GEOTECHNICAL UNIT FIELD SCOUR REPORT

PROJECT: 32589.1.1 ID: B-1303 COUNTY: Northampton
DESCRIPTION(1): Bridge No. 76 over the Roanoke River Overflow on US 258 SW of Rich Square at -L-
Station 18+81.0
INFORMATION ON EXISTING BRIDGE ✓ field inspection Information obtained from: ☐ microfilm (Reel:Pos:) Other:
BR. NO.: 76 BR. LENGTH: 100 NO. BENTS: 6 NO. BENTS IN: CHANNEL: 4 FLOODPLAIN: 2
FOUNDATION TYPE: Concrete Piles
EVIDENCE OF SCOUR(2): ABUTMENTS OR END BENT SLOPES: None noted
INTERIOR BENTS: None noted
CHANNEL BED: None noted
CHANNEL BANKS: None noted
EXISTING SCOUR PROTECTION:
TYPE(3): Concrete end walls and wing walls
EXTENT(4):Approximately 20' outside of existing edge of bridge
EFFECTIVENESS(5): Appear satisfactory
OBSTRUCTIONS(6) (DAMS,DEBRIS,ETC.): None noted
DESIGN INFORMATION
CHANNEL BED MATERIAL(7): Soft silty and sandy clay (SS-12, SS-21)
CHANNEL BANK MATERIAL(8): Medium stiff clayey silt (SS-4) and silty sandy clay (SS-26)
CHANNEL BANK COVER(9): Grasses, shrubs and trees
FLOOD PLAIN WIDTH(10): From north end of bridge south approximately 3.5 miles to the Roanoke River
FLOOD PLAIN COVER(11): Mostly hardwoods

SHEET 8 OF 10

DESIGN INFORMATION CONT.
STREAM IS: DEGRADINGX_ AGGRADING (12)
OTHER OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS:
CHANNEL MIGRATION TENDENCY (13): Mirgration tendency is highly unlikely
GEOTECHNICALLY ADJUSTED SCOUR ELEVATIONS(14):
This is not an active channel and does not appear to have received any significant flow over the
past 25 to 50 years based on the size of trees adjacent to and in the area of the channel. No
significant scour is anticipated at this site.
REPORTED BY: Kens B Mills DATE: 9/9/04
Kevin B. Miller

INSTRUCTIONS

- (1) GIVE THE DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIFIC SITE, INCLUDING ROUTE NUMBER AND BODY OF WATER CROSSED.
- (2) NOTE ANY EVIDENCE OF SCOUR AT THE EXISTING END BENTS OR ABUTMENTS (UNDERMINING, SLOUGHING, SCOUR LOCATIONS, DEGRADATIONS, ETC.)
- (3) NOTE ANY EXISTING SCOUR PROTECTION (RIR RAP, ETC.)
- (4) DESCRIBE THE EXTENT OF ANY EXISTING SCOUR PROTECTION.
- DESCRIBE WHETHER OR NOT THE SCOUR PROTECTION APPEARS TO BE WORKING.
- NOTE ANY DAMS, FALLEN TREES, DEBRIS AT BENTS, ETC.
- (7) DESCRIBE THE CHANNEL BED MATERIAL BASED ON OBSERVATION AND/OR SAMPLES.
- (8) DESCRIBE THE CHANNEL BANK MATERIAL BASED ON OBSERVATION AND/OR SAMPLES.
- DESCRIBE THE BANK COVERING (GRASS, TREES, RIP RAP, NONE, ETC.)
- 10) GIVE THE APPROXIMATE FLOOD PLAIN WIDTH (ESTIMATE).
- (11) DESCRIBE THE FLOOD PLAIN COVERING (GRASS, TREES, CROPS, ETC.)
- (12) CHECK THE APPROPRIATE SPACE AS TO WHETHER THE STREAM IS DEGRADING OR AGGRADING.
- (13) DESCRIBE THE POTENTIAL OF THE BODY OF WATER TO MIGRATE LATERALLY DURING THE LIFE OF THE BRIDGE (APPROXIMATELY 100 YEARS).
- (14) GIVE THE GEOTECHNICALLY ADJUSTED SCOUR ELEVATION EXPECTED OVER THE LIFE OF THE BRIDGE (APPROXIMATELY 100 YEARS). THIS CAN BE GIVEN AS AN ELEVATION RANGE ACROSS THE SITE, OR ON A BENT BY BENT BASIS WHERE VARIATIONS EXIST. DISCUSS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HYDRAULICS THEORETICAL SCOUR AND THE GEOTECHNICALLY ADJUSTED SCOUR ELEVATION. IF THE GEOTECHNICALLY ADJUSTED SCOUR ELEVATION IS DEPENDENT ON SCOUR COUNTER MEASURES, EXPLAIN. (RIPRAP ARMORING ON SLOPES, ETC.) THE GEOTECHNICALLY ADJUSTED SCOUR ELEVATION IS BASED ON THE ERODABILITY OF MATERIALS WITH CONSIDERATION FOR JOINTING, FOLIATION, BEDDING ORIENTATION AND FREQUENCY, CORE RECOVERY PERCENTAGE, PERCENTAGE RQD, DIFFERENTIAL WEATHERING, SHEAR STRENGTH, OBSERVATIONS AT EXISTING STRUCTURES, OTHER TESTS DEEMED APPROPRIATE, AND OVERALL GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS AT THE SITE.