$	-	per signalized intersesction
Fence											
707-01.11	0	LF	\$	8.57			\$	-	\$	-	Chain Link 6'

Item	Quantity	Unit	201 ²	I Unit Cost	Su	b-Total	Tot	al Cost	Rou	unded Cost	Description/Quantity Calculation
Guardrail	Juardrail										
705-02.02	75	LF	\$	16.11	\$	1,208					Guardrail (End Terminals Not Included in Price)
705-04.07	0	Each	\$	2,119.59	\$	-					Guardrail Terminal (Type 38)
705-04.09	0	Each	\$	1,055.94	\$	-					Type 38 Earth Pad
705-11.09	4	Each	\$	1,200.00	\$	4,800					Guardrail Terminal (Type 21)
705-04.04	0	Each	\$	1,982.61	\$	-					Guardrail Terminal (Type In Line)
706-01	0	LF	\$	1.29	\$	-					Guardrail Removed
711-05.70	0	LF	\$	69.45	\$	-					Median Barrier (single slope concrete barrier wall)
705-04.21	0	LF	\$	4.59	\$	-					Guardrail Delineation Enhancement
		Total					\$	6,008	\$	6,000	
Rip Rap or Slo	ope Protec	tion									
709-05.06	0	Ton	\$	24.43			\$	-	\$	-	1.5 ft deep, 1.75 Tons/CY
Total:									\$	301,000	



STATE OF TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-0350

MEMORANDUM

To:	Project Planning Division
From:	Jonathan Storey, PE The Corradino Group
Date:	October 19, 2012

Subject: TPR Field Review (Special Bridge Replacement Program) Double Branch Rd. (0A222) Bridge over Double Branch Log Mile 8.62, Bridge ID 910A2220009 Wayne County, TN PIN 103985.01

A field review was held for the above referenced project on July 5, 2012. Those in attendance included:

Name	Agency	Phone	E-mail
Glenda Tyus	TDOT Planning	615-741-1816	Glenda.Tyus@tn.gov
Lisa Reaney	TDOT Planning	615-741-0967	Lisa.Reaney@tn.gov
Casey Pounders	TDOT R.O.W.	615-350-4214	Casey.Pounders@tn.gov
Scott Johnson	TDOT Design	615-350-4263	Scott.Johnson@tn.gov
David Duncan	TDOT Planning	615-532-6131	David.A.Duncan@tn.gov
Terry Arnold	TDOT Design	615-350-4274	Terry.Arnold@tn.gov
Richard Sullivan	The Corradino Group	615-372-6972	rsullivan@corradino.com
Jonathan Storey	The Corradino Group	615-372-6972	jstorey@corradino.com

The existing structure consists of a single span steel girder bridge with a single lane wood deck. The overall bridge length is thirty (30) feet with approximately six-foot six-inches (6'6") for the vertical clearance. The out-to-out bridge width is twelve-foot five-inches (12'5"). The sufficiency rating for this bridge is 19.6. The 10-year and 100-year discharges and depths of flow for the drainage basin were determined using the appropriate

regression equations. It was determined that the 10-year flow depth is 6.8 feet and the 100-year flow depth is 9.3 feet. Both of these depths are higher than the available vertical clearance of 6' 6".

The proposed alignment for this structure will remain on the existing centerline and will be designed to meet the TDOT design standard RD01-TS-1A for a Design Speed of 30 miles per hour with no posted speed limit along Double Branch Road, which is a single lane gravel road. As per TDOT Hydraulic Design Section recommendations, the grade will be increased approximately two (2) feet to better accommodate the design-year flows.

The Wayne County Highway Superintendent, Mr. Billy Martin, was contacted to discuss maintenance of traffic and construction methodology. It is recommended to utilize a prefabricated bridge with a short-duration detour at this location to minimize construction time and cost. The Wayne County Highway Department approved a temporary road closure in order to utilize a pre-fabricated bridge. Although no markers were located in the vicinity of the bridge, a fiber optic line runs adjacent to Double Branch Road. Due to the potential conflicts with the fiber optic line and added right-of-way and construction cost, it is not desired to utilize a temporary runaround or shifted alignment. The existing bridge is too narrow to utilize phased construction. Because of the presence of a lowwater crossing west of this bridge location, it is not recommended to close the road for a long period of time. The low-water crossing is a concrete lined stream bottom along Double Branch Road. Properties between the closed bridge location and the low-water crossing would not be accessible during a heavy rain event. The bridge and approaches should be constructed during the summer or when heavy rainfalls are less frequent. Acceptable detour routes utilizing Tie Camp Road, State Route 13, Little Shawntee Creek Road, Big Shawntee Creek Road, and Factors Fork Road are available. The length of detour will be dependent upon the origin and destination of the motorist. However, it is estimated that the maximum detour length is fifteen (15) miles.

Double Branch Road has a base year (2016) AADT of 80 vehicles per day (vpd) and a design year (2036) AADT of 100 vpd. On a site visit, the majority of vehicles observed were logging trucks. The bridge over Double Branch will consist of an out-to-out width of twenty-three and a half (23.5) feet to accommodate a proposed approach roadway width of eighteen (18) feet, as specified in Standard Drawing RD01-TS1A for a rural local road. Because Double Branch Road is a single lane gravel road, it is not recommended to provide lane delineation pavement markings on the bridge or the proposed paved approaches. On both approaches of the bridge, the roadway will transition to match the existing twelve (12)-foot roadway cross section. The proposed structure is a fifty-five (55)-foot long single span bridge. Based on the regression equations, the 100-year flow depth of 9.3 feet will overtop the proposed structure. However, if this were to occur the entire surrounding roadway and area around the bridge would be overtopped as well. Approximately 0.05 acres of right-of-way will be acquired due to the increase in roadway width and grade.

The required approach work, estimated replacement, and preliminary engineering costs for this bridge are approximately \$435,000. Wayne County will be responsible for matching funds of twenty percent (20%), which is equal to approximately \$87,000.

JHS

cc: file

CHECK LIST OF DETERMINANTS FOR LOCATION STUDY

If any of the following facilities or ESE categories are located within the project area or corridor, place an "x" in the blank opposite the item. Where more than one alternate is to be considered, place its letter designation in the blank.

1.	Agricultural land usage								
2.									
2. 3.		Airport (existing or proposed)							
_	-	Commercial area, shopping center							
4. -		•							
5.		ested land			<u> </u>				
6.			or natural landmark						
7.	-	ustrial park, fact	•						
8.	Inst	titutional usages							
	a.		r educational institution						
	b.		r religious institution (Cemetery)						
	C.	Hospital or othe	er medical facility						
	d.	Public building	, e.g., fire station						
	e.	Defense install	ation						
9.	Recreation usages								
	a.	Park or recreat	tional area						
	b.	Game preserve	e or wildlife area						
10.	Re	sidential establis	shment		Х				
11.	Urb	an area, town, o	city, or community						
12.	. Wa	iterway, lake, po	ond, river, stream, spring		Х				
	Per	mit required:	Coast Guard						
			Section 404	Х					
			TVA Section 26a review						
			NPDES	X					
			Aquatic Resource Alteration	X					
13.	. Oth	ner							
14.	Loc	ation coordinate	ed with local officials		X				
15.	Rai	Iroad crossings							
16.	16. Hazardous materials site								
1									

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PLANNING DIVISION

PROJECT NO.:	99109-145	3-04	ROUTE: CITY:	Double Branch Road				
COUNTY:	Wayne			Collinwood				
PROJECT PIN N PROJECT DESC								
	RIPTION:	Bridge over Double Branch on Double Branch Road						
		L.M. 6.61						

TEMENT DESIGN

DIVISION REQUESTING:

MAINTENANCE PLANNING PROG. DEVELOPMENT & ADM. PUBLIC TRANS. & AERO. YEAR PROJECT PROGRAMMED FOR C	STRUCTURES Image: Structures SURVEY & DESIGN Image: Structures TRAFFIC SIGNAL DESIGN Image: Structures OTHER Image: Structures FONSTRUCTION: Image: Structures
PROJECTED LETTING DATE:	

TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT:


BASE YEAR		DESIGN YEAR					DESIGN ROADWAY % TRUCKS		DESIGN AVERAGE DAILY LOADS	
AADT	YEAR	AADT	DHV	%	YEAR	DIR.DIST.	DHV	AADT	FLEX	RIGID
80	2016	100	14	14	2036	65-35	1	2		


REQUESTED BY:	NAME	Glenda Tyus	DATE 5/10/12
	DIVISION	Project Planing	
	ADDRESS	10th Floor, JKP Bldg	
		Nashville, TN 37243	
REVIEWED BY:	TONY ARMS	TATION MANAGER 1	DATE 5-14-12
	SUITE 1000,	JAMES K. POLK BUILDING	
APPROVED BY:	DUDLEY DA	ANIEL ANA EL	DATE 15 Ng 12
		JAMES K. POLK BUILDING	

COMMENTS:

This Traffic is based on 1999 Bridge Count from ADAM. The Future Traffic Count is based on the Growth Rate from the ADAM Computer Program.


DHV'S ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR SIDE ROADS LESS THAN 1000 AADT. NOTE: FOR BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECTS, ADLS ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR ADTS OF 1000 OR LESS AND PERCENTAGE OF TRUCKS OF 7% OR LESS. SEE ATTACHMENTS FOR TURNING MOVEMENTS AND/OR OTHER DETAILS. (REV. 4/10/12)






SITE INSPECTION	
INSPECTION MADE BY: <u>Jon Storey</u> BRIDGE ID: <u>910A22</u> Date: 6/30/12 Route Name: Double Branch Rd. (0A222) Stream Name	220009 COUNTY: <u>Wayne</u> e: Double Branch @ L.M. 8.62
CHANNEL	
Approx depth and width of channel: Horizontal: Vertical:	
Depth of normal flow: 1' In Reservoir: Yes No	
Depth of Ordinary High Water: 1'	
Type of material in stream bed: Gravel	
Type of vegetation on banks: Trees, Bushes	
"N" factor of the channel: 0.035	
Are channel banks stable: 🔽 Yes 🔲 No	
If the streambed is gravel: $D_{30} = \ _ D_{85} = \$	
Skew of the channel with the roadway: 75 °	Channel Shape Sketch
FLOODPLAIN	
Is the skew same as the channel? Ves 🔽 No	
Is it symmetrical about the channel? 🗹 Yes 🛛 🗖 No	
Type of vegetation in the floodplain and "N" factors	
Left U.S.: <u>Woods (0.150)</u> Right U.S.: <u>Woods (0.150)</u>	
Left D.S.: Woods (0.150) Right D.S.: Woods (0.150) Are roadway approaches lower than the structure? Ves V No	
Are roadway approaches lower than the structure? Yes No Are there any buildings in the floodplain? Yes No	
Approx. floor elevations: 735	
Flood information from local residents:	
(elevations & dates)	Floodplain Sketch
EXISTING STRUCTURE	
	No. of lanes: 1 Skew: 75 °
Width (out to out): 12'5" Width (curb to curb): 11'1"	Approach: Daved graveled
Sidewalks on Structure: Yes Vood No Bridgerail type: Wood	Bridgerail height = 6"
Superstructure depth: <u>2'1"</u> Finished Grade to low girder = <u>1'3"</u>	Girder depth = 12"
Are any substructures in the channel? The Section Test Test Test Test Test Test Test Test	Vertical Clearance= 6'6"
Indications of overtopping: No	
High water marks: None observed, drought condit	
Local scour: Ves, Any signs of stream Aggradation or degradation? <u>None</u>	I No
Any drift or drift potential?	No
Any obstructions (pipes,stock fences,etc.)? None observed	
PROPOSED STRUCTURE	
Replacement Rehabilitate Widening	New Location
	t: Single Span Skew: 75 °
): <u>30</u> ADT (2036) = 100
Proposed grade: Same Proposed alignment:	Same
Method of maintaining traffic: 🛛 Stage construction 🗖 On site detour 🗖 Clo	se road 🛛 🗖 Shift Centerline
Cost of proposed Structure: \$150 per ft ² X 55 / 23.5 length (ft) / widt	
Cost of bridge removal: <u>\$15</u> per ft ² X <u>30</u> / <u>12.5</u> length (ft) / widt	
Detour structure: Type and size = Temporary road closure	Cost = \$25,000
Total Structure Cost - \$224 500	
Total Structure Cost = <u>\$224,500</u>	

Bridge TPR Flow Calculations For Hydrologic Area 2 Area > 300 Acres			
County: <u>Wayne</u> Bridge ID: <u>910A2220009</u> Route: Double Branch Rd. (0A222)	By: <u>JHS</u> Date: <u>6/30/12</u> PIN: 103985.01		
Feature Crossed: <u>Double Branch</u> Log Mile: <u>8.62</u>			
<u>DRAINAGE BASIN</u> Measurement from quad =	2,266 acres		
Contributing Drainage Area, CDA = acres/640 =	3.54 sq. mi.		
USGS REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR FLOW Q ₂ = 207(CDA)^0.725 =	518 cfs		
$Q_5 = 344(CDA)^{0.715} =$	849 cfs		
$Q_{10} = 444(CDA)^{-0.711} =$	1,091 cfs		
$Q_{25} = 578(CDA)^{0.708} =$	1,415 cfs		
$Q_{50} = 682(CDA)^{0.706} =$	1,665 cfs		
$Q_{100} = 788(CDA)^{0.705} =$	1,921 cfs		
DEPTH OF FLOW EQUATIONS			
10-Year Flood Depth = 5.33(CDA)^0.197 =	6.8 ft		
100-Year Flood Depth = 7.43(CDA)^0.181 =	9.3 ft		
AREAS			
Existing Area Below Low Chord =	195 ft ²		
Proposed Area Below Low Chord =	340 ft ²		
Proposed 10-Year Flood Area, $A_{10} =$	280 ft ²		
Proposed 100-Year Flood Area, $A_{100} =$	340 ft ²		
<u>VELOCITIES</u>			
Proposed 10-Year Flood Velocity, $V_{10} = Q_{10}/A_{10} =$	3.9 fps		
Proposed 100-Year Flood Velocity, $V_{100} = Q_{100}/A_{100} =$	5.7 fps		







BRIDGE NUMBER



INLET SIDE LOOKING NORTH TOWARDS THE BRIDGE



INLET SIDE LOOKING SOUTH AWAY FROM THE BRIDGE



OUTLET SIDE LOOKING SOUTH TOWARDS THE BRIDGE



OUTLET SIDE LOOKING NORTH AWAY FROM THE BRIDGE



WEST APPROACH LOOKING EAST TOWARDS THE BRIDGE



WEST APPROACH LOOKING WEST AWAY FROM THE BRIDGE



EAST APPROACH LOOKING WEST TOWARDS THE BRIDGE



EAST APPROACH LOOKING EAST AWAY FROM THE BRIDGE



WEIGHT LIMIT SIGN