

# Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Scour and Erosion (ICSE-10)

October 18-21, 2021  
Virtual



Editors:  
John Rice,  
Xiaofeng Liu,  
Inthuorn Sasanakul,  
Martin McIlroy,  
Ming Xiao

International Society of Soil Mechanics  
and Geotechnical Engineering  
Geo-Institute of American Society of Civil Engineers

## Foreword

The Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Scour and Erosion (ICSE-10) are a combination of the products of recent achievements by the geotechnical and hydraulic engineering communities, who meet biennially to share new findings on understanding, evaluating, and remediating scour and erosion. While celebrating such achievements, we have even more reasons to be thankful for the resilience of the international community in these challenging times. After the successful ICSE-5 in San Francisco in 2010, we anticipated the return of the ICSE to the United States in the beautiful fall of the Washington, D.C. area in 2020. Yet, we made the difficult decision to postpone the conference by one year and another difficult decision to hold the ICSE-10 entirely online for the first time. It is indeed with excitement and heart-felt appreciation to see the occurrence of the virtual ICSE-10 on October 18 to 21, 2021 after five years of preparation since the ISSMGE Technical Committee on Scour and Erosion awarded us the privilege of organizing the conference.

The ICSE-10 proceedings include 137 full papers and 5 abstracts of keynote lectures. Each paper was peer-reviewed by two reviewers. The publications cover fourteen broad topics in scour and erosion from fundamental research to full-scale applications. The topics include: mechanics of internal erosion; sediment transport: grain scale and continuum scale; effects of geology on internal erosion; rock scour; erosion and structures; river, coastal, estuarine and marine scour and erosion; numerical modelling of scour and erosion; physical modelling of scour and erosion; erosion monitoring and measurement; scour and erosion countermeasures and mitigation; geo-hazards induced by scour and internal erosion; erosion risk assessment; case histories, lessons learned, and general practice; and impact and adaptation: flooding, drought, and scour in a changing climate. They represent the state of the art and the state of the practice of scour and erosion and the most recent achievements by researchers, practitioners, policy makers, and the general public. The ICSE-10 proceedings are entirely open-access; the authors own the copyright of their publications. Thus, it is expected these achievements will be shared with and benefit a broad, international audience.

Many individuals and organizations have supported the ICSE-10 in many ways. The International Scientific Committee members and the National Scientific Committee members of ICSE-10 guided and directly participated in the conference preparation, decision making, technical paper reviews, and organizing conference technical sessions. The ICSE-10 is under the auspices of the International Society of Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering (ISSMGE) Technical Committee on Scour and Erosion (TC-213), that is chaired by Professor Shinji Sassa. The conference is organized and sponsored by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Geo-Institute. We particularly thank Geo-Institute Director, Mr. Brad Keelor, and the staff members, Lucy King, Erin Harrover, and Barbara Curtis, and the Geo-Institute Presidents, Drs. Youssef Hashash, Patrick Fox, and James Collin for supporting the conference.

Ming Xiao, ICSE-10 Chair  
On behalf of the ICSE-10 Organizing Committee  
University Park, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

### **ICSE-10 International Scientific Committee**

George Annandale (USA), Catherine Avila (USA, ICSE-5 Chair), Vera van Beek (The Netherlands), Erik Bollaert (Switzerland), Rodney Bridle (UK), Jean-Louis Briaud (USA, ICSE-1 Chair), Liang Cheng (Australia, ICSE-7 Chair), Christophe Chevalier (France, ICSE-6 co-Chair), Yee Meng Chiew (Singapore, ICSE-2 Chair), Scott Draper (Australia, ICSE-7 Chair), Robin Fell (Australia), Jean-Jacques Fry (France, ICSE-6 Chair), John Harris (UK, ICSE-8 co-Chair), Gijs Hoffmans (The Netherlands, ICSE-3 Chair), Beatrice Hunt (ICSE-5 co-Chair), Jan Kayser (Germany), Bruce Melville (New Zealand), Antonio Miglio (Italy), Catherine O'Sullivan (UK), Esther Rosenbrand (The Netherlands), Shinji Sassa (Japan, TC-213 Chair), Hideo Sekiguchi (ICSE-4 Chair), Adnan Suffian (Australia), Mutlu Sumer (Turkey), Richard Whitehouse (UK, ICSE-8 co-Chair).

### **ICSE-10 National Scientific Committee**

Catherine Avila, Jean-Louis Briaud, Hande Gerkus, Beatrice Hunt, Ningjun Jiang, Andreas Kammereck, Andrew Keffer, Kornel Kerényi, Stacey Kulesza, Yong Lai, Xiaofeng Liu, Martin McIlroy, Jennifer Nicks, Thanos Papanicolaou, John Rice, Bryant Robbins, Inthuorn Sasanakul, Nina Stark, Junliang Tao, Joe Tom, Ming Zhu.

### **ICSE-10 Organizing Committee**

Chair: Ming Xiao

Co-Chair: Peggy Johnson

Technical Committee Chair: John Rice

Technical Committee Vice-Chair: Xiaofeng Liu

Publications Committee: John Rice; Martin McIlroy; Xiaofeng Liu; Inthuorn Sasanakul; Ming Xiao

Local Committee Co-Chairs: Jennifer Nicks; Martin McIlroy

Sponsorship & Exhibits Co-Chairs: Hande Gerkus; Ming Zhu

Special Consultants: Catherine Avila; Beatrice Hunt; Jean-Louis Briaud

## Table of Contents

### Keynotes

History and future of backward erosion research .....	1
<i>John Rice; Vera van Beek; Adam Bezuijen</i>	
Erosion Testing, Simulations, and Applications .....	24
<i>Briaud J.-L.; Shidlovskaya A.V.; Bahmani M.</i>	
Mechanics and Countermeasures of Scour and Internal Erosion: Wave/Tsunami-Seabed-Structure Interaction from Geotechnical and Hydrodynamic Perspectives .....	26
<i>Shinji Sassa</i>	
Do Your Rock Scour DIGIT@L ? .....	27
<i>Erik Bollaert</i>	
Geosynthetic-Enhanced Erosion and Sediment Control Systems .....	28
<i>Sam Allen</i>	
Scour – A FHWA Perspective .....	29
<i>Hari Kalla</i>	

### Track A: Mechanics of Internal Erosion

Observation of progressive internal erosion in soils using X-ray CT scanner .....	30
<i>Shintaro Nohara</i>	
Parallel flow contact erosion test between coarse sand and silty clay layer .....	40
<i>Pradeep Pokhrel; Jiro Kuwano</i>	
Influence of Rate of Hydraulic Gradient on Washed-out Soil Mass Due to Perpendicular Contact Erosion or Poor Filter Design .....	50
<i>Peter To; Peter Price</i>	
Effect of gap-grading ratio on suffusion susceptibility of fine grained soil .....	59
<i>Mohamad Oueidat; Ahmed Benamar; Abdelkrim Bennabi</i>	
Numerical simulation of a large-scale backward erosion piping experiment in 2D and in 3D .....	70
<i>Esther Rosenbrand; Vera van Beek</i>	
Experimental Study on Internal Instability of Dike Foundation Soil and Its Impact on Mechanical Response .....	83
<i>Jitrakon Prasomsri; Akihiro Takahashi</i>	
Progression Rate of Backward Erosion Piping: Small Scale Experiments .....	93
<i>J.C. Pol; W. van Klaveren; W. Kanning; V.M. van Beek; Bryant Robbins; S.N. Jonkman</i>	
Suffusion Assessment Methods: A Critical Review .....	103
<i>Peter To; Alexander Scheuermann</i>	



Effect of Pipe Shape on the Pressure Conditions in the Hole Erosion Test.....	119
<i>Mikhail Bessonov; Thomas Shire</i>	
Detection of Internal Erosion Using Seismic Techniques .....	129
<i>Y. Maalouf; C. Jalekian; E. Geara; N. Houry</i>	
On the Mechanics of Internal Erosion in Cohesionless Soil.....	138
<i>Maoxin Li; Jonathan Fannin</i>	
Backward erosion piping mechanism and its size effect .....	148
<i>Qiuling Yao; Liuqian Ding; Shunfu Zhang; Dongya Sun; Changjun Liu</i>	
Granulometric compatibility between different materials. Interpretation of empirical criteria through micro-mechanical modeling .....	158
<i>Francesco Federico; Chiara Cesali</i>	
Particle Shape Effect on Internal Instability of Cohesionless Soils .....	171
<i>M.Ali Maroof; Ahmad Mahboubi; Ali Noorzad</i>	
On the Mechanism of Backward Erosion Piping in a CSB .....	182
<i>Adam Bezuijen; Sepideh Akrami; Vera van Beek; Esther Rosenbrand</i>	
Pipe Erosion In Laminar Flow .....	192
<i>Gijs Hoffmans</i>	
Modelling Internal Erosion in Gap-Graded Soils using Pore Network Models .....	201
<i>Adnan Sufian; Chris Knight; Catherine O'Sullivan; Berend van Wachem; Daniele Dini</i>	
Fundamentals of Laminar Flow In Pipes .....	210
<i>Gijs Hoffmans</i>	
Onset and Progression of Suffusion in Non-Cohesive Soils Using a Large Co-Axial Erosion Cell .....	219
<i>V. S. Ramakrishna Annapareddy; Therry Bore; Alexander Scheuermann</i>	
<b>Track B: Sediment Transport: Grain Scale and Continuum Scale</b>	
Experimental study on the particle size effect on the strength of calcareous sand .....	227
<i>Li W. L.; Yuan Q.; Gao Y.; Wu Z. Y.; Zhang H. Y.</i>	
Evaluating Sediment Dynamics in Waterways .....	237
<i>Parmeshwar L. Shrestha; Philip J. Shaller; Macan Doroudian; Kristina Cydzik</i>	
<b>Track C: Effects of Geology on Internal Erosion</b>	
Geophysical Investigations in Support of Remediation Design for Stream Avulsion and Scouring Due to Dam Removal.....	251
<i>Mario Carnevale; Katie Decker; Mark Domaracki; Myles Danforth</i>	
Numerical analysis of backward erosion piping for two geological environments in the Netherlands .....	272
<i>Esther Rosenbrand; Ane Wiersma; Aron Noordam; Vera van Beek</i>	

## Track D: Rock Scour

- Guidance on the calculation of stream power dissipation for rock scour assessments ..... 285  
*Steven E. Pells; William L. Peirson; Fanar Al-Qassab*
- Modeling Rock Scour Using Coupled 3D Discrete Element and Lattice Boltzmann Methods..... 293  
*Michael H. Gardner; Nicholas Sitar*

## Track E: Erosion and Structures

- Detecting Dominant Turbulent Flow Structures in the Vicinity of a Longitudinal Wall-Inclined Bank Junction with a Volumetric Particle Image Velocimetry System..... 307  
*Nasser Heydari; Panayiotis Diplas*
- Three-dimensional scour hole development under a plane horizontal jet downstream of a bed protection ..... 317  
*Y. B. Broekema; B. Üşenti; A. Zoon; M. Muttray*
- Experimental Study on Deficiency-induced Contact Erosion Between Cohesionless Soil and Concrete Structure ..... 328  
*Chenghao Chen; Shiang Mei, Yi Tang; Yuhan Li*
- Scour Depth Limit at Bridge Abutments ..... 337  
*Mabel Chedid; Jean-Louis Briaud*
- Two-phase Modelling of Bridge Pier Scour during Flood Event ..... 346  
*Bing Chen*
- Assessment of Bridge Protection Schemes against Scouring and Bed Degradation at the Pasig-Potrero River..... 354  
*Maria Cristelle A. San Antonio; Luigi Christian B. Francisco; Maria Jocelyn B. Jocson; Arian John D. Fruto; Ramon D. Quebral; Roy Anthony C. Luna*
- Abutment Scouring and Erosion Mitigation Measures for a Bridge on an Active Lahar-Draining River Channel: A Case Study of the Pasig-Potrero Bridge..... 369  
*Roy Anthony C. Luna; Ronalie F. Pangyarihan; Rodgie Ello B. Cabungcal; Arlene B. Paulino; Ramon D. Quebral*
- Effects of River Dredging as Mitigation for Lahar Accumulation Downstream of the Santo Tomas River..... 385  
*Anne Jeanette C. De La Rosa; Maria Deandra C. Andal; Ma. Michaela B. Biscocho; Rodgie Ello B. Cabungcal; Maria Jocelyn B. Jocson; Roy Anthony C. Luna; Ramon D. Quebral*
- Investigating failures of flood barriers caused by hurricane storm surge using joint coastal and geotechnical modeling ..... 400  
*Dylan M. Wood; Ethan J. Kubatko; Mehrzad Rahimi; Abdollah Shafieezadeh*
- Scour Considerations within AASHTO LRFD Design Specifications..... 410  
*Kornel Kerenyi; Joseph Krolak; Paul Sharp; Khalid Mohamed*
- Hydraulic Considerations for Shallow Abutment Foundations ..... 424  
*Paul Sharp; Joseph Krolak; Khalid Mohamed; Kornel Kerenyi*

Instituting a Geotechnical Focus for FHWA’s Scour Program .....	434
<i>Khalid Mohamed; Joseph Krolak; Paul Sharp; and Kornel Kerenyi</i>	
Coupled hydraulic and geotechnical analyses to assess the vulnerability of river-crossing bridge piers foundations .....	443
<i>Francesco Federico; Chiara Cesali</i>	
Preliminary Evaluation of Scour Testing Devices and Geotechnical Properties at Five Cohesive Soil Sites .....	454
<i>Jennifer E. Nicks; Haoyin Shan; Daniel Alzamora; Kornel Kerenyi; Chao Huang</i>	
Scour and Scour-Induced Settlement of Cuboid Structures.....	467
<i>Scott Draper; Mathilde Johannsen; Henning Mohr; Joe Tom</i>	
A review of Soils, Structures and Hydraulics: Expertise and Applied Research (SSHEAR) project.....	477
<i>Christophe Chevalier; Frédérique Larrarte; Franziska Schmidt; Hugues Chollet; Edouard Durand; Damien Pham Van Bang; Arnaud Bontemps; Philippe Sergent; Philippe Gondret; Cyprien Morize; Sidoine De La Roque; Mark Cheetham</i>	
Influence of sea water and wetting-drying cycles on the erosion of a lime treated soil: perspectives to marine dike improvement .....	487
<i>Margot De Baecque; Christophe Chevalier; Sergio Palma-Lopes; Reiffsteck Philippe</i>	
Bridge Scour and Geomorphic Analysis for the Replacement of South El Dorado Bridge over Los Gatos (Arroyo Pasajero) Creek in Coalinga, CA .....	497
<i>Holly L. Callahan; Jeff Peters; Catherine M.C. Avila; Mark Imbriani; Mohammad Alimi</i>	
Analysis and Design of Scour Countermeasures for a High-Head Dam Spillway Modification .....	512
<i>Dana W. Moses; Nicholas A. Koutsunis; Brian M. Hall</i>	
Estimating Scour from Tsunami at Bridges.....	526
<i>Steven Lottes; Marta A. Sitek; Chao Huang; Oscar Suaznabar; Kornel Kerenyi; Jerry Shen</i>	
Risk-Informed Levee Erosion Countermeasure Site Selection And Design In The Sacramento Area Part 2: Probabilistic Numerical Simulation Of Bank Erosion.....	537
<i>Todd M. Rivas; Jonathan AuBuchon; Anna Shidlovskaya; Eddy J. Langendoen; Paul Work; Daniel Livsey; Anna Timchenko; Kellie Jemes; Jean-Louis Briaud</i>	
Survey and Analysis of Design Parameters of Waterway-Crossing GRS-IBS Bridges: The State of U.S. Practice .....	547
<i>Ming Xiao; Min Liew; Xiaofeng Liu; Patrick Fox</i>	
Scour Development Around Truncated Cylinders: A Modified Approach .....	558
<i>John M. Harris, Scott Draper, Weidong Yao and Hongwei An</i>	
<b>Track F: River, Coastal, Estuarine and Marine Scour and Erosion</b>	
Prediction of Erosion Rate Based on Soil Properties at Different Flow Velocities Using EFA.....	568
<i>Pradip Adhikari; Abdolreza Osouli</i>	
Combined Acoustic and Geotechnical Scour Measurements at Bridge Piles in the New River, Virginia .....	579
<i>Nina Stark; Dennis Kiptoo; Reem Jaber; Julie Paprocki; Samuel Consolvo</i>	

Geotechnical Investigation of Spatiotemporal Variations at a Sand Beach characterized by Active Erosion and Sediment Remobilization Processes .....	589
<i>Nina Stark; Nicola Brilli</i>	
Effects of Organic Matter and Salinity on Fine-Grained Sediment Erosion.....	599
<i>Stacey E. Kulesza; Malay Ghose Hajra; Mark Mathis; Brittany M. Roberts</i>	
Scour at cofferdam structures on river walls .....	609
<i>Richard J.S. Whitehouse; Elizabeth S. Chellew; John M. Harris; Amelia J. Couldrey</i>	
Preliminary Evaluation of Existing Breaching Erosion Models .....	619
<i>Said Alhaddad; Robert Jan Labeur; Wim Uijtewaal</i>	
Wave Flume Experiment on the Scour Around Cylindrical Structure Considered to Influence Effective Stress Change in the Seabed.....	628
<i>Tatsuya Matsuda; Kinya Miura; Rintaro Takayanagi; Ryoya Makino</i>	
Numerical Modeling of Channel Shoaling and Scour in Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas.....	635
<i>L. Lin, Z. Demirbilek; Mohammad S. Islam</i>	
Integration Of Riverbed Shear Stress And Flow Duration Curves To Determine Stream Bank Full Width .....	647
<i>Chen Li; Kornel Kerenyi; Chao Huang</i>	
Experimental study on scour at circular river-crossing tunnels due to bed degradation.....	657
<i>Hongru Liang; Lu Wang; Ruihua Nie; Xudong Ma; Xingnian Liu</i>	
Scour Development Around Monopile and Jacket Foundations in Silty Sands .....	667
<i>John M. Harris; Richard J.S. Whitehouse</i>	
Do Oyster Colonies Influence Sediment Erodibility? A Hydro-morphodynamic Characterization of Intertidal Estuarine Reefs by Way of Jet Erosion Test and Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler.....	682
<i>Melody Thomas; Joanna Quiah; Celso F. Castro-Bolinaga; Grace Massey; Steve Hall; Nina Stark; and Samuel Consolvo</i>	
Experimental Study On Revet Mattresses In Open Channel Flow: A New Design Approach Against Erosion.....	692
<i>Paolo Di Pietro; Christopher Thornton; Taylor Hogan; Sachin Mandavkar; Nicola Mazzon</i>	
Evaluation of the Potential for Wetland Vegetation to Reduce Coastal Erosion Caused by Receding Water After a Storm Surge .....	702
<i>Mera Shabti; Burak Tanyu</i>	
<b>Track G: Numerical Modelling of Scour and Erosion</b>	
Cherry Creek Pressure Flushing: A 3D Modeling Approach .....	712
<i>Yong G. Lai; Blair P. Greimann</i>	
Geo-hydrodynamics and Erosion Potential of Fine-Grained Cohesive Sediments in Coastal Systems .....	722
<i>Laith Q. Alshamaileh; Malay Ghose Hajra; John A. McCorquodale; Brittany M. Roberts</i>	
Comparison of Shear Stress Magnitudes in Some Erosion Tests by Numerical Simulation.....	732
<i>Bahmani S. M.; Shafii I., Chen H-C.; Briaud J.-L.</i>	

A Methodology for Rapid Computation of Scour with Sediment Transport and Cyclic Remeshing.....	743
<i>Steven A. Lottes; Marta Sitek; Hubert Ley</i>	
Probabilistic Bank Erosion Numerical Simulation For Risk-Informed Erosion Protection Of The Sacramento Area .....	753
<i>Todd M. Rivas; Jonathan S. AuBuchon; Shyamal Chowdhury; Eddy J. Langendoen; Kellie Jemes</i>	
Numerical Modeling of Bank Erosion with SRH-2D for Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico.....	763
<i>Han Sang Kim; Yong G. Lai</i>	
Numerical Simulation of Erosion Lens Formation in 3D Geohydrological Environments .....	773
<i>Vera van Beek; Beatriz de La Loma Gonzalez; Esther Rosenbrand; Aron Noordam; Sieger Burger; John Rice</i>	
Numerical Modeling of Scour around Porous Hydraulic Structures: An Evaluation of the Porosity Model .....	784
<i>Yalan Song; Hassan Ismail; Xiaofeng Liu</i>	
A Coupled MPM-LBM Method for Soil-Water Interactions .....	792
<i>Gengshuo Zhang; Pei Zhang; Alexander Scheuermann</i>	
Numerical Simulation of Incipient Sediment Motion Driven by Fluid Flow .....	799
<i>Tian-Xiong Zhao; Xia Li</i>	
Numerical calculation method for the scouring phenomenon .....	808
<i>Syaoyue Chen; Kohei Suzuki; Taro Arikawa; Masashi Watanabe</i>	
Numerical Modeling of Scour around Mobile Objects with Prescribed Motion .....	818
<i>Yalan Song; Hassan Ismail; Xiaofeng Liu</i>	
Risk-Informed Levee Erosion Countermeasure Site Selection And Design In The Sacramento Area Part 1: Soil Sampling, Testing, And Data Processing.....	825
<i>Todd M. Rivas; Jonathan AuBuchon; Anna Shidlovskaya; Eddy J. Langendoen; Paul Work; Daniel Livsey; Anna Timchenko; Jean-Louis Briaud</i>	
High-fidelity modeling of coupled flow and bed morphodynamics to investigate scour damaged structures in California.....	837
<i>A. Khosronejad; K. Flora</i>	
Vegetation Impacts on Flow and Scour Processes in a Natural River .....	846
<i>Kevin S Flora; Ali Khosronejad</i>	
Hydraulic load decay functions for contraction and abutment scour calculation in fine-grained soils and erodible rocks.....	857
<i>Haoyin Shan; James Pagenkopf; Kornel Kerenyi; Chao Huang</i>	
<b>Track H: Physical Modelling of Scour and Erosion</b>	
Borehole Erosion Test: Some Improvements .....	871
<i>Anna Shidlovskaya; Iman Shafii; Jean-Louis Briaud</i>	



Offshore scour development in non-homogeneous soil with a subsurface non erodible layer.....	882
<i>Natalia Aleksandrova; Hendrik Jan Riezebos; Antonios Emmanouil; Yorick Broekema; Saskia Waßmuth</i>	
Modeling Backwards Erosion Piping Development under Converging Flow Conditions .....	892
<i>Ibrahim Ahmed; Dane Denison; Dr. John Rice; Bryant Robbins</i>	
Wave-induced liquefaction and the stability of suction bucket foundation.....	904
<i>Junji Miyamoto; Shinji Sassa; Kazuhiro Tsurugasaki; Hiroko Sumida</i>	
Turbulent Flow Fields around a Circular Bridge Pier on a Plane Bed.....	914
<i>Dawei Guan; Shengju Jin; Maoxing Wei; Xingyue Huang</i>	
Measurement Techniques for Capturing Piping-induced Deformation of Levees in Centrifuge Model.....	923
<i>Yusaku Ito; Shota Noda; Akihiro Takahashi; Kazuki Horikoshi</i>	
Dynamic Behaviour of a Rock Scour Protection Around Offshore Wind Monopile Foundations.....	931
<i>Baelus L.; Bolle A.</i>	
Model tests on the filter stability of coarse granular filters for revetments .....	941
<i>Jürgen Stein; Oliver Stelzer</i>	
Pore flow velocity measurement in filtration erosion enhanced with PIV technique.....	951
<i>Yingyi Zhang; Adnan Sufian; Alexander Scheuermann</i>	
Experimental Study of Infill Mobility through an Engineered Synthetic Turf Bed.....	960
<i>Hassan Ismail; Ming Xiao; Sajjad Salam; Bryan Scholl; Ming Zhu; Xiaofeng Liu</i>	
Centrifuge Modeling of the Backward Erosion Piping Process.....	969
<i>William Ovalle-Villamil; Inthuorn Sasanakul</i>	
Hydraulic Experiment on Time Varying Scour by Tsunami Overflowing.....	981
<i>Kojiro Suzuki</i>	
Influence of compaction conditions on erodibility of clayey sand .....	991
<i>Yoichi Watabe; Egy Crystal Soesilo; Shinji Sassa</i>	
Estimating seabed shear stress amplification around circular cylinders: an observational method based on laboratory experiments.....	1001
<i>Joe G. Tom; Scott Draper; Weidong Yao</i>	
Experimental investigation on the erosion of vegetated soils by flume tests.....	1014
<i>Gragano C.G.; Domeneghetti A.; Gottardi G.; Guerrero M.; Toth E.</i>	
Post-fire erosion potential of clayey sand soils and slopes – A laboratory study .....	1024
<i>T. Tabassum; B.N. Lingwall; T.V. Bheemasetti; A. Ferris</i>	
Influence of Suffusion on Shear Strength and Dilatancy Characteristics of Pumice Sand.....	1034
<i>Rupali Sarmah; Sho Kubota; Yoichi Watabe</i>	

## Track I: Erosion Monitoring and Measurement

Effect of Fines Content on the Erosion Parameters of Gravelly Mixes .....	1044
<i>Ghada S. Ellithy; John. W. Murphy; Maureen K. Corcoran</i>	
Incorporating Monitoring Information From Satellite Radar Imaging in Levee Internal Erosion Risk Analysis .....	1054
<i>Mehrzad Rahimi; Derek Gupta; Abdollah Shafieezadeh</i>	
Efficient Automated Laboratory Testing of Erosion Resistance for Fine-grained Soils .....	1063
<i>Haoyin Shan; Otto Wiblishauser; Kornel Kerenyi; Michael Uhrig; Chao Huang; James Pagenkopf</i>	
Interaction between seepage and heat transport to detect permeability defects in earthen structures ....	1072
<i>Chiara Cesali; Francesco Federico; Vincenzo Federico</i>	
The ARC-Boat: a remote controlled rapid response scour monitoring platform.....	1083
<i>Peter R. Watchorn; Neil A. Crossouard; Richard J.S. Whitehouse</i>	
A quasi-continuous bathymetry measurement method for dynamic evolution of bed levels around foundation scale models.....	1097
<i>Antonios Emmanouil; Natalia Aleksandrova; Hendrik Jan Riezebos; Greta van Velzen; Tim Raaijmakers</i>	
Can Fiber-Optic Distributed Temperature Sensing Improve Bridge Scour Monitoring? .....	1108
<i>Rebecca Hatley; Celso Castro-Bolinaga; Chadi Sayde; Matthew S. Lauffer; Stephen R. Morgan; Jerry M. Snead</i>	
Theoretical Investigation behind the Development of Geoacoustic Models in Scour Applications.....	1116
<i>Reem Jaber; Nina Stark</i>	

## Track K: Scour and Erosion Countermeasures and Mitigation

Erosion Performance of Cement Brick after Surface-treated by Microbial Induced Calcium Carbonate Precipitation.....	1126
<i>Shihui Liu; Kejun Wen; Lin Li</i>	
Scaling and performance of a flexible mesh bag scour protection .....	1135
<i>Hendrik Jan Riezebos; Greta van Velzen; Niek Bruinsma; Niels G. Jacobsen; Saskia Waßmuth</i>	
Development of Short-fiber Reinforced Soil as River Bank Erosion Control Material .....	1145
<i>Ramrav Hem; Tomohiro Yamasaki</i>	
Discussion Of Failure In Scour Protections.....	1154
<i>Tiago Fazerer-Ferradosa; Mario Welzel; Francisco Taveira-Pinto; Paulo Rosa-Santos; Alemi Mahdi; Alexander Schendel; Richard J.S. Whitehouse</i>	
Resisting Dune Erosion with Bio-cementation.....	1164
<i>Brina M. Montoya; T. Matthew Evans; Meagan E. Wengrove; Hailey Bond; Pegah Ghasemi; Ehsan Yazdani; Ali Dadashiserej; Qianwen Liu</i>	
Effect of gap width and pile diameter on efficacy of sacrificial piles for scour mitigation.....	1175
<i>Mohamed Kharbeche; Priscilla Williams; Ram Balachandar</i>	

Particle image velocimetry (PIV) measurements of local scour equilibrium with flow-altering countermeasures.....	1185
<i>Priscilla Williams; Ram Balachandar; Vesselina Roussinova</i>	
Developing a Convergent Research Coordination Network to Identify Challenges of and Solutions to Permafrost Coastal Erosion and Its Socioecological Impacts in the Arctic.....	1197
<i>Ming Xiao; Benjamin Jones; Vladimir Romanovsky; Kathleen Halvorsen; Guangqing Chi; Louise Farquharson; Min Liew</i>	
Wave Attenuation from Living Shorelines: A Parameter Study.....	1207
<i>Kristine A. Mosuela; Jennifer L. Irish</i>	
Evaluating Erosion Potential of Stabilized Fine-Grained Soils .....	1219
<i>Bheemasetti T.V.; Tabassum T.; Lingwall B.N.; Rahman R.</i>	
Partial Penetration Relief Well Design Nomograms .....	1230
<i>Andrew M. Keffer; Erich D. Guy</i>	
Assessment of Pier Modification to Reduce Scour around Circular Bridge Pier .....	1240
<i>Rashid Farooq; Muhammad Nadeem; Muhammad Zubair; Aziz Ullah</i>	
Tufted Reinforced Geosynthetics as Erosion Protection in Demanding Environments .....	1250
<i>Bryan Scholl; Bradford Cooley; Ming Zhu</i>	
Designing Scour-Resistant Bridge Structures for Extreme Events.....	1260
<i>Roger L. Simpson; Gwibo Byun</i>	
Supplement Traditional Erosion Assessment with Bank Stability and Toe Erosion Model (BSTEM) .....	1270
<i>HienDung Carmona; Chi Bui; Shyamal Chowdhury</i>	
Design Method for a Finite Line of Fully Penetrating Relief Wells.....	1284
<i>Andrew M. Keffer; Erich D. Guy</i>	

### **Track L: Geo-Hazards Induced by Scour and Internal Erosion**

Screening Methodology for Avulsion and Pipeline Exposure Estimation at Pipeline Watercourse Crossings.....	1299
<i>Gerry Ferris</i>	
Probabilistic Landslide Hazard in Pipiral, a highly susceptible area to superficial landslides in the Central Region of Colombia .....	1311
<i>Jairo E. Yepes-Heredia; Yenny Mosquera; Francis Mosquera</i>	
Investigation of Karakoram Highway Water Damage and Evaluation of Remediation Effect .....	1327
<i>Zhisheng Peng; Miao Wang; Dingwen Zhang; Zhigang Luo; Gongyan Zheng</i>	

### **Track M: Erosion Risk Assessment**

Applying Internal Erosion Mechanics to improve Internal Erosion Risk Assessments .....	1337
<i>Rodney Bridle</i>	

A Probabilistic Approach and Case Study to Evaluate the Reliability of Scour Countermeasure: Riprap for Pier Scour .....	1347
<i>Nasi Zhang; Chao Huang; Xinya Liu; Kornel Kerenyi; James Pagenkopf; Nandor Nagy</i>	

### **Track N: Case Histories, Lessons Learned, and General Practice**

Lake Michigan Shoreline Erosion – 3 Case Studies .....	1360
<i>Jeffery M. Krusinga; Robert C. Rabeler</i>	

Buoyancy Compensated Erosion Control Module (BCECM) Successfully Tested for Louisiana Shoreline Protection.....	1375
<i>Austin Huang; Grant Jansen</i>	

Lessons Learned from Some Accidents of Embankment Dams Induced by Suffusion.....	1393
<i>Yulong Luo; Xingjie Zhang</i>	

In-situ Scour Testing Device Demonstrations at 18 State Departments of Transportation .....	1406
<i>Haoyin Shan; Daniel Pastrich; James Pagenkopf; Otto Wiblishauser; Michael Uhrig; Nandor Nagy; Christoph Zuelow; Veronica Ghelardi; Daniel Alzamora; Khalid Mohamed; Kornel Kerenyi; Chao Huang</i>	

A Case History of Highwater Shore Erosion and Bank Stabilization via Tree Roots .....	1416
<i>Bret N. Lingwall</i>	

An experimental Study on Internal Instability of Bar Dam Alluvial Soils .....	1428
<i>M. Ali Maroof; Ahmad Mahboubi; Parsa Mostafaei</i>	

Case Study: River bank protection measures on the river Banoori, India .....	1439
<i>Saswati D.; Arun K.</i>	

Case studies of erosion protection pilots in Bangladesh: Embankments, bioengineering and using jute where it “mattress” .....	1452
<i>Hiba Khan; Knut Oberhagemann; Md Rafiqul Islam Choubey; Martin Hawskwood; Md Ahsan Habib</i>	

Bonner Bridge Replacement: Scour Analysis in a Littoral System .....	1467
<i>Philip Dompe; Mark Gosselin; Domenic Coletti</i>	

It’s a Mud Mud Mud World: The Impact on Infrastructure of Flooding Following Fires in Montecito in 2018.....	1482
<i>Catherine M.C. Avila</i>	

### **Track O: Impact and Adaptation: flooding, drought, and scour in a changing climate**

Soil desiccation effect on internal erosion of earth dams in Morocco .....	1496
<i>Ahmed Jalil; Ahmed Benamar; Mohamed Ebn Touhami</i>	

Scour and Extreme Events: Focusing on the Issues.....	1506
<i>Joseph Krolak; Kornel Kerenyi</i>	

## Designing Scour-Resistant Bridge Structures for Extreme Events

Roger L. Simpson, Ph.D., P.E., M.ASCE and Gwibo Byun, Ph.D.

AUR, Inc., 605 Preston Avenue, Blacksburg, VA 24060-4618; email: aur@aurinc.com

### ABSTRACT

Bridge failures over water are likely due to scour, often during floods and peak flow events which are becoming more common with climate change. All bridge scour failures are produced by large-scale scouring vortices formed at piers and abutments that bring higher velocity water down to erode the river bed. The purpose of this paper is to summarize scouring-vortex-preventing designs that would have prevented bridge scour failures and will prevent future failures at all flow speeds. Tests and computational fluid dynamic (CFD) studies for a large variety of pier and abutment cases show that no scouring vortices are produced. One case of rock scour under a concrete seal is discussed with application of a scAUR<sup>TM</sup> retrofit design to prevent scouring vortices. Other advantages of these designs are: much lower present value of all current and probable future costs, lower river levels and flow blockage, lower possibility for debris and ice buildup, and greater protection of piers and abutments against impact loads.

### INTRODUCTION

Removal of river bed substrate around bridge pier and abutment footings, also known as scour, presents a significant cost and risk in the maintenance of many bridges throughout the world and is one of the most common causes of highway bridge failures (Lagasse et al. 2001). For US bridges over water, 70% are not designed to withstand scour, 21000 are currently “scour critical”, and 80% of bridge failures are due to scour, often during floods and peak flow events over a short time, which are becoming more common with climate change, as discussed in detail by Flint et al. (2017). Lin et al. (2013) examined 36 bridge failures due to scour in terms of structural, hydraulic, and geotechnical conditions. Local scour, channel migration scour, and contraction scour were responsible for 78% of failures. Sadly, many lives were lost during these failures.

This has motivated research on the causes of scour at bridge piers and abutments (Ettema et al. 2004) and led bridge engineers to develop numerous scour countermeasures that attempt to reduce the risk of catastrophe. Unfortunately, all previously used scour countermeasures are temporary responses that require many recurring costs and do not prevent the formation of scouring vortices, which is the root cause of the local scour (Shepherd et al. 2011; Tian et al. 2010). Consequently, soil and rocks around the foundations of bridge abutments and piers are loosened and carried away by the flow during floods, which may compromise the integrity of the structure. Even designing bridge piers or abutments with the expectation of some scour is highly uncertain, since a recent study (Shepherd et al. 2011) showed huge uncertainties in scour data from hundreds of experiments.

None of the conservative current bridge pier and abutment footing or foundation designs prevent scouring vortices, which are created when the flow interacts with underwater structures, so the probability of scour during high water or floods is present in all previous designs. Baker et



al. (1988) point out that designs to avoid catastrophes should be based on extreme events and that there is a need for more physical understanding of flood processes and situations, rather than just using statistical probabilities from past experiments and events. *Preventing scouring vortices is a new approach to preventing scour at all flow speeds!* All previous scour protection methods tolerate scouring vortices and try to reduce their effects; those methods don't always work.

Two well publicized and investigated bridge failures due to scour were discussed by Simpson and Byun (2019): the Schoharie Creek Bridge pier collapse of 1987 and the Loon Mountain abutment collapse of 2011. These failures could have been avoided if scour-vortex-prevention designs had been used.

The nature of scouring vortices is briefly discussed below. *All* bridge scour failures are produced by large-scale scouring vortices formed at piers and abutments that bring high velocity water down to the river bed. Since the scouring forces on the bed material vary with the square of the local velocity, it is clear that the best scour countermeasure is to prevent the scouring vortices.

Because of the unique circumstances of each bridge, it is suggested that each bridge be designed for scour prevention, taking into account the upstream flow and geometry, rather than using data correlations with associated uncertainties. One should use peak flow levels estimated from rainfall and runoff data in an analysis to obtain the most severe scouring conditions.

After this, applications of the scAUR<sup>TM</sup> (streamlined control Against Underwater Rampage) special streamlined fairings that prevent scouring vortices will be discussed for rock scour under concrete seals and hydraulic structures. The costs of bridge failures relative to costs for application of the scAUR<sup>TM</sup> special streamlined fairings and VorGAUR<sup>TM</sup> (Vortex Generators Against Underwater Rampage) will be discussed.

The conclusions point out that that proper scouring-vortex-preventing designs would have prevented *all* of the bridge scour failures, will prevent future failures at *all* flow speeds, have much lower present value of all costs, lower river levels and flow blockage, lower possibility for debris and ice buildup, and greater protection of piers and abutments against impact loads.


## THE NATURE OF SCOURING VORTICES

The bridge foundations in a water current, such as piers and abutments, change the local hydraulics drastically because of the appearance of large-scale unsteadiness and shedding of coherent vortices, such as horseshoe vortices. Figure 1a is a sketch of the horseshoe vortex formed around the base of a pier by a separating boundary layer. The horseshoe vortex brings higher velocity downward toward the river bed, produces high turbulent shear stress on the bed, triggers the onset of rock and soil scour, and forms a scour hole (Simpson and Byun 2017). Like in tornadoes, stretching of the horseshoe vortices due to the contraction of the flow intensifies the velocities in the vortex, thus causing more scour. The "strength" of a horseshoe vortex varies with the approach velocity  $U$  times the width  $W$  of the pier nose or  $UW$ . (See [www.noscour.com](http://www.noscour.com) for more details.) Note that a wider pier nose exacerbates the scouring velocities on the river bed. The 19 foot wide Schoharie Creek pier nose created intense scouring horseshoe vortices. Since the scouring forces on the bed material vary with river bed roughness and the **square** of the local velocity, it is clear that the best scour countermeasure is to *prevent the scouring vortices*. One needs to keep the low velocity water on the river bottom.

The flowfield around an abutment is also highly three-dimensional and involves strong

separated vortex flow (Barkdoll et al. 2007). For the spill-through abutment with no scour protection, the flow is accelerated around the contraction and separates downstream of the contraction leading edge as shown in Figure 1b (Simpson and Byun 2017). There is a free surface level difference before and after the contraction leading edge due to the free surface vortex formation. The spill-through abutment has a deep scour hole at the downstream edge of the abutment due to the free surface vortex generated at the leading edge of the contraction. If not prevented, this deep scour hole can progress upstream and undermine the abutment.

It should be noted that riprap rock scour countermeasures are not acceptable design elements for new bridges. To avoid liability risk to engineers and bridge owners, new bridges must be over-designed to withstand 500-year superfloods, assuming that all sediment is removed from the ‘scour prism’ at that flowrate (Lagasse et al. 2001). Unlike temporary scour countermeasures, the scAUR™ (pronounced like ‘scour’) fairing designs, discussed below and by Simpson and Byun (2017), avoid liability risk by preventing or drastically diminishing the scour prism and reducing the cost of new bridge engineering and construction. This greatly reduces the probability of failure, by the tenets of catastrophic risk theory (Simpson 2013). See [www.noscour.com](http://www.noscour.com) for details.



**Figure 1. (a, left) The formation of a horseshoe vortex around the bottom of a bridge pier with no scouring-vortex prevention. (b, right) Flow structure around the spill-through abutment with no scouring vortex protection.**


### FEATURES OF SCAUR™ THAT PREVENT SCOURING VORTICES

As discussed in more detail by Simpson (2013) and Simpson and Byun (2017), using the knowledge of how to prevent the formation of discrete vortices and separation for junction flows (Simpson 1989, 1996, 2001) prior to the NCHRP-IDEA-162 project, AUR developed, proved using model-scale tests, and patented new local-scouring-vortex-prevention scAUR™ designs. As described in these patents, a key streamlined fairing design requirement is that the surface shape produces surface pressure gradients that limit the flux of new vorticity at the surface so discrete vortices are not formed. It is possible to select a surface shape that meet this requirement for all water speeds. No one before has used this design feature, thus leading to the patents.

The scAUR™ design fundamentally alters the way the river flows around a pier or abutment. The scAUR™ scouring-vortex-preventing fairing, US Patent No. 8,348,553, and VorGAUR™ tetrahedral vortex generators, US Patent No. 8,434,723, are practical long-term

permanent solutions. Piecewise continuous slope and curvature surface versions from sheet metal have been proven to produce the same result (US Patent no. 9,453,319, Sept. 27, 2016). A hydraulically optimum pier or abutment fairing prevents the formation of highly coherent vortices around the bridge pier (Figure 2) or abutment and reduces 3D separation downstream of the bridge pier or abutment with the help of the VorGAUR™ vortical flow separation control (Figure 2). This is in contrast to a fairing shape used in an unpublished FHWA study which did not prevent discrete vortex formation or scour for flows at angles of attack. Versions of scAUR™ for high-angle-of-attack flows use a dog-leg arrangement. A modified tail provides additional scour prevention for piers that are close together. Bridge owners receiving US federal funds are no longer prohibited from using patented or proprietary products in designs (FHWA 2019).

Based on the past published work on scour and the experience of AUR (Simpson 1989, 1996, 2001), more physical evidence and insights support the idea that these scour vortex preventing devices work better at full scale than model scale. Scouring forces on river bed materials are produced by pressure gradients and turbulent shearing stresses, which are instantaneously unsteady. At higher Reynolds numbers and sizes, pressure gradients and turbulent fluctuation stresses are lower than at model scale, so scour at the same flow speed is lower. Work by others (Ettema 2004; Shepherd et al. 2004, 2011) support the conclusion that scour predictive equations, developed largely from laboratory data, over predict scour on full-scale underwater structures. Thus, the scAUR™ and VorGAUR™ work as well or better in preventing the scouring vortices and any scour at full scale as at the proven model scale. Other computational fluid dynamics (CFD) studies by AUR, which is discussed by Simpson and Byun (2017), show that scAUR™ and VorGAUR™ designs also prevent scouring vortices around bridge piers downstream of bending rivers.




**Figure 2. (left) scAUR™ fairing around a pier (5) with VorGAUR™ vortex generators (3) that produce no scouring vortices. (right) Example stainless steel scAUR™ retrofit (black) for a pier. VorGAUR™ vortex generators create vortices that bring low-speed flow up to prevent scour at the pier downstream end.**

### **RECENT NCHRP-IDEA-162 PROJECT BY AUR PROVES THAT scAUR™ IS EFFECTIVE**

This project focused on providing more evidence that the scAUR™ and VorGAUR™ concepts and designs work at full scale in preventing scour-producing vortices and for a wider range of geometries and conditions. Simpson and Byun (2017) summarized the results, which

were all successful. Task I dealt with selecting a scour-critical bridge in Virginia for prototype installation (Simpson 2013). Further CFD work on the effect of pier size or scale (Task II) (Figure 3) and model flume tests for other sediments (Task III), other abutment designs (Task IV.A), and for open bed scour conditions (Task IV.B) were done to expand confidence in these concepts and designs. Constructed full-scale prototypes (Task V) were tested (Task VI). Cost-effective manufacturing and installation of scAUR™ and VorGAUR™ designs were further developed (Task VII). Designs for various types of piers, footings, abutments, angles of attack, river swirl, and bed conditions have been tested at model scale and some at full scale and show no scouring vortices (Simpson 2013; Simpson and Byun 2017). These designs have much lower present value of all costs, lower river levels and flow blockage, lower possibility for debris and ice buildup, and greater protection of piers and abutments against impact loads.

Low Reynolds Number Case - Near wall streamlines pass through  
 $X/t = 7.24$  and  $Y/t = 0.013$



**Figure 3. Low Reynolds number case CFD calculated flow streamline patterns around a scAUR™ streamlined bridge pier fairing. Flow indicates no discrete vortex formation on nose and sides (Simpson and Byun 2017).**

### DESIGN TO PREVENT SCOURING-VORTICES FOR A SPECIFIC BRIDGE CASE

Each bridge has a number of specific unique features that affect the design to prevent scouring vortices at the river bed next to a pier or abutment. One or two dimensional calculations with correlations of laboratory data or full-scale data of past scour are not likely to apply for this case. Consequently, it is prudent to use a physics-based approach with a proven turbulence model in a fully three-dimensional Navier-Stokes computational fluid dynamics (CFD) code. This will produce more detailed results of the flow around the bridge hydraulic structures. AUR uses the v2F model in an OpenFOAM code. Many important features of 3-D flows are closely modeled by this code and model.

One needs information on the upstream 3-D river bed and banks geometry and the size and distribution of the surface roughness that will affect the shearing stress on the flow. The three-dimensional inflow to the river at least 10 river widths upstream should be used. If the bridge is downstream of a bend of the river, the piers and abutment are particularly susceptible to scour. The high velocity surface water hits the outer river bank, moves to the bottom of the river




and scours hydraulic structures. One would need information on the resultant flow distribution to be able to modify the scAUR™ shape to account for swirl.

It is prudent to be ready for flood conditions that are likely to happen sometime (Flint et al. 2017), so data on the maximum river flowrate that has been observed are needed. This is the flow condition that should be used in the CFD computations. Use the highest flowrate outlier points in the USGS and other data, which suggest catastrophic conditions, rather than an average flowrate from data (Baker 1988; Flint et al. 2017). Sources of maximum river flowrate information include maximum rainfall historical data from rain gages and radar used in regression equations. A surface runoff analysis should also be used.

### SCOURING-VORTEX PREVENTION APPLIED TO ROCK SCOUR

A heavily used large long bridge is downstream of a bend in a river and has the most severe scour under the pier seals of any relatively new bridge in this state. Swirling flow produced by the bend in the river brings the highest velocity surface water down to the river bottom. The limestone under the base seals of the piers, which do not have pilings, has been partially scoured away, not the concrete seals. One pier has lost 40% of its load-bearing strength and 70% of its moment-bearing strength. The loss of this bridge would devastate the local rural economy.



**Figure 4 . Pier with severe seal scour (left). The 2010, 2013, and 2016 state bridge inspection reports show progression of limestone rock scour under the concrete.**

The scour that occurs around the seal foundation is due to the near-surface high velocities produced by horseshoe vortices formed around the model, such as shown in Figure 5 below. Model flume test scour results shown in Figure 6 below are very similar to full-scale case loss of limestone in Figure 4 above.






Figure 5. The flow behavior around a seal is like around a surface-mounted cube represented well by Martinuzzi and Tropea (1993).






Figure 6. Case 39: Base seal model in the AUR flume. Results after one hour test run. Scour under model very similar to full-scale case limestone loss in Figure 4 above.



This design is protected by United States Patents 8,348,553 and 9,453,319  
Figure 7. SELECTED PROVEN DESIGN. Case 43: Seal model with C-shaped extended ramp on the front and both sides.

Figure 7 shows the *only* scouring-vortex-preventing retrofit design for foundation rock scour prevention for this seal. It uses cost-effective modular stainless steel units that can be attached to the concrete seal using standard methods over a short time. *The permanent solution* - prevent the swirling flow from reaching the limestone under the seal. Traditional scour countermeasures do not do this. Just filling the gap under the seal with concrete under pressure does not restore support under the seal less vertical containment plates at the edges of the seal are used in a strong structure, as in this design. Without the ramps and streamlined fairings to prevent scouring vortices, a repaired seal would scour rock under the repaired concrete and defeat the repair.

This streamlined fairing design was added to the seal model in Figure 6 and tested in the AUR flume with no scour, as shown in Figure 8 below. This project will restore the strength of these piers using accepted methods, and fabricate and install a scouring-flow-altering stainless steel streamlined fairing design that permanently prevent future scour under the seal.



**Figure 8. Case 43: Seal model with C-shaped extended ramp on the front and both sides. The streamlined ramps and fairings produced no scour undermining of the seal or ramps. Results after one hour flume test run.**

### **COST OF THE BRIDGE FAILURES AND COST-EFFECTIVE MANUFACTURING AND INSTALLATION OF scaUR™ AND VorGAUR™ DESIGNS**

Before the NCHRP-162 project, AUR performed a cost-benefit analysis of scaUR™ with VorGAUR™ designs as compared to currently used scour countermeasures (Simpson 2013). Published information on these currently used countermeasures shows that periodic expenses are required for scour monitoring, evaluation, and anti-scour mitigation design and construction, usually with rip-rap. For a bridge closed due to scour, the cost to motorists due to traffic detours is estimated to be as great as all other costs combined. When one includes the present value of future costs, repetitive temporary scour countermeasures are more expensive (Simpson and Byun 2017, 2019).

There is no situation where scaUR™ and VorGAUR™ designs, as shown in Figure 2 for a stainless steel pier retrofit, cost more than current countermeasures. There is no situation where any type of scour is worse with the use of the scaUR™ and VorGAUR™ designs than without them. The more frequent that scouring floods occur, the more cost effective are scaUR™ and VorGAUR™. Clearly, scaUR™ and VorGAUR™ designs are practical and cost-effective for US highway bridges (Simpson and Byun 2017).

An installed welded stainless steel (SS) scaUR™ retrofit bridge fairing is cost-effective,

being about half of all costs for precast or cast-in-place concrete manufacturing and installation. Its corrosion resistance gives it a lifetime of 100 years even in seawater environments, using a proper thickness, construction methods, and type of SS. It is an effective way to reduce weight and the cost associated with casting custom reinforced concrete structures. Another benefit is that the SS VorGAUR™ vortex generators can be welded directly onto the side sections instead of having to be integrated into the rebar cage of the reinforced concrete structure. *Even for bridges with little life left, current temporary countermeasures are much more expensive when the present value of future expenses is considered* (Simpson 2013; Simpson and Byun 2017).

For new construction, the estimates were done on the basis of added cost. This means determining the incremental increase in the total cost of the bridge project that can be attributed to the scAUR™ design since laborers, contractors, and equipment are already involved in new construction. If a cofferdam is required or other site conditions produce extra costs, it affects the project as a whole and not just scAUR™ design installation. Clearly, since the new construction cost is about 1/3 of retrofit costs, the best time to include the scAUR™ fairing on piers and abutments is during new construction (Simpson 2013).

Simpson and Byun (2019) discuss the liability costs associated with injuries and the loss of life in bridge failures due to scour. For the Schoharie Creek Bridge collapse, prior to the failure both piers could have been protected permanently from scouring vortices for all water flow speeds for **0.45%** of what was eventually spent after failure. For the Loon Mountain Bridge abutment collapse, prior to the failure the abutment could have been permanently protected from scouring vortices for all water speeds for less than **0.9%** of what was spent after the abutment collapse.

## CONCLUSIONS

Many bridges over water around the world are susceptible to scour of supporting rocks and soil during peak flow events such as floods. Since scouring forces vary with the velocity-squared and scouring vortices are generated around piers and abutments, it is desirable to prevent these vortices. This is what the scAUR™ with VorGAUR™ designs and components accomplish: prevent the formation of scouring vortices for all flow speeds. Bridge owners receiving US federal funds are no longer prohibited from using patented or proprietary products in designs.

Designs for various types of piers, footings, abutments, angles of attack, river swirl, and bed conditions have been tested at model scale and some at full scale and show no scouring vortices. Computational fluid dynamic studies show that no scouring vortices are produced.

A successful scAUR™ streamlined fairing design was discussed to prevent rock scour under concrete seals and hydraulic structures. The costs of bridge failures is 100 times more than costs for application of the scAUR™ special streamlined fairings and VorGAUR™ vortex generators. Other advantages of these designs are much lower present value of all current and probable future costs, lower river levels and flow blockage, lower possibility for debris and ice buildup, and greater protection of piers and abutments against impact loads.

## REFERENCES

Baker, V.R., Kochel, R. C., and Patton, P.C., editors, (1988) *Flood Geomorphology*, Wiley-Interscience, 503 pages; p. 5.

- Barkdoll, B.D., Ettema, R., and B. W. Melville, (2007) *Countermeasures to Protect Bridge Abutments from Scour*, NCHRP Report 587.
- Ettema, R., Yoon, Byungman, Nakato, Tatsuaki and Muste, Marian, (2004) A review of scour conditions and scour-estimation difficulties for bridge abutments, *KSCE J. Civil Engineering*, 8(6), 643-65.
- FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) (2019) Construction and Maintenance— Promoting Innovation in Use of Patented and Proprietary Products, 23 CFR Part 635 Rules and Regulations, *Federal Register*, 84, No. 188, p. 51023; also *Civil Engineering*, 89(11),16-17, 2019.
- Flint, M. M., Fringer, O., Billington, S. L., Freyberg, D., and Diffenbaugh, N. S., (2017) Historical Analysis of Hydraulic Bridge Collapses in the Continental United States, *ASCE J. Infrastructure Systems*, 23(3),ASCE, ISSN 1076-0342.
- Lagasse, P., Zevenbergen, L., Schall, J., and Clopper, P., (2001) Bridge Scour and Stream Instability Countermeasures. *FHWA Technical Report Hydraulic Engineering Circular (HEC)-23*.
- Lin, C., Han, J., Bennett, C., and Parsons, R. (2013) Case History Analysis of Bridge Failures due to Scour, *Climatic Effects on Pavement and Geotechnical Infrastructure*, 204 - 216, ASCE.
- Martinuzzi, R. and Tropea, C. 1993 The Flow Around Surface Mounted, Prismatic Obstacles Placed in a Fully Developed Channel Flow *J. Fluids Eng., ASME*, 115(1), 85 -92.
- Sheppard, D.M., Demir, H., and Melville, B. (2011) *Scour at Wide Piers and Long Skewed Piers*, NCHRP-Report 682.
- Sheppard, D.M., Odeh, M., Glasser,T. (2004) Large Scale Clear-Water Local Pier Scour Experiments, *J. Hydraulic Eng.*, ASCE., 130, 957 -063.
- Simpson, R.L. (1989) Turbulent Boundary Layer Separation, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 21, 205-234.
- Simpson, R.L. (1996) Aspects of Turbulent Boundary Layer Separation, *Progress in Aerospace Sciences*, 32, 457 – 521.
- Simpson, R. L. (2001) Junction Flows, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 33, 415-443.
- Simpson, R. L. (2013) *Unabridged Report on Full-Scale Prototype Testing and Manufacturing and Installation Plans for New Scour-Vortex-Prevention scaUR™ and VorGAUR™ Products for a Representative Scour-critical Bridge*, AUR, Inc., Internal Report NCHRP-162, July.
- Simpson, R. L. and Byun, G. (2017) Low-Cost Scour Preventing Fairings for Bridges, paper IBC 17-89, *34<sup>th</sup> International Bridge Conference, Gaylord National Resort, National Harbor, MD, June 5-8*.
- Simpson, R. L. and Byun, G. (2019) Case Studies of Bridge Failure due to Scour and Prevention of Future Failures, paper IBC 19-04, *36<sup>th</sup> International Bridge Conference, Gaylord National Resort, National Harbor, MD, June 10-12*.
- Tian, Q.Q., Simpson, R.L., and Lowe, K.T. (2010), A laser-based optical approach for measuring scour depth around hydraulic structures, *5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Scour and Erosion*, ASCE, San Francisco, Nov. 7-11, 787 - 796.