



HIGHWAY NO S4 4 NAME OF HIGHWAY
STRUCTURE NO COUNTY FRANKLIN TOWN HIGHGATE
PROJECT NO I 89-3(1) LOCATION OVER INTERSTATE

EXISTING STRUCTURE

1 RATED LOADING OF EXISTING STRUCTURE NONE
2 TYPE OF EXISTING STRUCTURE
3 UNDERCLEARANCE ELEVATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURE
4 WHAT DISPOSITION SHOULD BE MADE OF EXISTING STRUCTURE COST OF REMOVAL
5 SHOULD EXISTING STRUCTURE BE USED TO MAINTAIN TRAFFIC DURING CONSTRUCTION OF NEW STRUCTURE
6 SHOULD NEW TEMPORARY STRUCTURE BE BUILT
7 ORDINARY HIGH WATER SURFACE ELEV. AT EXISTING STRUCTURE WATERWAY TO ORDINARY H.W.
8 EXTREME HIGH WATER AT EXISTING STRUCTURE
9 SPAN OF EXISTING BRIDGE UPSTREAM WATERWAY TO EXTREME H.W.
SPAN OF EXISTING BRIDGE DOWNSTREAM WATERWAY TO EXTREME H.W.
10 TYPE OF FOUNDATION UNDER EXISTING ABUTMENTS
11 DOES ALL WATER AT FLOOD ELEVATION PASS THROUGH EXISTING STRUCTURE
12 IF NOT AT WHAT ELEVATION IS RELIEF AFFORDED
13 ADDITIONAL WATERWAY AREA PROVIDED

NEW STRUCTURE

1 RECOMMENDED TYPE OF STRUCTURE WF COMPOSITE 49.67, 54, 64.89
2 RECOMMENDED CLEAR SPAN OR SPANS
MEASURED PARALLEL TO ℄ NEW HIGHWAY 44.84, 44.84, 44.84, 44.84, 44.84
MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES TO ℄ STREAM 43.01, 43.29, 43.29, 43.50, 43.03
3 ARE THERE OBJECTIONS TO A PIER IN THE STREAM, ANSWER YES OR NO
4 ORDINARY HIGH WATER ELEVATION AT NEW STRUCTURE
5 EXTREME HIGH WATER ELEVATION AT NEW STRUCTURE SOURCE OF INFORMATION
6 IS ALL WATER INTENDED TO PASS THROUGH NEW STRUCTURE?
7 DOES STREAM REACH ITS MAXIMUM HIGH WATER ELEVATION RAPIDLY? IS ORDINARY RISE RAPID?
8 LOW WATER ELEVATION AT NEW STRUCTURE
9 DRAINAGE AREA IN ACRES ABOVE STRUCTURE CHARACTER OF TERRAINE
10 IS STREAM EVER DRY?
11 VELOCITY OF STREAM AT HIGH WATER STAGE ESTIMATED DISCHARGE
12 AREA FULL OPENING AREA BELOW ORDINARY H.W.
13 CHARACTER OF SCOUR DRIFT ICE
14 ESTIMATED DRAINAGE AREA ABOVE NATURAL OR ARTIFICIAL STORAGE
15 VERTICAL CLEARANCE ABOVE FLOOD ELEVATION
16 ARE SIDEWALKS REQUIRED, IF SO ON WHAT SIDE NO BOTH SIDES
17 RECOMMENDED TYPE OF PAVEMENT BITUMINOUS CONCRETE
18 TRAFFIC TO BE MAINTAINED UNDER ITEM NO. ONE OR TWO WAYS PROBABLE COST
19 PROBABLE COST OF CLEARING AND GRUBBING STREAM CHANNEL AT STRUCTURE SITE
20 SHOULD PROVISIONS BE MADE FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES? NO
21 ESTIMATED ALLOWABLE LOAD ON FOUNDATIONS 45 TONS SHOULD PILES BE USED? YES EST. LGTH. NA

FOUNDATION INFORMATION

OBTAINED FOR DESIGN PURPOSES ONLY, AND THE STATE ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY WHATSOEVER FOR THE SUFFICIENCY OR ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION SHOWN. BOULDERS MAY BE ENCOUNTERED AT ANY PIER OR ABUTMENT LOCATION.

FOR BORINGS SEE BORING SHEET

MILTON-HIGHGATE
IM MEMB(26)

SHEET 62 OF 70
BRIDGE 99
FOR REFERENCE ONLY

STATE OF VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS
S4-OVERPASS IN THE TOWNS OF
MILTON-HIGHGATE
ROUTE NO I 89 STA NB 783+60
NORTHBOUND CONSTRUCTION
PRELIMINARY INFORMATION SHEET
SURVEYED BY J.V. DRAWN BY J.V. | CHECKED BY IN CHARGE | SCALE DATE
PROJECT NO I 89-3(1) SHEET 62 OF 246

CORRECT 12/19/97 BRIDGE ENGINEER
APPROVED CHIEF ENGINEER
BR501