

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

MODELING OF CLEAR-WATER CONTRACTION SCOUR FOR AN ABUTMENT BRIDGE IN A COMPOUND CHANNEL

PEZHMAN TAHEREI GHAZVINEI

FK 2014 53



MODELING OF CLEAR-WATER CONTRACTION SCOUR FOR AN ABUTMENT BRIDGE IN A COMPOUND CHANNEL



By

PEZHMAN TAHEREI GHAZVINEI

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January 2014



COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artworks, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained with thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



This thesis is dedicated to my lovely wife and inspiring parents for their endless support, and encouragement.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for degree of Doctor of philosophy

MODELING OF CLEAR-WATER CONTRACTION SCOUR FOR AN ABUTMENT BRIDGE IN A COMPOUND CHANNEL

By

PEZHMAN TAHEREI GHAZVINEI

January 2014

Chair: Prof. Thamer Ahmed Mohammad Ali, PhD

Faculty: Engineering

Bridge collapse has dramatic consequences in transportation system. Besides losing of life, disruption in service results tremendous effects on the economic growth of the countries. Contraction scour is a common and major cause of bridge failure. Designing the bridge foundation safely needs an accurate estimation of scour depth, underestimation may lead to bridge failure while over estimation will lead to excessive construction cost. Abutment bridges most commonly are used for bridges overcomparatively small channels. Reliability, strength and economy are the main reasons to increase concerning in Abutment Bridges. Commonly, in the compound channels, Abutment Bridgesare protrudedinto the main channel. Consequently, contraction scour expands in the main channel. Prior design approaches treated abutments as being solid structure locating in a floodplain or main channel, individually. The main deficiency of previous studies is that they do not accurately simulated the actual constriction features of Abutment Bridge in a compound channel with a complex geometries. Subsequently, the data and observations lead to unrealistically scour depth estimates.

The main objective of the current research is to provide reliable prediction of geometrical characteristics for protruded abutment bridge in the compound channel on contraction scour depth and its' location. The study required extensive experimentation conducted with laboratory flume, and abutments of realistic design that were subjected to the contraction scour for a range of channel constriction, channel geometries, and embankment protection layers. The experiments on clear-water conditions under steady flow at threshold velocity were conducted at an Abutment Bridge with approach embankment configured in a range of erodiblity conditions: fixed embankment on erodible and then far less-erodible floodplain; riprap, gabion-mattress, and non-erodible embankment on readily erodible floodplain. Flow depth was kept constant for all of the experiments with thecohesionless uniform sediment.

A methodology is developed to predict the maximum contraction scour depth and its' location along the compound channel. Outcomes of verifying the method show that proposed method gives reasonable maximum contraction scour depth and location predictions. The results indicate that the contraction degree, abutments' protrusionfrom floodplain into the main channel, soil, and protection layer properties really affect the final contraction scour depth and its' location. Results allow promoting the Abutment Bridges' design and consequentlyincreasingeconomical andpublic safety by decreasing the bridges' construction cost, saving additional maintenance charges, increasing bridges' stability, and preventing loss of lives. However, application of the currently developed methodology are limited to laboratory conditions. Site verifications are necessary in the future study.



Abstrak tesis dikemukakan kepada Senate Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan ijazah Doktor Falsafah

PEMODELAN PENGUNCUPAN JELAS-AIR KEROKAN UNTUK PENAMPAN JAMBATAN DALAM RANGKAIAN KOMPAUN

Oleh

PEZHMAN TAHEREI GHAZVINEI

Januari 2014

Pengerusi: Prof. Thamer Ahmed Mohammad Ali, PhD

Fakulti: Kejuruteraan

Keruntuhan Jambatan mempunyai kesan dramatic dalam sistem pengangkutan. Selain kehilangan nyawa, gangguan perkhidmatan menyebabkan impak yang besar terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi negara-negara. Kerukan pengecutan adalah penyebab umum dan penyebab utama kegagalan jambatan. Mereka bentuk asas jambatan dengan selamat memerlukan anggaran kedalaman kerukan yang tepat, anggaran yang kurang boleh membawa kepada kegagalan jambatan manakala terlebih anggaran akan membawa kepada kos pembinaan yang berlebihan. Jambatan-jambatan penampan lazimnya digunakan untuk jambatan yang merentasi saluran-saluran yang agak kecil. Keandalan, kekuatan dan ekonomi merupakan sebab-sebab utama yang perlu ditingkatkan bagi kes jambatan penampan. Dalam saluran majmuk, Jambatan Penampan lazimnya tersembul ke dalam saluran utama. Oleh yang demikian, kerukan pengecutan mengembang di dalam saluranutama. Pendekatan reka bentuk terdahulu menganggap penampan itu sendiri sebagai suatu struktur pepejal yang terletak di dalam dataran banjir atau saluran utama. Kekurangan utama kajian lepasa dalah ianya tidak mensimulasikan dengan tepat ciri-ciri penyempitan sebenar Jambatan Penampan dalam saluran majmuk denga nciri-ciri geometri kompleks. Kemudiannya, data dan pemerhatian-pemerhatian membawake pada penganggaran kedalaman kerukan yang tidak relistik.

Objektif utama kajian ini adalah untuk menyediakan ramalan yang boleh dipercayai tentang ciri-ciri geometri bagi jambatan penampan yang tersembul ke dalam saluran majmuk, terhadap kedalaman kerukan pengecutan dan lokasinya. Kajian ini memerlukan eksperimen menyeluruh yang dijalankan dengan saluran di dalam makmal, dan penampan-penampan yang mempunyai reka bentuk realistic yang tertakluk kepada pengecutan kerukan bagi suatu julat penyempitan saluran, geometri-geometri saluran, dan apisan-lapisan perlindungan benteng. Eksperimen ke atas keadaan air jernih di bawah aliran mantap pada kelajuan ambang telah dijalankan pada satu Jambatan Penampan menggunakan pendekatan di mana benteng deselaraskan dalam pelbagai keadaankebolehhakisan: benteng di tetapkan ke atas dataran banjir yang boleh hakis dan kemudiann yayang tidak mudah terhakis; batu lindung, kotak batu (*gabion-mattress*), dan benteng tidak-hakis ke atas dataran banjir yang mudah hakis. Kedalaman aliran telah dimalarkan bagi kesemua eksperimen tersebut bersama enapan seragam tak menjeleket.

Satu kaedah telah dibangunkan untuk meramalkan kedalaman maksimum kerukan pengecutan dan lokasinya di sepanjang saluran majmuk tersebut. Dalam mengesahkan kaedah tersebut, didapati bahawa kaedah yang dicadangkan telah memberikan ramalan kedalaman maksimum kerukan pengecutan dan lokasi yang munasabah. Dap atan kajian menunjukkan bahawa darjah pengecutan, penonjolan penampan daripada dataran banjir ke dalam saluran utama, tanah, dan sifat-sifat lapisan perlindungan benar-benar mempengaruhi kedalaman akhir kerukan pengecutan dan lokasinya. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa reka bentuk Jambatan Penampan berdaya maju untuk diguna pakai, seterusnya dapat meningkatkan ekonomidan keselamatan awam dengan mengurangkan kos pembinaan jambatan, menjimatkan caj-caj penyelenggaraan tambahan, meningkatkan kestabilan jambatan, dan mencegah kehilangan nyawa.Walau bagaimanapun, aplikasi kaedah yang sedang dibangunkan ini adalah terhad kepada persekitaran makmal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would have been impossible to write this doctoral thesis without the assistance and support of the kind people around me, to whom I am truly indebted and thankful.

First, I wish to express my gratitude to my main supervisor, Professor Dr. Thamer Ahmed Mohamed, for the valuable support, patience, and guidance he gave me. He was unfailingly available for my questions and concerns, large or small, and always ready with thoughtful suggestions and valuable insights.

My gratitude also goes for the other members of my supervisory committee, Professor Dr. Bujang Bin Kim Huat and Associate Professor Dr. Abdul Halim Ghazali, who had given me invaluable advice, encouragement, and careful guidance.

I also wish to express my deepest appreciation to Professor Dr. Bruce W. Melville who gave me great comments on methodology for my laboratory's experiments.

I wish to thank the NAHRIM laboratory staff who provided me with assistance during my experiments.

Last but not least, I am grateful to the unending support of my family, especially my parents. Although they were physically far from me, their constant support made this learning journey possible. I appreciate them more than words can express. To them I dedicate this thesis.

I certify that an Examination Committee has met on15 January 2014to conduct the final examination of Pezhman Taherei Ghazvinei on his Doctor of Philosophy thesis entitled "Modeling of Clear-Water Contraction Scour at Abutment Bridge in a Compound Channel" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The committee recommends that candidate be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 15 January 2014 to conduct the final examination of Pezhman Taherei Ghazvinie on his thesis entitled "Modeling of Clear-Water Contraction Scour for an Abutment Bridge in a Compound Channel" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Abang Abdullah bin Abang Mohamad Ali, PhD

Professor Dato' Ir Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Badronnisa binti Yusuf, PhD Senior Lecturer Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

Ratnasamy a/l Muniandy, PhD Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Internal Examiner)

A. Melih Yanmaz, PhD Professor Middle East Technical University Turkey (External Examiner)

NORITAH OMAR, PhD Associate Professor and Deputy Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 21 April 2014





This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Thamer Ahmed Mohamed, PhD

Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairperson)

Bujang Bin Kim Huat, PhD

Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Abdul Halim Ghazali, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, Professor and Dean School of graduate studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- Quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writing, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____

Date: ____

Name and Matric Number: Pezhman Taherei Ghazvinei GS24142

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: Name of Chairman of Supervisory Committee:	<u>Thamer Ahmed Mohamed,</u> PhD	Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee:	<u>Bujang Bin Kim Huat, PhD</u>
Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee:	<u>Abdul Halim Ghazali, PhD</u>		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
AKNOWLDEGMENTS	\mathbf{v}
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	XV
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xxvii
LIST OF NOTATIONS	xxiii

CHAPTER

C

1	INTI	RODUCTION	
	1.1	Background of the Study	1
	1.2	Problem statement	6
	1.3	Scope and Objectives	8
	1.4	Thesis Organization	9
2	LITF	RATURE REVIEW	
	2.1	Bridges Definition	11
	2.2	Abutment Configuration	11
		2.2.1 Abutment Form	12
		2.2.2 Abutment Layouts	14
		2.2.3 Abutments Structure	16
	2.3	Flow Field	17
	2.4	Sediments and Soil	19
	2.5	Fundamental Scour at Bridges	20
	2.6	Types of Scour at bridge crossings	21
		2.6.1 Aggradation and Degradation	21
		2.6.2 General scour	21
		2.6.3 Contraction scour	21
		2.6.4 Local Scour	23
	2.7	Clear-Water Scour And Live-Bed Scour	23
	2.8	Total scour	24
	2.9	Scour Development at Abutment	25

2.10	Locatio	ons of Scour for Abutments	26
	2.10.1	Scour Location Slope-side Abutment	26
	2.10.2	Scour Location for Wing-Wall Abutment	28
2.11	Bridge	Contraction Scour Studies	29
	2.11.1	Critical velocity and Shear Stress Assessment	29
	2.11.2	Estimation Scour Depth at Location 1	31
	2.11.3	Estimation Scour Depth at Location 2	31
	2.11.4	Estimation Scour Depth at Location 3	32
	2.11.5	Foundamental Research on Contraction	33
	2.11.6	Flow Pattern in Bridge Contraction	36
	2.11.7	Infulencing Factor in Contraction Scour	36
	2.11.8	Long contraction scour	37
	2.11.9	Maximum Contraction Scour Depth	37
	2.11.10	Clear-water Contraction Scour Prediction	37
2.12	Param	eters Affecting Scour Depth at Abutments	43
	2.12 <mark>.1</mark>	Flow Intensity	43
	2.12 <mark>.2</mark>	Flow Shallowness	44
	2.12.3	Sediment Coarseness	45
	2.12.4	Sediment Nonunifurmity	45
	2.12.5	Sedimnt Abutment Shape	46
	2.12.6	Abutment Alignment	46
	2.12.7	Approach Channel Geometry	47
	2.12.8	Sediment Time	48
	2.12.9	Contraction Degree	50
2.13	Scour H	Hole Position in Compound Channels	51
MAT	ERIALS	AND METHODS	
3.1	Experin Condit	ments Configuration and the Facilities ions	54
	3.1.1	Vaiable and constant parameters	56
	3.1.2	Requierd materials	56

xi

		3.1.3	Requiered measurment instrumentation	58
	3.2	Experi	iments Setup and Instruments	58
		3.2.1	Laboratory Flume	58
		3.2.2	Current Meter	62
		3.2.3	Area Velocity Module	63
		3.2.4	Point Gauge	64
		3.2.4	Bed Materials	65
	3.3	Scalab	ility and Model	68
		3.3.1	Model Scalability	68
		3.3.2	Simulated Bridge Abutments	68
	3.4	Experi	imental Design	71
		3.4.1	Model Design of experiments and Flow Condition	72
		3.4.2	Time development of scour	74
		3.4.3	Water-surface profile, velocity and scour measurements	75
		3.4.4	Measurement Contents	76
	3.5	An <mark>aly</mark> s	sis of Collected Data	77
	3.6	Gra <mark>ph</mark>	ical Analysis of the Results	79
4	RESU	JLT AN	D ANALYSIS	
	4.1	Illustr	ations of Scour for Abutments	80
	4.2	Scour Embai (b) No	State 1, Abutment with Fixed hkment and (a) Erodible Floodplain, and n-Erodible Floodplain.	82
		4.2.1	Abutment with Fixed Embankment, Erodible Floodplain and, without Slope Side Protection Laer.	82
		4.2.2	Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Non-erodible Floodplain.	88
	4.3	Illustr Protec Floodj	ation of Scour for at Abutment with ted Embankment and Erodible plain.	94
		4.3.1	Scour at Abutment with Riprap Protected Embankment and Erodible Floodplain	94
		4.3.2	Scour at Abutment with Gabion-	101

		Mattress Protected Embankment and Erodible Floodplain	
	4.3.3	Illustration of Scour at Abutment with Fixed Embankment, Fixed Slope-slides and Erodible Floodplain	108
4.4	Time H Equilib	istory Scour in the Observations of rium Scour Depth	115
4.5	Summa Abutmo	ry of Observation Results for Scour at ent Bridge Model	136
4.6	Interact with D	ion of Local Scour and Contraction Scour ifferent Reference Elevation	139
4.7	Contrac Abutmo	ction Scour Profile Around Bridge ents at the Channel Centerline	146
4.8	Compa Contrac	rison of the Predicted and Measured ction Scour Depths	157
4.9	Scour H Conditi Channe	Iole Geometry under Clear Water ons due to Variations in the Compound I and Abutment Geometries	163
4.10	Method	lology Development	166
	4.10.1	Proposed Methodology	166
	4.10.2	Flow and Velocity Status during Scour Development	168
	4.10.3	Basic Configuration of Contraction Scour Equation	169
4.11	Maxim	um contraction scour location	175
	4.11.1	Langitidunal Distance from the Abutment to the Deepest Scour Location in the Flow Direction, Y	175
	4.11.2	Transverse Distance From The Abutment to the Deepest Scour Location in the Transverse Direction, <i>Xmin</i>	178
4.12	Correct	ion factors from secondary tests	181
	4.12.1	Floodplain Erodiblity Effect	181
	4.12.2	Slope Sides Protection Effect	190
4.13	Evalua	ation of the Proposed Method	200

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

5

5.1 Summary	206
5.2 Conclusions	207
5.3 Major Contributions	209
5.4 Limitations of the Study	210
5.5 Recommendation For Future Study	211
REFERENCES	213
APPENDICES	221
BIODATA OF STUDENT	226
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	227



 \bigcirc

LIST OF TABLES

]	Fable		Page
	1.1	Statistics of Malaysia Bridges	3
	1.2	Malaysian Experience; Defect Due to Scour Hazard	4
	2.1	Equations For Uniform Contraction Scour Under Clear Water Condition	42
	2.2	Classification of Local Scour Processes at Bridge Abutments	45
	2.3	Shape Factors for Piers and Abutments	46
	3.1	Properties of Sample Sand Uesd as Bed Material in Flume	65
	3.2	Conditions in flume experiments	74
	3.3	Range of Parameters in Flume Experiments	74
	4.1	MAE, RMSE, Regression, Correlation, STDEV and Theil's Coefficient of the Calculated Contraction Scour Depth Compared to Laboratory Measured Contraction Scour Depth.	159
	4.2	Table 4.2. Variables in Contraction Scour Regression Analysis	173
	4.3	Results o <mark>f the Regression</mark> Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.19.	173
	4.4	Variable <mark>s in Multi-variables Regression Analysis o</mark> f the Longitudinal Distance between Abutment and the Deepest Scour Location	176
	4.5	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.28.	176
	4.6	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of the Transverse Distance between Abutment and the Deepest Scour Location	180
	4.7	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.29.	181
	4.8	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor for the Maximum Contraction Scour Depth at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	186
	4.9	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor foe the Longitudinal Distance between Abutment and the Deepest Scour Location at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	186
	4.10	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor foe the Transverse Distance between	187

	Abutment and the Deepest Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	
4.11	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.33.	187
4.12	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.34.	187
4.13	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.35.	188
4.14	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor for the Maximum Contraction Scour Depth at Abutments with Slope Side Protection.	195
4.15	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.37	195
4.16	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor for the Longitudinal Distance of Maximum Contraction Scour and Abutment at Abutments with Slope Side Protection $(b_2/b_1 \le 0.2)$.	196
4.17	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.38 $(b_2/b_1 \le 0.2)$.	196
4.18	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor for the Longitudinal Distance of Maximum Contraction Scour and Abutment at Abutments with Slope Side Protection $(b_2/b_1 > 0.2)$.	197
4.19	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.39 $(b_2/b_1 > 0.2)$.	197
4.20	Variables in Multi-variables Regression Analysis of Correction Factor for the Transverse Distance of Maximum Contraction Scour and Abutment at Abutments with Slope Side Protection.	197
4.21	Results of the Regression Analysis for Calculating the Coefficients of the Equation 4.40.	198
4.22	Point Distribution of the Superposition Method.	205
A.1	Summaries of Experiment Results.	222
A.2	Experimental Data of Different Investigators Under Clear- Water Contraction Scour Depth Used for Comparative Study of Existing Scour Equations.	223
A.3	Left Abutment Scour Location.	224
A.4	Right Abutment Scour Location.	225

LIST OF FIGURES

•	Figure		Page
	1.1	A Simple Beam Bridge.	1
	1.2	An Abutment Bridge.	2
	1.3	Types of Bridges in Malaysia Along the Federal Routes.	4
	1.4	The flow of water downstream near Gugusan Manjoi was flowing into Sungai Pari.	5
	1.5	Sungai Pari bridge after the recent flood at Febuary 2012.	5
	1.6	Civil Defence Department members helping to evacuate pepole from their home at Jalan Raja, Ipoh, when the area was flooded.	6
	1.7	View of the destroyed bridge in Cameron Highlands.	6
	2.1	A Simple Beam Bridge.	12
	2.2	A Truss Bridge.	12
	2.3	Left: A Wing Wall Abutment, Right: Wing Wall Abutment Bridges.	14
	2.4	Vertical Wall Abutment at a Bridge.	14
	2.5	Spill-thr <mark>ough Abutments at Bridges.</mark>	14
	2.6	Abutme <mark>nts in a Compound Channel with Definiti</mark> ons of embankment length, floodplain width, and main channel width.	15
	2.7	Views of a Dimensionless Vertical-Wall Abutment.	17
	2.8	A Non-scaled Typical Bridge Lateral Cross-section for a Primary Road	17
	2.9	Flow Through a Short Contraction in a Channel.	18
	2.10	Schematic of Near-Field Flow around a Abutment in a Compound Channel.	19
	2.11	Different Soils at Bridge Waterway's Abutments.	20
	2.12	Definition Sketch for Contraction Scour.	22
	2.13	Local Scour Depths as a Function Time and Flow Velocity	26
	2.14	(a) Flow Distribution in the Laboratory, and (b) Flow Distribution in a Compound River Channel.	26
	2.15	Scour at Location 1.	27
	2.16	Scour at Location 2.	27
	2.17	Scour at Location 3.	28

C

2.18	Scour at Location 1: Scour Hole Develops at the Front of the Wing-Wall Abutment.	28	
2.19	Scour at Location 3: Washout of the Approach Embankment.	29	
2.20	Critical Shear Stress Versus Mean Soil Grain Diameter.	30	
2.21	Concepts in Contraction Scour.	36	
2.22	Location of Maximum Contraction Scour.	38	
2.23	Abutment Skewness Angle Definition.	47	
2.24	Characteristic dimensions of position of the deepest point of scour at compound channel.	52	
2.25	Schematic diagram showing three different cases of scour development relative to the bed level in the flood channel.	53	
3.1	Flow Chart for Experimental Work.	55	
3.2	Selected Flume to Conduct the Experiments.	59	
3.3	Schematic (Non-Scaled) Drawing of The Flume Test Facilities and Model Setup.	60	
3.4	Transverse section of the flume.	61	
3.5	Flume carriage with vernier point gauge over the test flume.	61	
3.6	Cross section sh <mark>owing layout of experimental set up in the</mark> lab flume.	62	
3.7	Current meter type OTT C2.	63	
3.8	Acoustic Doppler Velocimeter.	64	
3.9	Grids for bathymetry measurements around the model abutment in the flume.	65	
3.10	Mechanical sieve analysis for bed material.	66	
3.11	Particle size distribution of bed material.	67	
3.12	Prototype dimensions of standard stub abutment	69	
3.13	Model Layout and Dimensions of the Protected Abutments.	70	
3.14	Model Layout And Dimensions of the Abutments in the Primary Series of Experiments.	71	
3.15	Initial Setup for Condition 1. Protected Embankment and Erodible Floodplain: (a) Gabion Mattress, and (b) Riprap.	73	
3.16	Initial Setup for Condition 2. Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain: (a) Wing-Wall Abutment, and (b) Slope Protected Abutment.	73	

3.17	Initial Setup for Condition 3. Fixed Embankment and Fixed Floodplain: (a) Before Covering the Fixed Floodplain, and (b) After Covering the Fixed Floodplain.	74
3.18	Locations of the Measuring Stations Along the Test Cross Section at the Channel Bed During the Experiments.	76
4.1	Performance of One Sample from Each Series of the Tests under Clear-Water Conditions.	81
4.2	Scour at the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain for Bf0.5B =0.52 and LBf=1.46 (A) A View before the Scour, and (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	83
4.3	Scour at the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain for Bf0.5B =0.52 and LBf=1.37 (A) a View before the Scour, and (B) an Upstream View of Scour Holes.	83
4.4	Scour at the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain for Bf0.5B =0.52 and LBf=1.09 (A) a View before the Scour, and (B) an Upstream View of Scour.	83
4.5	Scour At the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain for $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 0.98$ (A) A View before the Scour, And (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	84
4.6	Contour Plot of Resulting Scour Hole, $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ When $L/b_f = 1.46$ (A), 1.37 (B), 1.09 (C), and 0.98 (D) With Fixed Embankment and Erodible Floodplain. Contours Are Drawn From Maximum Scour Depth With an Increment Of $0.1 \sim 0.05$ m.	85
4.7	Lateral Bed Profiles of Maximum Contraction Scour Cross- Sections Shown in Figure 4.6.	86
4.8	Longitudinal Bed Profiles of Channel Centerline Shown in Figure 4.6.	87
4.9	Bathymetry Contours of Scour Holes: $b_f/o.5b=0.52$ When $L/b_f=1.46$ (a), 1.37 (b), 1.09 (c) And 0.9869 (d).	88
4.10	Scour at the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Non- Erodible Floodplain for $b_f/o.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 1.46$ (a) A View Before Covering the Non-Erodible Floodplain, (b) After Covering the Non-Erodible Floodplain and Before the Scour, and (c) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	89
4.11	Scour at the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Non- Erodible Floodplain for $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 1.37$ (a) A	89

	View before the Scour, and (b) an Upstream View of Scour Holes.	
4.12	Scour At the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Non- Erodible Floodplain for $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 1.09$ (A) An Upstream View of Scour, And (B) A Downstream View of Scour Holes.	90
4.13	Scour At the Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Non- Erodible Floodplain for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/0.5b=0.98$ (a) A View before the Scour, and (b) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	90
4.14	Contour Plot of Resulting Scour Hole, $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ When $L/0.5b=1.46$ (a), 1.37 (b), 1.09 (c) and 0.98 (d) for the Abutments with Fixed Embankment and Non-Erodible Floodplain. Contours are drawn from Maximum Scour Depth with an Increment of $0.1 \sim 0.05m$.	91
4.15	Lateral Bed Profiles of Maximum Contraction Scour Cross- Sections Shown In Figure 4.14.	92
4.16	Longitudinal bed profiles of channel centerline shown in Figure 4.15.	93
4.17	Bathymetry contours of scour holes: $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ when $L/0.5b=1.46$ (a), 1.37 (b), 1.09 (c) and 0.98 (d).	94
4.18	Scour at wing-wall abutment for $L/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 2.49$ (a) A view before the scour, and (b) An upstream view of scour holes.	96
4.19	Scour at wing-wall abutment for $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 2.4754$ (a) A view before the scour, and (b) An upstream view of scour holes.	96
4.20	Scour at wing-wall abutment for $b_f/0.5b$ 0.52 and $L/b_f=2.3608$ (a) a view before the scour, and (b) an upstream view of scour holes.	97
4.21	Scour at wing-wall abutment for $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ and $L/b_f = 2.1569$ (a) a view before the scour, and (b) an upstream view of scour holes.	97
4.22	Contour plot of resulting scour hole, $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ when $L/b_f = 2.4902$ (a), 2.4754 (b), 2.3608 (c) and 2.1569 (d) for wing-wall abutments with rip-rap protected embankment. Contours are drawn from maximum scour depth with an increment of 0.1~0.05m.	98
4.23	Lateral Bed Profiles of Maximum Contraction Scour Cross-	99

Sections Shown In Figure 4.22.

4.24	Longitudinal Bed Profiles of Channel Centerline Shown In Figure 4.22.	100
4.25	Bathymetry Contours of Scour Holes: $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ When $L/b_f=2.4902$ (a), 2.4754 (b), 2.3608 (c) and 2.1569 (d).	101
4.26	Scour At Wing-Wall Abutment for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.1569$ (A) A View before the Scour, And (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	103
4.27	Scour at Wing-Wall Abutment for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.3608$ (A) A View before the Scour, And (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	103
4.28	Scour at Wing-Wall Abutment for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.4754(A)$ A View before the Scour, and (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes	104
4.29	Scour at Wing-Wall Abutment for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.4902$ (A) A View before the Scour, and (B) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	104
4.30	Contour Plot of Resulting Scour Hole, $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ When $L/b_f=2.1569$ (a), 2.3608 (b), 2.4754 (c) And 2.4902 (d) for Wing-Wall Abutments with Gabion-Mattress Protected Embankment. Contours Are Drawn from Maximum Scour Depth with an Increment of $0.1 \sim 0.05$ m.	105
4.31	Bed Profiles of Maximum Scour Cross-Sections Shown In Figure 4.30.	106
4.32	Longitudinal Bed Profiles of Channel Centerline.	107
4.33	Bathymetry Contours of Scour Holes: $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ when $L/b_f=2.1569$ (a), 2.3608 (b), 2.4754 (c) and 2.4902 (d).	108
4.34	Scour At Wing-Wall Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Slope-Slide for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.4902$ (a) A View before the Scour, and (b) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	109
4.35	Scour At Wing-Wall Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Slope-Slide for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.4754$ (a) A View before the Scour, and (b) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	110
4.36	Scour At Wing-Wall Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Slope-Slide for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.3608$ (a) A View before the Scour, and (b) An Upstream View of Scour	110

 \bigcirc

Holes.

4.37	Scour At Wing-Wall Abutment with Fixed Embankment and Slope-Slide for $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ and $L/b_f=2.1569$ (a) A View before the Scour, and (b) An Upstream View of Scour Holes.	111
4.38	Contour Plot of Resulting Scour Hole, $b_f/0.5b = 0.52$ when $L/b_f = 2.4902$ (a), 2.4754 (b), 2.3608 (c) And 2.1569 (d) for Wing-Wall Abutments with Fixed Embankment and Slope-Slide. Contours are Drawn from Maximum Scour Depth with An Increment of $0.1 \sim 0.05$ m.	112
4.39	Lateral Bed Profiles of Maximum Scour Cross-Sections Shown In <mark>Figure 4.38.</mark>	113
4.40	Longitudinal Bed Profiles of Channel Centerline Shown In Figure 4.39.164	114
4.41	Bathymetry Contours of Scour Holes: $b_f/0.5b=0.52$ when $L/b_f=2.4902$ (a), 2.4754 (b), 2.3608 (c) and 2.1569 (d).	115
4.42	Time Development of Scour and Semi-Hyperbola Trend Simulation for Experiments No. UE-01 and UE-02 at Points A, B, and C.	117
4.43	Time Development of Scour and Semi-Hyperbola Trend Simulation for Experiments No. UE-03 and UE-04 at Points A, B, and C.	118
4.44	Best Fit by Lea <mark>st Square Method for Contraction Scour</mark> Depth at Experiments No. UE-01 and UE-02 at Point C.	119
4.45	Best Fit by Least S <mark>quare Me</mark> thod for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments No. UE-03 to UE-04 at Point C.	120
4.46	Time development of scour during Experiments UE-01 and UF-02 at points A, B and C.	121
4.47	Time development of scour during Experiments UE-03 and UF-04 at points A, B and C.	122
4.48	Best Fit by Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments No. UF-01 and UF-02 at Point C.	123
4.49	Best Fit by Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments No. UF-03 and UF-04 at Point C.	124
4.50	Time Development of Scour during Experiments RE-01 and RE-02 at A, B and Point C.	125
4.51	Time Development of Scour during Experiments RE-03 and RE-04 at A, B and Point C.	126
4.52	Best Fit by Least Square Method for Contraction Scour	127

	Depth at Experiments No. RE-01 and RE-02 at Point C.	
4.53	Best Fit by Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments No. RE-03 and RE-04 at Point C.	128
4.54	Time Development of Scour during Experiment GE-01 and GE-02 at the Up-Stream Front of the Slope Layer and Point C.	129
4.55	Time Development of Scour during Experiment GE-03 and GE-04 at the Up-Stream Front of the Slope Layer and Point C.	130
4.56	Best Fit By Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments No. GE-01 and GE-02 at Point C.	131
4.57	Best Fit By Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments GE-03 and GE-04 at Point C.	132
4.58	Time Development of Scour during Experiment FE-01 and FE-02 at the Up-Stream Front of the Slope Layer and Point C.	133
4.59	Time Development of Scour during Experiment FE-01 and FE-02 at the Up-Stream Front of the Slope Layer and Point C.	134
4.60	Best Fit By Least Square Method for Contraction Scour Depth a <mark>t Experiments FE-01 and FE-02 at Point C.</mark>	135
4.61	Best Fit <mark>By Least Squa</mark> re Method for Contraction Scour Depth at Experiments FE-03 and FE-04 at Point C.	136
4.62	Maximum Contraction Scour Depth versus Relative Length of the Embankment for Four Different Contraction Ratios.	138
4.63	Maximum Contraction Scour Depth versus Relative Length of the Embankment for Four Different Contraction Ratios.	139
4.64	Bathymetry of the test section before scour.	140
4.65	Transverse section of the channel before scour.	140
4.66	Comparison between Abutment Scour and Maximum Contraction Scour.	142
4.67	Comparison between Abutment Scour and Maximum Contraction Scour.	143
4.68	Comparison between Abutment Scour and Maximum Contraction Scour with the Reference Elevation Base on the Main Channel Bed Centerline.	145
4.69	Comparison between Abutment Scour and Maximum Contraction Scour Based on the Moving the Reference Elevation to the Floodplain at Adjacent the Abutment for	145

 \bigcirc

Measuring Local Scour Depths.

4.70	Comparison between Abutment Scour and Maximum Contraction Scour Based on the Moving the Reference Elevation to the Top Toe of the Slope Sides for Measuring Local Scour Depths.	146
4.71	Maximum Contraction Scour Depths along the Channel.	147
4.72	Influence of the Contraction Ratio and Different Protection Slope Side Layers on the Longitudinal Scour Profile.	148
4.73	Influence of the contraction ratio on the contraction scour depth; (a) abutments with apron protection, (b) abutments without apron protection	152
4.74	Influence of the Contraction Degree on the Local Scour Depth; (a) Abutments without Apron Protection, (b) Abutments with Apron Protection.	154
4.75	Influence of the Contraction Ratio on the Local Scour Depth at Abutments with Non-Erodible Slope-Side.	155
4.76	Comparisons between Measured Contraction Scour Depths. Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Laursen (1963) Formula.	160
4.77	Comparisons Between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Komura (1966) Formula.	160
4.78	Comparisons between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Gill (1981) Formula.	161
4.79	Comparisons Between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Lim (1998) Formula.	161
4.80	Comparisons Between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Chang (1998) Formula.	162
4.81	Comparisons Between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Richardson (2001) Formula	162
4.82	Comparisons Between Measured Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments and Predicted Scour Depths Using Li (2002) Formula.	163
4.83	Locations Of Deepest Scour: (A), No Protective Apron; (B), Loose Protective Apron That Partially Fails; (C), Protective Apron Tied To Abutment.	164

4.84	Scour Hole Parameters Measured for Each Experiment in the 1.5m Wide Flume.	166
4.85	Maximum Contraction Scour and Reynolds Number.	170
4.86	Maximum Contraction Scour and Froud Number.	170
4.87	Predicted Maximum Contraction Scour Depths Versus Measured Depths.	174
4.88	Effect of the Contraction Degree on Contraction Scour Side View.	177
4.89	Relationship Between a_y/b_2 and Contraction Scour Geometry.	177
4.90	Relationship Between Y and Contraction Geometry	178
4.91	Effect of the Contraction Degree on Contraction Scour Horizontal Distance from Abutments' Tip	179
4.92	Relationship Between a_x/L and Contraction Scour Geometry.	179
4.93	Relationship Between Xmin and Contraction Geometry.	180
4.94	Variations of <i>d_{smax}</i> with Contraction Degree for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	183
4.95	Variations of Y with Contraction Degree for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	183
4.96	Variations of <i>X</i> with Contraction Degree for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	184
4.97	Variations of d_{smax} with L/ b_f for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	184
4.98	Variations of <i>Y</i> with L/b _f for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	185
4.99	Variations of <i>X</i> with L/b_f for Scour at Abutments on Fixed Floodplains.	185
4.100	Channel Geometry Effect on the Maximum Contraction Scour Depth.	189
4.101	Channel Geometry Effect on the Vertical Distance of the Maximum Scour Depth form the Upstream Toe of the Abutment.	189
4.102	Channel Geometry Effect on Horizontal Distance of the Maximum Contraction Scour Depth form the Abutment Tip.	190
4.103	Variations of d_{smax} with b_2/b_1 and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	192

4.104	Variations of d_{smax} with L/b_f and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	192
4.105	Variations of Y with b_2/b_1 and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	193
4.106	Variations of Y with L/b_f and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	193
4.107	Variations of X with b_2/b_1 and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	194
4.108	Variations of X with L/b_f and Protection Layers for Scour at Abutments.	194
4.109	Protection Layer Effect on the Maximum Scour Depth.	199
4.110	Protection Layer Effect on the Vertical Distance of the Maximum Scour Depth form the Middle of Abutment, when $b_2/b_1 > 0.2$.	199
4.111	Protection Layer Effect on the Vertical Distance of the Maximum Scour Depth form the Middle of Abutment, when $b_2/b_1 < 0.2$.	200
4.112	Protection Layer Effect on Horizontal Distance of the Maximum Scour <mark>Depth form the Middle of the Abutmen</mark> t	200
4.113	Measured Maximum Contraction Scour Depths Obtained from Experiments Versus Contraction Scour Depths Applying Predicted by Proposed Equation	202
4.114	Measured Transverse Distance Between the Maximum Contraction Scour Location and Middle of the Abutment Face, Obtained from Experiments Versus Predicted Transverse Distance of the Maximum Contraction Scour Depths Applying Proposed Equation.	203
4.115	Measured Longitudinal Distance Between the Maximum Contraction Scour Location and Middle of the Abutment Face, Obtained from Experiments Versus Predicted Longitudinal Distance of the Maximum Contraction Scour Depths Applying Proposed Equation.	204

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.1	Summaries of experiment results.	220
A.2	Experimental Data of Different Investigators Under Clear-Water Contraction Scour Depth Used for Comparative Study of Existing Scour Equations.	221
A.3	Left Abutment scour location.	222
A.4	Right Abutment scour location.	223



LIST OF NOTATIONS

The following symbols are used in this note:

b = Channel width **[L]**;

 d_s = Scour depth [L];

d = flow depth **[L]**;

 $(d_s)_o =$ scour depth obtained from experiments or laboratory observation (in statistical analaysis) [L];

 $(d_s)_c$ = the corresponding predicted scour obtained from the application of the selected scour formulae (in statistical analaysis) [L];

 $\hat{d}_s = d_s/L$, nondimensional equilibrium scour depth [M⁰L⁰T⁰];

D= Diameter of smallest non-transportable particle in the bed material **[L]**;

 \mathbf{D}_a = Diameter of smallest non-transportable particle present in bed material [L];

 \mathbf{D}_m = Effective mean diameter of the bed material in the bridge = 1.25 D_{50} [L];

D₁₆= 16% of the particles by weight are finer[**L**];

 D_{50} = Median particle diameter (50% of the particles by weight are finer) [L];

 \mathbf{D}_{84} = 84% of the particles by weight are finer [L];

 e_i = Absolute errors (in statistical analaysis);

 f_i = The prediction (in statistical analaysis);

Fr= Froud number (dimensionless);

 \mathbf{F}_a = Froud number in the floodplain upstream of the end of the abutment (dimensioless);

 \mathbf{F}_c = Critical Froud number for the initiation of bed material movement (dimensioless);

 \mathbf{F}_d = Densimetric particle Froude number (dimensionless);

 $\mathbf{F}_e = U_e / (\Delta g l)^{0.5} =$ excess abutment Froude number (dimensionless);

 $\mathbf{g} = \text{Gravitaional acceleration force } [\mathbf{LT}^{-2}];$

 h_1, h_2 = Depth of the flow [L];

$$\hat{h} = h_1/L;$$

K= Constant coeficient (dimensionless);

 $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{I}} =$ Flow intensity factor;

 $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{v}}$ = Flow depth factor;

 \mathbf{K}_{d} = Factor to account for the effect of channel curvature on the shear stress acting on the outside of the bend;

 \mathbf{K}_{σ} = Factor of sediment nonuniformity;

 $\mathbf{K}_{s} = \text{Roughness height};$

 \mathbf{K}_{θ} = Foundation aligment factor;

 $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{G}}$ = Approach channel geometry factor;

 $K_n = 1/21.1$, if **D**₅₀ is measured by meters. Strickler Equation coefficient

 \mathbf{K}_{yL} = Depth size factor for abutments;

 \mathbf{K}_{u} = Constant coefficient in Richardon's Equation.

L= Length of embankment (contraction section) [L];

 L_a = Abutment length [L];

 L_f = Flood plain width **[L]**;

 L_F = Total width of the flood plains in the channel [L];

 $\bar{l} = L/D_{50};$

MAE= Mean Absolute Error (dimensionless);

n = Manning coefficient (dimensionless);

n = The sample size or the number of subjects, things, whatever, in the sample (in statistical analaysis);

N = Shape number;

q = Unit discharge [LT⁻¹];

Q =Total discharge in compound channel [L³T⁻¹];

 Q_a = Flow intercepted by the abutment and diverted towards the main channel, discharge [L³T⁻¹];

 Q_w = Discharge moving in a width of the main channel, in a streamwise direction in the flood-plain section [L³T⁻¹];

Re= Reynolds number, (dimensioless);

RMSE= Root Mean Square Error;

 t_e = Time to achieve equilibrium conditions [T];

T = time;

 T_s = Dimensionless time in the proposed method;

U = Theil's coefficient, it is unitless.

u^{*} = Shear velocity [LT⁻¹];

 v_c = Critical velocity for the initiation of bed material movement [LT⁻¹];

 $v, v_1 \& v_2 =$ Flow velocity [LT⁻¹];

w= Particle settling velocity [LT⁻¹];

x = The value of data (in statistical analaysis), the unite depends on the data unit.

 \overline{x} = The average of data (in statistical analaysis), the unite depends on the data unit.

 y_a = Average depth of flow at approach cross section [L];

 y_i =The true (measured) value (in statistical analaysis), the unite depends on the data unit.

y = Average depth [L];

 ds_R = Reference scour depth [L];

 $\alpha = 0.59 \sim 0.69.$

 $\alpha_1 = 0.066 \sim 0.367.$

 β = Degree of contraction ratio;

 θ = Transition angle, [°];

 θ_{c50} = Dimensionless critical shear of meadian-size particle in bed material.

 ρ = Mass density of water [ML⁻³];

- ρ_s = Mass density of sediments [ML⁻³];
- σ = Standard deviation (in statistical analaysis).
- σ_{o} = Shear stress on the bed size distribution.
- σ_{g} = Geometric standard deviation of the sediment [M⁰L⁰T⁰];

 τ_c , τ_1 = Bed shear stress; the subscript "c" symbolizes the condition for initial sediment motion [L²T²];

 τ_* = Shields parameter [L²T²];

- γ_w = water specific weight [MNL⁻³]
- ω = Fall velocity of bed material based on the **D**₅₀ [LT⁻¹];

 Δ = Relative density.

Subscripts

1= Uncontracted (approach) section and;

2= Contracted section

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Abutments are located at the two ends of a bridge, that act double purposes of transferring the loads from the superstructure to the footing bed and giving support to the approach embankment. Bridges are characterized by how they support themselves. The simplest type of bridge is the beam bridge. This type of bridge has a single horizontal beam across two supports with articulated structures. A simple beam bridge main structures are shown in Figure 1.1. When it is needed to build a bridge across a wide space and don't want to sink supports in the middle, thus hoping to build a beam bridge with one very long span. But, a long beam may sag too much in the middle. To avoid sagging, bridge is build with support at the two ends by using cross members to make the bridge stronger. These kinds of bridges without movement joints at the junction of the deck on the abutments named abutment bridge (also called Integral abutment bridges or joint less bridges). Figure 1.2 shows contiguous abutment bridge. Reliability, strength and economy are the main reasons to increase concerning in a bridge structure. Besides, abutment bridges have less initial cost in construction and long-term maintenance in comparison with simple beam bridges. Abutments acquit an extra function as a protector of the embankment against scour during stream in a abutment bridge constructed on a waterway.



Deficiency of load capability and bridge scouring are the most reasons of bridge collapse. The erosive action of flowing water sources scour, which excavates and carries away materials from bank's bridge foundations and streambeds through the normal flood flowing or water. Scour is a natural occurrence caused by the flow of

water over an erodible boundary, whereas flowing water generates the shear stress that is the basic erosive stress on the streambed. The materials of the streambed provide the resisting stress against scouring. Scour reaches its equilibrium standing when these two stresses get balanced. Excessive scour can lead to the undermining of the bridge foundations. Different materials scour at different rates. Under constant flow conditions, scour will reach maximum depth in sand and gravel bed material in hours; cohesive bed material in days; glacial till, sandstones, and shale in months; limestone in years and dense granite in centuries. Under flow conditions typical of actual bridge crossings, several floods may be needed to attain maximum scour (Arneson et al., 2012).

Total scour is comprised of the three components: Aggradations or degradation, contraction scour and local scour. Aggradations or degradation is long-term streambed elevation changes due to natural or human-induced causes within the reach of the river on which the bridge is located. Contraction scour involves the removal of material from the bed and banks across all or most of the width of the channel. This scour can be resulted from the approach flow constricted by the embankments encroaching in the floodplain or into the main channel. Such an encroachment are due to the change in downstream control of the water surface elevation or from the location of the bridge in relation to a bend. In each case, scour is caused by an increase in transport of bed material in the bridge cross section.

Local scour occurs around piers, abutments, spurs and embankments and is caused by the acceleration of the flow and the development of vortex systems induced by these obstructions to the flow (Li, 2005). Relevant with location in the main channel or floodplain of a river, abutments are susceptible to failure by scour.

Abutment bridges most commonly are used over comparatively small channels. In these situations, abutments are very close and they may still be located at the banks of a main channel or may protruded to the main channel to reduce the cost of the bridge construction. When a channel is constricted, the approach flow accelerates and causes an increase in the bed shear stress and related turbulence. The embankments and abutments shorten the necessary bridge span, but consequently contract the flow through the waterway. As the bed shear stress exceeds the critical shear stress of the bed material, contraction scour expands. That construction advantage, however, can lead to a potentially severe scour situation as a contraction scour at a site of the abutment bridge.

The most common cause of bridge failures is attributed to scouring around foundations during floods. Study of 503 bridge structure's failures in the United States from 1989 to 2000 indicated that the main reasons for failure or damage of the bridges are those interconnected to scouring at the abutments and piers of the bridges (Wardhana and Hadipriono, 2003). Bridge collapse reasons were evaluated in Colombia based on the study of 63 real cases of reported failures since 1986. Through the analysis of each failure event, the main reasons of total or partial collapse of the bridge structures were recognized and studied. The 64% of the cases studied

corresponds to concrete bridges that collapsed mainly because of scour effect and overloads; and the remaining 36% corresponds to steel structures that failed mainly because of structural deficiencies (Diaz et al., 2009).

In Malaysia, the use of abutment bridge has also dramatically increased in recent years. However, since the development of abutment bridge is still new in Malaysia, factors that caused bridge failure other than loading must be investigated. Flood is one of the recent interests in abutment bridge structure because it can cause scouring (Akib et al., 2011; Akib et al., 2008; Fayyadh et al., 2011). In Malaysia the main responcible governmental agency for bridges construction and mainenace is called Public Work Department or in local language in Malaysia, Jabatan Kerja Raya (JKR). There are about more than 7133 bridges in Malaysia.

Table: 1.1 Statistics of Manaysia Dridges (Heng, 2000).				
Department	Bridge (Nos)			
JKR Federal	7133			
JKR State	7000			
JKR Sabah	1730			
JKR Sarawak	1540			
Toll Concessionaires	560			
Malayan Railways Department (in				
local language in Malaysia; Keretapi	920			
Tanah Melayu, KTM)				

Table. 1.1 Statistics of Malaysia Bridges (Heng, 2008)
--

Figure 1.3 displays the numbers of bridge constructed along the federal roads under JKR, based on the material type (Heng and Hamid, 2009; Nadzri, 2011).



Figure 1.3. Types of Bridges in Malaysia Along the Federal Routes (Heng and Hamid, 2009; Nadzri, 2011).

As a country located in Southeast Asia, Malaysia is categorized as equatorial, being hot and humid throughout the year with annual rainfall exceeds 2000.

Malaysia experiences very high rainfall intensity, especially during the Monsoon season from October to January. Flooding is very common during this period. Ng and Razak (1998) reported that bridge failure due to structure damage is very rare in Malaysia, while bridge failures are very often caused by scouring the footing structure during major floods. A governmental report presented JKR experiences in facing hydraulic problems in Malysia (Meng et al., 2000). Revetment of Pukin river bridge, Keratong river bridge and Plentong river bridge were cited as case history. It is later learned that the Pukin River Bridge was badly scoured at both abutments during heavy flooding in December 2006 (Heng, 2010). Scouring problems are the main, if not only cause of bridge damage in Malysia. The most scour hazards to the abutments of bridges in Malaysia are shown in Table 1.2.

No.	Location of Bridge	Date of Failure	Problems
1	Kota Tinggi, Johor	1989	Collaped due to scour at abutments after big flood
2	Port Dickson, Negri Sembiln	1995	Collaped due to scour at abutments after big flood
3	Calvert bridge, Sungai Semiar, Jeneri, Pahang	1996	Filled Embankement was washed away after big flood
4	Sungai Batang Busu, Gombak, Selangor	2003	Collaped due to scour at abutments after big flood
5	Sungai Buaya, Selangor	2005	Collaped due to scour at abutments after big flood

Table.	1.2 Mal	aysian	Experience ;	Defect D	ue to Scour	Hazard	(Heng,	2008).
		•	1 /				\ O /	

Recent floods at past two years in Malaysia had serious damage and failure of bridges. For instance, heavy rain at 20 february 2012, that lasted six hours caused over topping the bridge of the Pari river. The water levels had risen to a dangerous level and the whole area had been flooded. At the same area, strong currents also caused the bridge at Wing Onn Garden to collapse. Figures 1.6 shows the overflow during the flooding for that area (Loh and Hew, 2012).



Figure 1.4. Flooding At Pari River On February 2012 (Loh and Hew, 2012).



Figure 1.5. Pari River Bridge After The Recent Flood On Febuary 2012 (Loh and Hew, 2012).



Figure 1.6. Evacuation During Flooding Of Pari (Loh and Hew, 2012).

Furthermore, as a latest abutment bridge collapsed on24 October 2013, due to abutment scour at Cameron Highlands (Figure 1.7). Also, 4 people have died after the flood surrounded the areas (Today, 2013).



Figure 1.7. View Of The Destroyed Bridge In Cameron Highlands (Today, 2013).

1.2. Problem Statement

Bridge collapse has dramatic consequences in transportation system. Besides loss of life, disruption in service results tremendous effects on the economic growth of the countries. In many developing countries, bridges are constructed with less quality control and limit adherence to the design code. Designing the bridge foundation safely needs an accurate estimation of structure footing depth. Therefore, engineers need reliable methods for predicting scour depth and location which, affect the bridge foundations. Such consistent methods can applied in estimating any damage or collapsed due to scouring for the bridges in design stage or constructed bridge to design erosion protection.

Underestimation may lead to bridge failure while overestimation will lead to excessive construction cost.

Many abutment bridges are located on compound channels whose geometry and hydraulic characteristics are markedly site-specific. Moreover, the channel is formed of various types of soils occupying different locations within a bridge site. Sands or gravels may form the bed of main channel. Rocks and various types of concrete elements may have been placed as erosion protection for the abutments as well, along adjoining riverbanks. Scour at abutment bridges typically occurs at two-phase process, including hydraulic erosion of the main channel or floodplain and thereafter, a geotechnical slope stability failure of the river banks adjacent or earth-fill embankment. This two-phase process makes scour prediction more complicated in comparison with contraction scour in a simple rectangular channel. Prior studies treated abutments as being solid structure locating in a floodplain or main channel, individualy. Some studies, however, have illustrated some of the processes causing scour, remarkably scour referable to flow contraction through a bridge waterway. These studies have described certain parametric trends related with flow contraction and have developed tentative design relationships for estimating scour depth. In case of contraction scour, the relief bridges in flood valleys, with a small width, require a special procedure to evaluate the scour (Schreider et al., 2001). According to the result of the perfect laboratory experiments which often applying simple rectangular channels and uniform sediment, it was concluded that the accuracy of scour depth estimate is less than the measured scour depth of the field or laboratory conditions (Hong, 2005). Recent research on the bridge scour has focused on local scour, such as scour around bridge piers or near abutments; by comparison, contraction scour at abutment bridges in compound channel has received much less attention. Most of the techniques and guidelines that are available for predicting contraction scour at abutment bridge have been developed from small scale hydraulic modelling conducted in laboratories (Azamathulla, 2012; Coleman et al., 2003; Dey et al., 2008; Ettema et al., 2004; Husain et al., 1998; Kouchakzadeh and Townsend, 2000; Lim and Cheng, 1998; Martin-Vide, 2007; Mueller and Wagner, 2005; Yanmaz and Celebi, 2004). Limited amount of empirical data along with unreliable observations has been acquired from simulated real situations. However, few conditions of flow, boundary erosion and alluvial-sediment transport are more complex than those related with scour in compound channels at abutments bridge. Therefore, several essential aspects of scour at abutment bridge has remained little understood, the main deficiency of prior studies are:

- 1. They do not consider contraction scour development at abutments bridges in a compound channel. Most of the abutments are located in the bank line or protruded into the main channel in a compound river. However, the existing contraction scour equations focused on setback abutments.
- 2. Guidelines and available relationships to predict contraction scour do not adequately take into account the complexities of the channel geometry and bed materials. Most of the contraction scour studies conducted in a simple rectangular channel, while most river morphologies are compound.
- 3. Abutment bridges, are found to be a primarily concern for bridges over smaller waterways than the large rivers. The applicability of the previous contraction scour equations are in the long contraction, while bridges typically causes short contraction.

4. Previous studies are commonly dedicated to determine maximum scour depth around bridge foundations. Besides, most of the studies are conducted in clear water conditions that are generally based on the prediction the equilibrium scour depth at bridge abutments. Not only application degree of the scour countermeasures materials is determined by the maximum depth of scour but also by the characteristics of volume and surface area of the scour hole around such foundations (Yanmaz and Kose, 2007).

It has been recognized that along with new prediction of the maximum contraction scour depth and location concepts, current design and construction guidelines need to be developed to protect bridge abutments and approach embankments from scour damage and to reduce the depths to which expensive deep foundations may have to be placed. That is why bridge engineer designers are interested in scouring which affect the abutments and alongside the contracted section. Therefore, it is not surprising that several aspects of scour related with abutments remain to be resolved. Requirement to more research on scaled most in used abutment bridge in Malaysia within a compound channel, led us to conduct a new series of experiments.

The major concentrations of the current study will be the clarification of scour processes at contracted section of the abutment bridges and improvement of relationship for estimating contraction scour depth and location in clear-water conditions in a compound channel using empirical methods. These improvements are based on formulation supported by laboratory experiments. Credible predictions of contraction scour depths can assist the design engineers to promote the bridges' design, monitor and correct the scour problem before any bridge failure, and decreasing the bridges' cost in construction and maintenance processes.

1.3 Scope and Objectives

Natural contraction caused by abutment bridge in a compound channel with complex geometry is more multifaceted. There are many issues of scours in contracted channel from the practical point of view that were not clarified in previous studies. Briefly, there are four relatively pronounced weakness in previous studies on scour in contracted channels:

- 1. For the small rivers, abutments encroach on the main channel banks, the floodplains portion of the contracted section no longer exist. Abutments being sited in the bank line or protruded in to the main channel in a compound river. However, the existing contraction scour methods focused on setback abutments or bank line abutments in a compound channels. Further study on scour at abutment sited in the main channel of a compound river is necessary.
- 2. Local and contraction scour equations were typically developed in uniform sands. However, what would be the behavior in armored layers which protect the bridge structures?

- 3. Most of the available equations are limited to predict the uniform scour depth in a long contraction channel. But the knowledge on how the scour distributes, location and depth of the maximum contraction scour are more critical in scour evaluations at short contraction caused by abutment bridges.
- 4. Bridge typically impose short, abrupt contraction. The applicability of the long rectangular contraction solution is uncertain for this case. Further study on influence of contraction degree and bridge openning width is necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the bridge scour in contracted channel.

The main cause of bridge failures built across small rivers is attributed to the problem of scour around bridge abutments. In this experimental study, contraction scour at abutment bridges is investigated in detail to achieve the main objective. In order to generalize the final results to other similar cases, it is needed to select an abutment bridge for scaling down in a laboratory model, as a representative prototype in footing and structure with the most in used abutment bridges in Malaysia and other countries. Besides, compound channel geometry within a abutment bridge model need to be scaled down hydraulically and geometrically to generalize the outcomes of the study to similar rivers and bridges bathymetries in and out of the Malaysia. Within scope, the study set out to produce practical guidelines for accurate contraction scour estimation by civil engineers. The main goal of this study is to develop a methodology for predicting contraction scour depth and location within full scaled abutments model of the most in used abutment bridge specially in Malaysia. The outcomes of the study will promote bridge design method in river environments by increasing estimation accuracy of maximum contraction scour depth which affect the final abutment footing depth and consequently bridge construction cost. This goal will be achieved by encounter the following set of specific objectives:

- 1. To simulate contraction scour for abutment bridge in a compound channel.
- 2. To quantify the contraction scour depth and location produced by individual components of the contraction degree, floodplain erodibility and slope protection resistance with propose of correction coefficients in improved proposed method.
- 3. To evaluate the existing methodologies by concentrating on the ability of the methodologies to be used as design equations for predicting contraction scour depth with complex geometries.
- 4. Evaluting the accuracy of proposed theory to determine the contraction scour hole geometry under clear-water conditions due to variations in the compound channel with complex geometries.

For the objectives, a semi-emperical approach to determine clear water contraction scour depth at abutment bridges is presented.

1.4 Thesis Organization

Based on the results of preliminary work done in getting underway with the study, there are some important keys in understanding scour at abutment bridge and developing useful relationships to predict depths of the contraction scour. Previous researcher were concentrated only on long contraction scour.

- 1. Are the common types of abutment configuration, and thereby scour conditions, of essential and practical importance?
- 2. How do floodplain and main-channel flows combine and contribute to scour at abutments located in compound channels formed of floodplain beside a main channel?
- 3. Why scour-prediction relationships developed from laboratory flumes seems to predict larger scour-depths than the depths observed at actual bridge abutments?

In the current study, laboratory experiments were conducted using common model of the selected abutment bridge in Malaysia in the compound channel. The time history of the scour and the velocity in the bridge section were measured. For this case, comparisons were made among flume measurements of scour depth (experimental results), and predicted contraction scour depth using existing formulas and proposed equation for scour-prediction. The experimental results were used to assess the relative contribution of contraction scour at abutment bridge to the final design of the bridge foundation depth.

The background of scour related to bridge abutments will be explained in details in chapter 2. It will include several sections, bridge structure, abutment characteristics, bridge scour and it's fundamental. In addition, several approaches to study the bridge abutment scour depth will be reviewed. Analytical methods are discussed for obtaining both the equilibrium contraction scour depth and its' location. The experimental studies based on dimensional analysis are presented to explain the effects of several parameters. Also, a review of physical model studies are undertaken and at least scour component method performance are discussed.

Chapter 3 focuses on the location and bed elevations for selected bridge sites. Moreover, the instrumentation which will be used in measuring the flow characteristics, the type of sensors being used to monitor the abutment bridge scour and how the data are collected and recorded are explained. Physical modeling and experimental procedures for this study are given in this chapter.

In Chapter 4 the results which are derived from experimental tests including the scour contours at abutment bridge are investigated. The data of the maximum contraction scour at abutment bridge have been collected. The effect of channel contraction degree, the effect of abutment aspect ratio, the effect of abutment protection materials, and the effect of the compound channel configuration are taken into account. The final chapter provides conclusions and recommendations for future study.

REFERENCES

- Abou-Seida, M.M., Elsaeed, G.H., Mostafa, T.M., & Elzahry, E.F. (2012). Local scour at bridge abutments in cohesive soil. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, **50**(2), 171-180.
- Akib, S., Fayyadh, M.M., & Othman, I. (2011). Structural Behaviour of a Skewed Integral Bridge Affected by Different Parameters. *Balt. J. Road. Bridge*. *Eng.*, 6(2), 107-114.
- Akib, S., Othman, F., & Othman, I. (2008). *Scour Behaviour on singly and doubly row pile integral bridges*. Paper presented at the United Kingdom Malaysia Engineering Conference University College London.
- Alabi, P.D. (2006). *Time Development of Local Scour at a Bridge Pier Fitted with a Collar*. (Ph.D. Dessertation), Saskatchewan, Canada.
- Annandale, G.W. (2006). *Scour technology*. Denver, Colorado: Civil engineering series, McGraw-Hill.
- Arneson, L.A., Zevenbergen, L.W., Lagasse, P.F., & Clopper, P.E. (2012). *Evaluating Scour At Bridges, Fifth Edition.* U.S. Department of Transportation, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.
- Ataie-Ashtiani., B., & Z. Baratian-Ghorghi, A.A.B. (2010). Experimental Investigation of Clear-Water Local Scour of Compound Piers. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 136(4), 343-351.
- Azamathulla, H.M. (2012). Gene-expression programming to predict scour at a bridge abutment. *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 14(2), 324-331.
- Ballegooy, S.v. (2005). Bridge abutment scour countermeasures. (Ph.D. Thesis), University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Ballio, F., Teruzzi, A., & Radice, A. (2009). Constriction Effects in Clear-Water Scour at Abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **135**(2), 140-145.
- Barbhuiya, A.K., & Dey, S. (2004). Local scour at abutments: A review. Sadhana, 29(5), 449-476.
- Barkdoll, B.D., Ettema, R., & Melville, B.W. (2007). Countermeasures to Protect Bridge Abutments from Scour. Transportation Research Board, WASHINGTON, D.C.
- Benahmed, N., & Bonelli, S. (2012). Investigating concentrated leak erosion behaviour of cohesive soils by performing hole erosion tests. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, **16**(1), 43–58.
- Benedict, S.T., & Caldwell, A.W. (2005). Development and evaluation of clearwater pier and contraction scour envelope curves in the Coastal Plain and Piedmont Provinces of South Carolina. South Carolina Department of Transportation, Virginia. Retrieved from <u>http://www.usgs.gov</u>.
- Bendict, S.T. (2003). Clear-Water Abutment and Contraction Scour in the Coastal Plain and Piedmont Provinces of South Carolina, 1996-99. U.S. Geological Survey, Columbia, South Carolina.
- Biglari, B., & turm, T.W. (1998). Numerical Modeling of Flow Around Bridge Abutments in

Compound Channel. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, ASCE, 124(2), 156-164.

- Brandimarte, L., D'Odorico, P., & Montanari, A. (2006). A probabilistic approach to the analysis of contraction scour. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, *44*(5), 8.
- Bressan, F. (2010). Large Eddy Simulation Of Turbulence Around a Scoured Bridge Abutment. (Phd), University of Trieste, Trieste, Slovenia.
- Bressan, F., Ballio, F., & Armenio, V. (2011). Turbulence around a scoured bridge abutment. *Journal of Turbulence*, **12**(3), 1-24.
- Breusers, H.N.C., & Raudkivi, A.J. (1991). *Scouring*. Roterdam, Brookfield: A.A. Balkema.
- Briaud, J.L., Chek, H.C., Li, Y., & Wang, J. (2004). *Pier and Contraction Scour in Cohesive Soils*. National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Washington D. C.
- Briaud, J.L., Chen, H.-C., Chang, K.-A., Oh, S.J., & Chen, X. (2009). *Abutment Scour in Cohesive Materials*. U. S. Transportation Research Board.
- Briaud, J.L., Chen, H.C., Kwak, K.W., Han, S.W., & Ting, F.C.K. (2001). Multiflood And M Ultilayer M Ethod Forscour Rate Prediction At Bridgepiers. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineeing, 127(2), 114-125.
- Briaud, J.L., Chen, H.C., Li, Y., Nurtjahyo, P., & Wang, J. (2003). *Complex Pier* Scour and Contraction Scour in cohesive Soils NCHRP, Washington D.C.
- Briaud, J.L., Chen, H.C., Li, Y., Nurtjahyo, P., & Wang, J. (2005). SRICOS-EFA Method for Contraction Scour in Fine-Grained Soils. *Journal of Geotechnical* and Geoenvironmental Engineering, **131**(10), 1283-1295.
- Cardoso, A.H., & Fae, C.M.S. (2010). Time to equilibrium scour at vertical wall bridge abutments. *Water Management- ICE*, *163*(WM1), 1–5.
- Cardoso, A.H., Simarro, G., Fael, C., Doucen, O.L., & Schleiss, A.J. (2010). Toe protection for spill-through and vertical-wall abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, 48(4), 491-498.
- Chabert, J., & Engeldinger, P. (1956). *Etude des affonillements author des piles des ponts*, Laboratoire National d'Hydraulique, Chatou, France.
- Chang, F., & Davis, S. (1998). Maryland SHA Procedure for Estimating Scour at Bridge Abutments: Part 2-Clear Water Scour. Paper presented at the ASCE Compendium of Conference Scour Papers (1991 to 1998), Reston, Virginia, USA.
- Chen, X. (2008). Numerical Study of Abutment Scour in Cohesive Soils. (Ph.D. Thesis), Texas A&M University, Texas.
- Coleman, S.E., Lauchlan, C.S., & Melville, B.W. (2003). Clear-water scour development at bridge abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, 41(5), 521-531.
- Conaway, J.S. (2004). Summary and Comparison of Multiphase Streambed Scour Analysis at Selected Bridge Sites in Alaska. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia:. Retrieved from <u>http://www.usgs.gov</u>
- Deng, L., & Cai, C.S. (2010). Bridge Scour: Prediction, Modeling, Monitoring, and Countermeasures-Review. Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction, 15(2), 125-134.

- Dey, S., & Barbhuiya, A.K. (2004). *Clear water scour at abutments* (Vol. 157). London, ROYAUME-UNI: Telford.
- Dey, S., & Barbhuiyab, A.K. (2005). Velocity and turbulence in a scour hole at a vertical-wall abutment. *Elsevier*.
- Dey, S., Chiew, Y.-M., & Kadam, M.S. (2008). Local Scour and Riprap Stability at an Abutment in a Degrading Bed. *Hydraulic Engineering*, **134**(10), 1496-1502.
- Dey, S., & Raikar, R.V. (2005). Scour in Long Contractions. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 131(12), 1036-1049.
- Dey, S., Chiew, Y.-M., & Kadam, M.S. (2008). Local Scour and Riprap Stability at an Abutment in a Degrading Bed. *Hydraulic Engineering*, **134**(10), 1496-1502.
- Diaz, E.E.M., Moreno, F.N., & Mohammadi, J. (2009). Investigation of Common Causes of Bridge Collapse in Colombia. *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction*, **1a**(4), 194-200.
- Dongol, D.M.S. (1994). Local scour at br idge abutments. University of Auckland, School of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering Private Bag, Auckland, New Zealand. (544)
- Duc, B.M., & Rodi, W. (2008). Numerical Simulation of Contraction Scour in an Open Laboratory Channel. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **134**(4), 367-377.
- Ettema, R. (1980). Scour at Bridge Piers. (Ph.D.), University of Iowa.
- Ettema, R., Nakato, T., & Muste, M. (2003). An Overview of Scour Types and Scour-Estimation Difficulties Faced at Bridge Abutments. Paper presented at the Mid-Continent Transportation Research Symposium.
- Ettema, R., Nakato, T., & Muste, M. (2010). *Estimation of Scour Depth at Bridge Abutments*. The University of Iowa, Iowa.
- Ettema, R., Yoon, B., Nakato, T., & Muste, M. (2004). A Review of Scour Conditions and Scour-Estimation Difficulties for Bridge Abutments. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, 8(6), 643-650.
- Fael, M.S., Simarro-Grande, G., Martin-Vide, J.P., & Cardoso, A.H. (2006). Local scour at vertical-wall abutments under clear-water flow conditions. *Water Resources Research*, 42(10), 1-12.
- Fayyadh, M.M., Akib, S., Othman, I., & Razak, H.A. (2011). Experimental investigation and finite element modelling of the effects of flow velocities on a skewed integral bridge. *Simul. Model. Pract. Theory.*, 19(9), 1795-1810.
- Froehlich, D.C. (1995). Armor-Limited Clear-Water Contraction Scour at Bridges. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 121(6), 490-493.
- Garcia, R.M. (2010). Insights from Depth-Averaged Numerical Simulation of Flow at Bridge Abutments in Compound Channels. (Ph.D.), University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
- Garde, R.J., Subramanya, K., & Nambudripad, K.D. (1962). Study of Scour Around Spur-Dikes. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division*, 88(3), 225-228.
- Gill, M.A. (1972). Erosion of sand beds around spur dikes. *Journal of Hydraulic Devision*, 98, 1587-1601.

- Gill, M.A. (1981). Bed Erosion in Rectangular Long Contraction. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division*, **107**(3), 273-283.
- Govindasamy, A. (2009). Simplified method for estimating future scour depth at existing bridges. (Ph.D.), Texas A&M University. (3370821)
- Govindasamy, A.V., Briaud, J.L., Kim, D., Olivera, F., Gardon, P., & Delphia, J. (2012). Observation Method for Estimating Future Scour Depth at Existing Bridges. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*.
- Grimaldi, C. (2005). Non-conventional countermeasures against local scouring at bridge piers. (Ph.D.), Univ. of Calabria, Cosenza, Italy.
- Guo, J. (2011). Time-dependent clear-water scour for submerged bridge flows. Journal of Hydraulic Research, 49(6), 744-749.
- Guo, J., Kerenyi, K., & Pagan-Ortiz, J.E. (2009). Bridge Pressure Flow Scour for Clear Water Conditions. GKY and Associates, Inc. University of Nebraska.
- Guo, J., Kerenyi, K., & Pagan-Ortiz, J.E. (2009). Bridge Pressure Flow Scour for Clear Water Conditions. Federal Highway Administration, Georgetown, USA.
- Hahn, E.M., & Lyn, D.A. (2010). Anomalous Contraction Scour? Vertical-Contraction Case. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **136**(2), 137-141.
- Heng, L.C. (2008). Bridge scour in Malaysia. Public Work Department Malaysia (JKR), Malaysia.
- Heng, L.C. (2010). [Private communication with the head of bridge rehabilitation of JKR.
- Heng, L.C., & Hamid, A. (2009). *Bridge scour in Malaysia*. Public Work Department Malaysia (JKR), Malaysia.
- Hong, S. (2005). Interaction of Bridge Contraction Scour and Pier Scour in a Laboratory River Model. (Master of Science), Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia.
- Husain, D., Quraishi, A.A., & Ibrahm, A. (1998). Local Scour at Bridge Abutments. *JKAU. Engineering Science*, **10**(1), 141-153.
- Hydraulic Design of Energy Dissipators for Culverts and Channels- HEC 14. ((1983).), U.S. Federal Highway Administration. Retrieved from http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/library listing.cfm (FHWA EPD-86-110).
- Hydraulic Laboratory Techniques. (1980). Denver, Colorado: U.S. Department of Interior.
- Keller, G. (2012). Smarter, Faster, Cheaper: Geosynthetic Reinforced Soil (GRS) Bridge Abutments. Retrieved 27/08/2012, 2012, from http://www.geosynthetica.net/smarter-faster-cheaper-geosyntheticreinforced-soil-grs-bridge-abutments-part-1/
- Khosronejad, A., Kang, S., & Sotiropoulos, F. (2012). Experimental and computational investigation of local scour around bridge piers. *Advances in Water Resources*, **37**, 73-85.
- Komura, S. (1966). Equilibrium depth of scour in long constrictions. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division*, **92**(5), 17-37.
- Kose, O. & Yanmaz, A.M. (2010). Scouring Reliability of Bridge Abutments. *Teknik Dergi*, *21*(1), 15.

- Kothyari, U.C. & Raju, K.G.R. (2001). Scour around spur dikes and bridge abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, **39**(4), 367-374.
- Kouchakzadeh, S. & Townsend, R.D. (1997). Maximum scour depth at bridge abutments terminating in the floodplain zone. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, **24**(6), 996-1005.
- Kouchakzadeh, S., & Townsend, R.D. (2000). Bridge Abutment Scour in Compound River Channel. *Journal of Agriciture Science Technology*, **2**, 95-106.
- Kirkegaard, J., Wolters, G., Sutherland, J., Soulsby, R., Frostick, L., McLelland, S., Mercer, T., & Gerritsen, H. (2011). Users Guide to Physical Modelling and Experimentation (Peter A Davies Ed.). Dundee, United Kingdom: The University of Dundee.
- Li, H. (2005). Countermeasures against scour at bridge abutments. (Ph.D. Thesis), Michigan Technology University, Michigan.
- Laursen, E.M. (1960). Scour at bridge crossing. Journal of the Hydraulics Division, 86(2), 39-54.
- Laursen, E.M. (1963). An analysis of relief bridge scour. ASCE Journal of Hydraulic Division, 89(HY3), 93-109.
- Lim, S.Y., & Cheng, N.S. (1998). Scouring in Long Contractions. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 124(5), 258-261.
- Li, H. (2005). Countermeasures against scour at bridge abutments. (Ph.D. Thesis), Michigan Technology University, Michigan.
- Li, Y. (2002). Bridge Pier Scour and Contraction Scour in Cohesive Soils on the Basis of Flume Tests. (Ph.D.), Texas A&M University, Texas.
- Lim, S.Y., & Cheng, N.S. (1998). Scouring in Long Contractions. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 124(5), 258-261.
- Liu, H.K., Chang, F.M., & Skinner, M.M. (1961). *Effect of bridge construction on scour and backwater*. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, U.S.
- Loh, I., & Hew, C. (2012, 21/02/2012). Floods cause havoc in Ipoh, News, The Star.
- Lombard, P.J., & Hodgkins, G.A. (2008). Comparison of Observed and Predicted Abutment Scour at Selected Bridges in Maine. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Maine Department of Transportation, Reston, Virginia.
- MacBroom, J.G. (2012). Bridge Scour and Sediment Analysis for River Restoration Projects. Paper presented at the World Environmental and Water Resources Congress, Albuquerque, NM.
- Maddison, B. (2012). Scour failure of bridges. *ICE Bridge Engineering Journal*, *165*(FE1), 39-52.
- Martin-Vide, J.P. (2007). Local scour in a protruding wall on a river bank. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, **45**(5), 4.
- May, R.W., Ackers, J.C., & Kirby, A.M. (2002). *Manual on scour at bridges and other hydraulic structures*. London: Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA).
- Melville, B.W. (1992). Local scour at bridge abutments. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 118(4), 615-631.
- Melville, B.W. (1997). Pier and Abutment Scour: Intergrated Approach. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **125**(2), 125-136.

- Melville, B.W., Ballegooy, S.v., Coleman, S., & Barkdoll, B. (2006). Countermeasure Toe Protection at Spill-Through Abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **132**(3).
- Melville, B.W., Ballegooy, S.v., Coleman, S., & Barkdoll, B. (2006). Scour Countermeasures for Wing-Wall Abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **132**(6), 563-574.
- Melville, B.W., Ballegooy, S.v., Coleman, S.E., & Barkdoll, B. (2006). Riprap Size Selection at Wing-Wall Abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 133(11), 1265-1269.
- Melville, B.W., & Chiew, Y.M. (1999). Time scale for local scour at bridge piers. Journal of Hydraulic Engineer, 125(1), 59-65.
- Melville, B.W., & Coleman, S.E. (2000). *Bridge scour*. Colorado, USA: Water Resources Publication, LLC.
- Melville, B.W. (1995). Bridge Abutment Scour in Compound Channels. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 121(12), 863-868.
- Melville, B.W., & Sutherland, A.J. (1988). Design Method for Local Scour at Bridge Piers. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 114(10), 1210-1226.
- Meng, C.Y., King, N.S., & Yong, L.S. (2000). *Hydraulic Problem in Malaysia*. Paper presented at the International Symposium of the International Society of Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering on Scour of Foundations, Melbourne, Australia.
- Mohammadpour, R., Aminuddin, A.G., & Hazi Mohammad, A. (2011). Prediction of equilibrium scour time around long abutments *Water Management*, **166**(7), 394-401.
- MOWM, M.o.W.M. (2011). *Malaysian Highway Capacity Manual*. Malaysia: Ministry of Works.
- Mueller, D.S., & Wagner, C.R. (2005). Field Observations and Evaluations of Streambed Scour at Bridges. Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C. (FHWA-RD-03-052)
- Muzzammil, M., Siddiqui, N.A., & Siddiqui, A.F. (2008). Reliability considerations in bridge pier scouring. *Journal of Structural engineering and mechanics*, 28(1), 1-18.
- Nadzri, A. (2011). *Effects of pier alignment on scouring depth.* (Master of science), Universiti Putra Malysia, Malysia.
- Neill, C.R. (1973). Guide to bridge hydraulics. Toronto, Canada: Road s and Transportation Assoc. of Canada, Univ. of Toronto Press.
- Ng, S.K., & razak, R.A. (2008). *Bridges Haydraulic Problems in Malaysia*. Public Works Department Malaysia, Kuala Lompour.
- Oliveto, G., Hager, W.H., & F.Asce. (2002). Temporal Evolution of Clear-Water Pier and Abutment Scour. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **128**(9), 811-820.
- Papanicolaou, A.N.T., Elhakeem, M., Wilson, C., & Bertrand, F. (2010). Automated Erosion System to Protect Highway Bridge Crossings at Abutments. The University of Iowa, Iowa City. (MATC TRB RiP No. 24483)

- Rahman, M.M., & Haque, M.A. (2003). Local Scour Estimation at Bridge Site: Modification and Application of Lacey Formula. *International Journal of Sediment Research*, 18(4), 333-339.
- Raikar, R.V. (2004). *Local and general scour of gravel beds*. (PhD), Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur.
- Richardson, E.V., & Davis, S.R. (2012). *Evaluating Scour At Bridges*. Federal Highway Administration, Washington. (FHWA NHI 01-001, HEC-18).
- Roger, T., Kilgore, & Cotton, G.K. (2005). *Design of Roadside Channels with Flexible Linings Hydraulic Engineering Circular Number 15.* Federal Highway Administration, Washington D.C. USA.
- Schreider, M., G., S., Franco, F., & Romano, C. (2001). *Reducing Scour Around Bridge Piers and Abutments*. Paper presented at the Conference Proceeding Paper, ASCE, Wetlands Engineering & River Restoration.
- Simarro, G., Chreties, C., & Teixeira, L. (2011). Riprap Sizing for Pile Groups. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 137(12), 1676-1679.
- Simarro, G., Civeira, S., & Cardoso, A.H. (2012). Influence of riprap apron shape on spill-through abutments. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, *50*(1), 138-141.
- Smyre, E.A. (2002). Effect of Suspended Fine Sediment on Equilibrium Local Scour Depths. (Master od Science Unpublished), University of Florida, Florida.
- Straub, L.G. (1934). Effect of Channel Contraction Works upon Regimen of Movable Bed Streams. *Trans. Am. Geophysical Union*, **2**, 454-463.
- Sturm, T.W., & Janjua, N.S. (1994). Clear-Water Scour Around Abutments in Floodplains. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **120**(8), 956-972.
- Sumer, B.M. (2007). Mathematical modelling of scour: A review. Journal of *Hydraulic Research*, **45**(6), 723-735.
- Taherei Ghazvinei, P., Mohamed, T. A., Ghazali, A. H. and Kim Huat, B. (2012) Scour Hazard Assessment and Bridge Abutment Instability Analysis. *Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Geology* **17**(0), 2213-2224.
- Today (Producer). (2013). Four dead after flood at Cameron Highlands dam. Retrieved from http://www.todavonline.com/world/asia/four-dead-afterflood-cameron-highlands-dam.
- Troitsky, M.S. (1994). *Planning and Design of Bridges*. NEW York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Umbrell, E.R., Young, G.K., Stein, S.M., & Jones, J.S. (1998). Clear-Water Contraction Scour under Bridges in Pressure Flow. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, **124**(2), 236-240.
- Wagner, C.R., Mueller, D.S., Parola, A.C., Hagerty, D.J., & Benedict, S.T. (2006). Scour at Contracted Bridges. U.S. Geological Survey and University of Louisville, Kentucky. (24-14).
- Wardhana, K., & Hadipriono, F.C. (2003). Analysis of Recent Bridge Failures in the United States. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 17(3), 144-150.
- Webby, M.G. (1984). *General scour at contraction*. Paper presented at the Bridge Design and Research Seminar, New Zealand.
- Yanmaz, A.M., & Celebi, T. (2004). A reliability model for bridge abutment scour. *Turkish Journal of Engineering and Environmental Science*, **28**, 67-83.

- Yanmaz, A.M., & Kose, O. (2007). Surface Characteristics of Scouring at Bridge Elements. *Turkish Journal of Engineering and Environmental Science*, 31, 127-134.
- Yanmaz, A.M., & Kose, O. (2007). Time-wise variation of scouring at bridge abutments. *Sadhana*, **32**(3), 199-213.
- Yanmaz, A.M., & Ustun, I. (2001). Generalized Reliability Model for Local Scour around Bridge Piers of Various Shapes. *Turkish Journal of Engineering and Enviromental Science*, **25**, 687-698.
- Yorozuya, A. (2005). Scour at bridge abutment with erodible embankments. (Ph.D.), University of Iowa, Iowa.

