# The Observation Method for Bridge Scour: Case Histories

**Jean-Louis Briaud,** *Distinguished Professor, Zachry Dpt of Civil Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA; email: briaud@tamu.edu*
**Inwoo Jung,** *Dpt. of Construction Science, Texas A&M University, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3136, USA; email: realmaru@tamu.edu*
**Anand Govindasamy**, *Principal Engineer, Geocomp Corporation, Acton, Massachusetts, USA; email: agovindasamy@geocomp.com*
**Dongkyun Kim,** *Professor, Dpt of Civil Engineering, Hongik University Industry, Seoul, Korea; email: dekaykim@gmail.com*
**Jaehyeon Lee,** *Graduate student, Dpt of Civil Engineering, Hongik University Industry, Seoul, Korea; email: jhl1782@gmail.com*

**ABSTRACT**: *Bridge scour is the number one cause of bridge collapse in the USA yet the existing guidelines are felt to be excessively conservative. These apparently conflicting statements are due to the fact that most bridge foundations designed before 1987 did not consider scour as part of the design. The Observation Method for Scour (OMS) was developed to address the conservatism inherent in the current procedures by relying significantly on past observations at the bridge. The OMS works in four steps. Step 1 consists of collecting the maximum observed scour depth at the bridge, $Z_{mo}$. Step 2 consists of finding out what is the biggest flood velocity $V_{mo}$ that the bridge has been subjected to since its construction. Step 3 answers, by using an extrapolation function, the question: what will be the scour depth $Z_{fut}$ if the bridge is subjected to a major flood velocity $V_{fut}$. Step 4 is a comparison between $Z_{fut}$ and the allowable scour depth $Z_{all}$ for the foundation. Eleven bridge scour case histories in Texas and in Massachusetts are presented where the OMS was applied and the results are used to compare predicted and measured values of $Z_{fut}$ for both the OMS and the current FHWA guidelines. The advantages and drawbacks of the OMS are outlined in a final section.*

**KEYWORDS:** Observation Method, Bridge scour, Z-future charts, Probability of failure

**SITE LOCATION:** Geo-Database

## INTRODUCTION

Bridge scour (Fig. 1) is the formation of holes in the soil due to water flow around bridge supports. These scour holes can form around the pier in the river (pier scour) or around the abutment (abutment scour) or can be due to the narrowing of the river flow (contraction scour). Bridge scour is the number one cause of bridge collapse in the USA as shown by the hydraulic condition bar in Fig. 2. Yet the current FHWA guidelines are considered by many to be very conservative on the average (Fig. 3). These apparently conflicting statements come from the fact that the foundation of most bridges built before 1987 was not designed for scour. Thus the pre-1987 bridges have most of the scour problems while the post-1987 bridges are very conservatively designed against scour. On 5 April 1987, the New York State Thruway Bridge over Schoharie Creek collapsed due to scour and 10 people died. This disaster prompted a national reaction, which through research and design guidelines has made bridges in the USA much more scour safe (Fig. 4). Fig. 3 shows significant conservatism on the average and significant scatter overall. Because of the scatter, the FHWA guidelines are sound since they minimize the number of times where the scour depth is likely to be under-estimated.

A new method is proposed and evaluated against case histories in this article to decrease the scatter in the predictions and decrease the conservatism on the average without increasing the probability of underestimating the scour depth. The method is called the Observation Method for Scour or OMS because it is based primarily on observed measurements at the bridge

Submitted: 10 July 2017; Published: 20 April 2018
Reference: Briaud, J.L., Jung, I., Govindasamy, A., Kim, D. and Lee, J. (2018). *The Observation Method for Bridge Scour: Case Histories*. International Journal of Geoengineering Case Histories, Vol.4, Issue 3, p.185-202. doi: 10.4417/IJGCH-04-03-03

sites. The method consists of measuring the current scour depth at the bridge site, finding out how big of a flood the bridge has experienced, and extrapolating these observations to predict how deep the scour hole would become should the bridge be subjected to a major future flood. The OMS is evaluated against eleven bridge case histories in Texas and Massachusetts.





*Figure 1. Bridge scour.*





*Figure 2. Causes of bridge failures in the USA (Briaud, 2006).*





*Figure 3. Predicted vs. measured pier scour depth using Landers-Mueller database (Landers, Mueller, 1996, Briaud et al., 2014).*





*Figure 4. Impact of scour research and associated design guidelines on bridge scour failures in the USA (Briaud, 2006).*

## THE OBSERVATION METHOD FOR SCOUR – OMS

The observation method for scour (OMS) has been described in the following documents (Briaud et al., 2009, Govindasamy et al., 2013, Briaud et al., 2016). The steps to predict the future scour depth at existing bridges by using the OMS are summarized below.

Step 1: Obtain the maximum observed scour depth $Z_{mo}$ at the bridge

The maximum observed scour depth $Z_{mo}$ is obtained from the bridge inspection records by studying the river bottom profile (Fig. 1). To predict pier scour, $Z_{mo}$ is the maximum observed value of $Z_{(pier)}$ in Fig. 1. To predict abutment scour $Z_{mo}$ is the maximum obsevred value of $Z_{(abut)}$ in Fig. 1. To predict contraction scour, $Z_{mo}$ is the maximum observed value of $Z_{(contraction)}$ in Fig. 1.

Step 2: Obtain the highest flood the bridge has seen

This is done by first collecting the records of all USGS flow gages in a State (Fig. 5). Then for each one of the gages, a detailed flood analysis is conducted to identify the maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ during each year at the gage location on that river.




*Figure 5. Location of the flow gages used for mapping Texas and neighboring States (Briaud et al., 2009).*

Then $RI_{mo}$ contour maps are prepared for the state for any one year and organized in a software called TAMU-OMS. If $RI_{mo}$ is required for a period of several years, the life of the bridge for example, the yearly RI data is combined over the required period and TAMU-OMS outputs a map covering the required period (e.g., Fig. 6). Linear interpolation is used to obtain $RI_{mo}$ at river locations where a gage is not available. The velocity ratio ($V_{fut}/V_{mo}$) is obtained from the recurrence interval ratio ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}$) by using a combination of correlation using all the flow gage data and open channel hydraulics (Briaud et al. 2009). These relationships depend on the recurrence interval and are embedded in TAMU-OMS, but a reasonable approximation is given below:

$$\left(\frac{V_{mo}}{V_{fut}}\right) = \left(\frac{Q_{mo}}{Q_{fut}}\right)^{0.35} = \left(\left(\frac{RI_{mo}}{RI_{fut}}\right)^{0.261}\right)^{0.35} = \left(\frac{RI_{mo}}{RI_{fut}}\right)^{0.091} \quad (1)$$

Where $V_{fut}$ and $V_{mo}$ are the future flood velocity being considered and the maximum observed velocity, $Q_{fut}$ and $Q_{mo}$ are the future flood flow being considered and the maximum observed flow, and $RI_{fut}$ and $RI_{mo}$ are the future flood recurrence interval being considered and the maximum observed recurrence interval.





*Figure 6. Maximum recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ map for Texas for 1920 to 2005.*

Step 3: Predict the future scour depth for a chosen future flood

Now that the ratio $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ is known, we must predict the ratio $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$:

$$\left(\frac{Z_{fut}}{Z_{mo}}\right) = F\left(\frac{V_{fut}}{V_{mo}}\right) \tag{2}$$

In this equation $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ is known from step 2 and $Z_{mo}$ is known from step 1. The problem is to find the function F. This is done by using the TAMU-SCOUR method (Briaud, 2013) which is included in the most recent version of HEC-18 (Arneson et al., 2012). A total of half a million scour cases were considered, calculated, and plotted. Fig. 7 shows an example of the calculations for the given set of variables shown in the legend. Each dot on the figure is one TAMU-SCOUR method calculation for a bridge scour case. These half million cases covered a large variety of scour combinations including scour types (Fig. 1), bridge and river dimensions (e.g.: pier width from 1 to 10 m, contraction ratio from 0.1 to 0.9, water depth 1 to 20 m), length of the future hydrograph $t_{hyd}$ (5 to 25 years), and soil type represented by a soil erosion category. The soil erosion category came from the chart proposed by Briaud (2013) (Fig. 8) which is based on the soil type and associated USCS classification. This erosion category number gives a zone on Fig. 8 within which the erosion function (erosion rate vs. shear stress or vs. water velocity) of the soil is likely to be found.





*Figure 7. Large number of calculations to select conservative envelope for $Z_{fut}$ chart.*

In the end and to be conservative, the upper bound of all dots shown on the example of Fig. 7, was selected as the recommended curve for that $Z_{fut}$ chart. These charts are embedded in the software TAMU-OMS and require the following input: scour type, soil type, time duration of the hydrograph, and the size of the obstacle. At the end of step 3, the future scour depth $Z_{fut}$ that the bridge would experience should it be subjected to the chosen future flood ($V_{fut}$) is estimated by obtaining the ratio $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ from the $Z_{fut}$ chart and multiplying that ratio by the known value of $Z_{mo}$ from step 1. This is automated with TAMU-OMS.





*Figure 8. Erosion categories charts (Briaud, 2013): (a) erosion rate vs. velocity; (b) erosion rate vs. shear stress.*

Step 4: Compare the future scour depth to the foundation depth

This step consists of comparing $Z_{fut}$ to the allowable scour depth $Z_{all}$. For example, the Texas DOT considers that the allowable pier scour depth for one event is half the pile length. From the comparison between $Z_{fut}$ and $Z_{all}$ the scour situation for the bridge is appraised and decisions are made.

## CASE HISTORIES

A database of 11 full-scale bridge case histories was collected to evaluate the precision of the TAMU-OMS method. Four of those bridges were located in Texas and seven in Massachusetts. The bridge identification number from the DOT inventory, the bridge location, the year built, the soil type and the soil erosion category from Fig. 8 are listed in Table 1.

*Table 1. Database of 11 bridge scour case histories in Texas and Massachusetts: physical information.*

| Bridge# | State | City /Town | Highway | River | Longitude | Latitude | Year Built | Soil Material | Erosion Category |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0188-02-023 | TX | Houston | SH 36 | Big Creek | -95.81305 | 29.47642 | 1932 | Sand, Silt | I & II |
| 0072-04-020 | TX | San Antonio | US 87 | Guadalupe | -98.8967 | 29.96498 | 1932(1984) | Sand, gravel, clay | I & II |
| 170-0177-05-119 | TX | Houston | US 59 | Peach Creek | -95.18168 | 30.20833 | 1970 | Sand | I & II |
| 0382-05-021 | TX | Bryan | SH 7 | Navasota | -96.33053 | 31.25425 | 1956 | Sand, Sandy silty clay | I & II |
| B13001-1EA | MA | Blackstone | Bridge Street | Blackstone River | -71.53869 | 42.01686 | 1955 | Cobble, boulders, gravel | III |
| B28032-0JC | MA | Buckland | State Route 2 | Deerfield | -72.73625 | 42.61303 | 1954 | sand, gravel | III |
| D06002-0U4 | MA | Deerfield | US 5 | Water Deerfield | -72.59211 | 42.57028 | 1932 | sand, silty | I & II |
| B28009-0JD | MA | Buckland | State Route 2 | Deerfield | -72.74625 | 42.61819 | 1954 | sand, gravel, silt. Mud | III |
| D10005-367 | MA | Dover | Chestnut ST | Water Chales | -71.23717 | 42.26003 | 1922 | Sand, Gravel, Boulders, cobbles | III |
| D12026-1XX | MA | Dudley | Sttate Route 131 | Quinebaug | -71.95919 | 42.02778 | 1930(1984) | Rock, Gravel, cobble | IV |
| E01001-41Q | MA | East Bridgewater | Spring ST | Water Matfield | -70.96717 | 42.02644 | 1946 | Sand | I & II |

For each bridge, the following information was collected.

1. Observed scour depth as a function of time. This came from the inspection records which are required to be collected every two years in the USA.

2. Observed flow as a function of time. This came from the flow gages information.

3. Soil type. This came from the site borings.

4. Bridge support (pier or abutment) geometry. This came from the construction plans.

5. River geometry (contraction). This came from the bridge files.

This information is summarized in Table 2. With this information the following process was followed. Let's say that the bridge was built in 1960 (year built) and that items 1 and 2 above were available from 1960 to 2010 (end year). We would consider the year 1990 (intermediate year) and find $Z_{mo}$ and $V_{mo}$ from 1960 to 1990. Then the year 2000 (year predicted) might be chosen as the year for which the $Z_{fut}$ would be predicted. Then $V_{fut}$ for the period 1990-2000 was found by reading the maximum flow $Q_{fut}$ on the gage record from 1990 to 2000, transforming it into $RI_{fut}$ and then into $V_{fut}$ using equations exemplified by Eq. 1. Then we would use $Z_{mo}$ and $V_{mo}$ from 1960 to 1990 and $V_{fut}$ from 1990-2000 and predict $Z_{fut}$ for the year 2000. This gave us $Z_{fut(predicted)}$. Then the inspection record from 1990 to 2000 would give us $Z_{fut(measured)}$. In this fashion

we ended up with a $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ and a $Z_{fut(measured)}$ for that bridge. This procedure was applied several times for each bridge by varying the year predicted. Then the process was repeated for the 4 bridges in Texas and the 7 bridges in Massachusetts. The results are tabulated in Table 2. As an example, the case history for bridge B13001-1EA is described next in more detail.

**TAMU-OMS PREDICTIONS VS. MEASUREMENTS**

Two examples are presented to illustrate the sequence of calculations for all the bridge case histories:

Case #1 - bridge B13001-1EA from 2002 to 2005 ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}>1$)

- Bridge B13001-1EA was built in 1955. The observed scour depth and the observed flow were available from 1955 to 2010. The year 2002 was considered as the intermediate year. As such the record from 1955 to 2002 would be used to predict the future scour depth $Z_{fut}$ between 2002 and 2005 (year predicted).
- The maximum observed scour depth $Z_{mo}$ between 1955 and 2002 was found to be 2.01 m and the maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ during the same period was 28 year. The maximum recurrence interval from 2002 and 2005, $RI_{fut}$, was 146 year.
- The soil erosion category based on the borings available was category 3, the pier diameter was 1.22 m and the scour type was pier scour.
- Using the relationships established during the research work, embedded in TAMU-OMS and approximated by Eq. 1, the ratio $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ was obtained from the recurrence interval ratio ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}$ = 146/28 = 5.214) and was found to be 1.145.
- Then given the soil erosion category (3), the scour type (pier), the length of the future hydrograph considered ($t_{hyd}$ = 5 years) and the value of $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ (1.145), the value of $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was found from the $Z_{fut}$ chart embedded in TAMU-OMS (Fig. 7 is an example) to be 1.17.
- Since $Z_{mo}$ was 2.01m and since $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was 1.17, the predicted $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ was 2.34 m.
- The measured maximum depth of scour $Z_{fut(measured)}$ during the period of 2002 to 2005 was found from the bridge inspection record to be 2.07 m.

Case #2 - bridge B13001-1EA from 2007 to 2010 ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}<1$)

- In this case, the year 2007 was considered as the intermediate year. As such the record from 1955 to 2007 would be used to predict the future scour depth $Z_{fut}$ between 2007 and 2010.
- The maximum observed scour depth $Z_{mo}$ between 1955 and 2007 was found to be 2.07 m and the maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ during the same period was 146 year. The maximum recurrence interval from 2007 and 2010, $RI_{fut}$, was 68 year.
- The soil erosion category based on the borings available was category 3, the pier diameter was 1.22 m and the scour type was pier scour.
- Using the relationships established during the research work, embedded in TAMU-OMS and approximated by Eq. 1, the ratio $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ was obtained from the recurrence interval ratio ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}$ = 68/146 = 0.466) and was found to be 0.95.
- Then given the soil erosion category (3), the scour type (pier), the length of the future hydrograph considered ($T_{hyd}$ = 5 years) and the value of $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ (0.95), the value of $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was found from the $Z_{fut}$ chart embedded in TAMU-OMS (Fig. 7 is an example) to be 1.07.
- Since $Z_{mo}$ was 2.07 m and since $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was 1.07, the predicted $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ was 2.22 m.

The measured maximum depth of scour $Z_{fut(measured)}$ during the period of 2007 to 2010 was found from the bridge inspection record to be 2.01 m

*Table 2. Database of 11 bridge scour case histories in Texas and Massachusetts: engineering information.*

| Bridge# | Erosion Category | Year Built | End year | Intermediate year | Year predicted | Pier diameter (m) | TAMU-OMS | | | $Z_{mo}$ (m) | $T_{hyd}$ (year) | $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ by Z-future Chart | Z-future Scour Depth (m) | Z-future Scour Depth (m) | Z-future Scour Depth (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | $RI_{mo}$ | $RI_{fut}$ | $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ | Pier &Cont | | Pier&Cont | OMS (Pier & Cont) | HEC-18 (Pier) | Measured |
| 0188-02-023 | I/II | 1932 | 2005 | 1994 | 1995 | 0.37 | 240 | 15 | 0.75 | 1.16 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.10 | 1.62 | 1.16 |
| | | 1932 | 2005 | 1995 | 1997 | 0.37 | 240 | 2 | 0.68 | 1.16 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.16 | 1.62 | 1.16 |
| | | 1932 | 2005 | 1997 | 1998 | 0.37 | 240 | 2 | 0.68 | 1.16 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.16 | 1.62 | 1.13 |
| | | 1932 | 2005 | 1998 | 2001 | 0.37 | 240 | 3 | 0.68 | 1.16 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.16 | 1.62 | 1.07 |
| | | 1932 | 2005 | 2001 | 2005 | 0.37 | 240 | 5 | 0.68 | 1.16 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.16 | 1.62 | 0.79 |
| 0072-04-020 | I&II | 1932 | 2000 | 1998 | 2000 | 1.83 | 68 | 8 | 0.73 | 1.92 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.92 | 7.15 | 1.92 |
| 170-0177-05-119 | I&II | 1970 | 2006 | 1999 | 2001 | 0.41 | 129 | 8 | 0.7 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.000 | 2.50 | 1.15 | 1.55 |
| | | 1970 | 2006 | 2001 | 2003 | 0.41 | 129 | 7 | 0.7 | 2.50 | 5 | 1.000 | 2.50 | 1.15 | 2.41 |
| | | 1970 | 2006 | 2003 | 2005 | 0.41 | 129 | 4 | 0.7 | 2.59 | 5 | 1.000 | 2.50 | 1.15 | 2.59 |
| | | 1970 | 2006 | 2005 | 2006 | 0.41 | 129 | 1 | 0.7 | 2.59 | 5 | 1.000 | 2.59 | 1.15 | 2.44 |
| 0382-05-021 | I&II | 1956 | 2005 | 1994 | 1996 | 0.37 | 22 | 7 | 0.795 | 1.22 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.22 | 1.60 | 1.68 |
| | | 1956 | 2005 | 1996 | 1998 | 0.37 | 22 | 3 | 0.795 | 1.68 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.68 | 1.60 | 1.89 |
| | | 1956 | 2005 | 1998 | 2001 | 0.37 | 22 | 6 | 0.795 | 1.89 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.89 | 1.60 | 1.89 |
| | | 1956 | 2005 | 2001 | 2003 | 0.37 | 22 | 8 | 0.795 | 1.89 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.89 | 1.60 | 2.32 |
| | | 1956 | 2005 | 2003 | 2005 | 0.37 | 22 | 3 | 0.795 | 2.32 | 5 | 1.000 | 2.32 | 1.60 | 2.47 |
| B13001-1EA | III | 1955 | 2010 | 1989 | 1996 | 1.22 | 28 | 11 | 0.995 | 1.55 | 7 | 1.080 | 1.68 | 2.59 | 1.98 |
| | | 1955 | 2010 | 1999 | 2002 | 1.22 | 28 | 6 | 0.96 | 1.98 | 5 | 1.075 | 2.13 | 2.59 | 2.01 |
| | | 1955 | 2010 | 2002 | 2005 | 1.22 | 28 | 146 | 1.145 | 2.01 | 5 | 1.165 | 2.34 | 2.59 | 2.07 |
| | | 1955 | 2010 | 2005 | 2007 | 1.22 | 146 | 20 | 0.835 | 2.07 | 5 | 1.040 | 2.16 | 2.85 | 2.07 |
| | | 1955 | 2010 | 2007 | 2010 | 1.22 | 146 | 68 | 0.95 | 2.07 | 5 | 1.070 | 2.22 | 2.85 | 2.01 |
| B28032-0JC | III | 1954 | 2010 | 2004 | 2007 | 3.22 | 10 | 29 | 1.24 | 1.49 | 5 | 1.240 | 1.85 | 4.45 | 1.34 |
| | | 1954 | 2010 | 2007 | 2010 | 3.22 | 29 | 8 | 0.95 | 1.49 | 5 | 1.070 | 1.60 | 4.74 | 1.46 |
| D06002-0U4 | I&II | 1932 | 2012 | 1996 | 2002 | 4.88 | 68 | 8 | 0.85 | 2.77 | 6 | 1.000 | 2.77 | 5.95 | 3.20 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2002 | 2003 | 4.88 | 68 | 1 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.59 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2003 | 2004 | 4.88 | 68 | 4 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.93 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2004 | 2005 | 4.88 | 68 | 22 | 0.94 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.87 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2005 | 2006 | 4.88 | 68 | 4 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.74 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2006 | 2007 | 4.88 | 68 | 3 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.65 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2007 | 2008 | 4.88 | 68 | 2 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.99 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 4.88 | 68 | 8 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.71 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 4.88 | 68 | 2 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.83 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2010 | 2011 | 4.88 | 68 | 2 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.90 |
| | | 1932 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 4.88 | 68 | 2 | 0.85 | 3.20 | 5 | 1.000 | 3.20 | 5.95 | 2.93 |
| B28009-0JD | III | 1954 | 2009 | 1992 | 2001 | 3.66 | 10 | 7 | 1.185 | 2.05 | 9 | 1.180 | 2.42 | 7.11 | 2.26 |
| | | 1954 | 2009 | 2001 | 2006 | 3.66 | 10 | 29 | 1.24 | 2.26 | 5 | 1.240 | 2.81 | 7.11 | 2.23 |
| | | 1954 | 2009 | 2006 | 2009 | 3.66 | 29 | 8 | 0.95 | 2.26 | 5 | 1.070 | 2.42 | 7.56 | 1.75 |
| D10005-367 | III | 1922 | 2014 | 2009 | 2014 | 1.22 | 34 | 30 | 1.015 | 0.16 | 5 | 1.095 | 0.18 | 2.68 | 0.13 |
| D12026-1XX | IV | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1992 | 1995 | 1.22 | 29 | 2 | 0.95 | 1.40 | 5 | 1.010 | 1.42 | 2.22 | 0.91 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1995 | 1998 | 1.22 | 29 | 5 | 0.95 | 1.40 | 5 | 1.010 | 1.42 | 2.22 | 1.28 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1998 | 2001 | 1.22 | 29 | 4 | 0.95 | 1.40 | 5 | 1.010 | 1.42 | 2.22 | 1.10 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2001 | 2004 | 1.22 | 29 | 5 | 0.95 | 1.40 | 5 | 1.010 | 1.42 | 2.22 | 1.13 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2004 | 2007 | 1.22 | 29 | 247 | 1.17 | 1.40 | 5 | 1.015 | 1.42 | 2.22 | 1.74 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2007 | 2010 | 1.22 | 247 | 30 | 0.845 | 1.74 | 5 | 1.005 | 1.75 | 2.51 | 1.83 |
| | | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2010 | 2013 | 1.22 | 247 | 2 | 0.76 | 1.83 | 5 | 1.000 | 1.83 | 2.51 | 2.29 |
| E01001-41Q | I& II | 1946 | 2004 | 1992 | 1998 | 0.30 | 47 | 14 | 0.93 | 0.57 | 6 | 1.005 | 0.57 | 1.49 | 0.45 |
| | | 1946 | 2004 | 1998 | 2001 | 0.30 | 47 | 8 | 0.89 | 0.57 | 5 | 1.000 | 0.57 | 1.49 | 0.60 |
| | | 1946 | 2004 | 2001 | 2004 | 0.30 | 47 | 2 | 0.89 | 0.60 | 5 | 1.000 | 0.60 | 1.49 | 0.54 |

TAMU-OMS prediction vs. measurement for all case histories

The comparisons between the measured scour depth and the TAMU-OMS predicted scour depth for the 11 bridges are tabulated in Table 2 and presented in Fig. 9. It indicates a very reasonable match.





*Figure 9. Comparison between measured and OMS predicted $Z_{fut}$ for 11 bridges in Texas and Massachusetts.*

## HEC-18 PREDICTIONS VS. MEASUREMENTS

Predictions were also performed using the HEC-18 current method (Table 2, Arneson et al., 2012). In addition to the input required for the TAMU-OMS method, the water depth y and the flow velocity v are needed for the HEC-18 calculations. These quantities were obtained from the following Eq. 3 and Eq. 1 (Briaud et al., 2016).

$$\left(\frac{y_{mo}}{y_{fut}}\right)=\left(\frac{Q_{mo}}{Q_{fut}}\right)^{0.525}=\left(\left(\frac{RI_{mo}}{RI_{fut}}\right)^{0.261}\right)^{0.525}=\left(\frac{RI_{mo}}{RI_{fut}}\right)^{0.137} \quad (3)$$

Based on the calculated water depth and the calculated flow velocity as well as the other input quantities, the HEC-18 calculations were performed. All the parameters used to caculate the scour depth according to HEC-18 are listed in Table 3; the parameters are defined in HEC-18 (Arneson et al., 2012). The results are tabulated in Table 3 and the comparison between the HEC-18 predicted scour depths and the measured scour depths is presented on Fig. 10. As an example, the case history of bridge B28009-0JD is described next for two scenarios.

Case #1 - Bridge B28009-0JD from 2001 to 2006 ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}>1$)

- Bridge B28009-0JD was built in 1954 (year built). The observed flow hydrograph was available from 1954 to 2009 (end year). The year 2001 (intermediate year) was considered as the intermediate year. As such the record from 1954 to 2001 would be used to predict the future scour depth $Z_{fut}$ between 2001 and 2006 (year precicted).
- The maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ between 1954 and 2001 was 10 year and the maximum recurrence interval from 2001 and 2006, $RI_{fut}$, was 29 year.
- The water depth and the water velocity for the 100-year flood were found in the bridge design/monitoring report to be 8.38 m and 1.98 m/s respectively.
- Using the Eq. 3 and 4 as well as the water depth and velocity for RI equal 100 year, the water depth and the water velocity for RI equal 10 year were calculated to be 6.11 m and 1.61 m/s.
- The scour type was pier scour, the pier diameter was 3.66 m, and the other variables such as pier length, and attack angle were obtained from the bridge design/monitoring report and are listed in Table 3.
- Based on the information above, the HEC-18 predicted $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ value was calculated to be 7.11 m.
- The measured maximum depth of scour $Z_{fut(measured)}$ during the period of 2001 to 2006 was found from the bridge inspection record to be 2.23 m.

The case #2 - Bridge B28009-0JD from 2006 to 2009 ($RI_{fut}/RI_{mo}<1$)

- In this case, the year 2006 was considered as the intermediate year. As such the record from 1955 to 2006 would be used to predict the future scour depth $Z_{fut}$ between 2006 and 2009.
- The maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ between 1955 and 2006 was 29 year and the maximum recurrence interval from 2006 and 2009, $RI_{fut}$, was 8 year.
- The water depth and the water velocity for the 100-year flood were found in the bridge design/monitoring report to be 8.38 m and 1.98 m/s respectively.
- Using the Eq. 3 and 4 as well as the water depth and velocity for RI equal 100 year, the water depth and the water velocity for RI equal 29 year were calculated to be 7.07 m and 1.77 m/s.
- The scour type was pier scour, the pier diameter was 3.66 m, and the other variables such as pier length, attack angle were obtained from the bridge design/monitoring report and are listed in Table 3.
- Based on the information above, the HEC-18 predicted $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ value was calculated to be 7.56 m
- The measured maximum depth of scour $Z_{fut(measured)}$ during the period of 2006 to 2009 was found from the bridge inspection record to be 1.75 m.

Inspection of Figs. 9 and 10 shows that the scatter in TAMU-OMS is significantly reduced compared to the scatter in the current HEC-18 method. Indeed the $R^2$ value for the predicted vs. measured regression is increased from 0.3061 for HEC-18 to 0.8612 for TAMU-OMS. Also the degree of conservatism is practically eliminated since the mean ratio between the predicted scour depth over the measured scour depth (slope of the regression line) decreases from 1.7687 for HEC-18 to 1.0669 from TAMU-OMS.





*Figure 10. Comparison between measured and HEC-18 predicted scour depth for 11 bridges in Texas and Massachusetts.*

*Table 3. Database of 11 bridge scour case histories in Texas and Massachusetts: engineering information for HEC-18.*

| Bridge# | Year built | End year | Intermediate year | Year predicted | $RI_{mo}$ | $RI_{fut}$ | $y_1$ (m) | a (m) | L (m) | θ (o) | a' (m) | L/a | $V_1$ (m/s) | $F_r$ | $K_1$ | $K_2$ | $K_3$ | $y_{s(total)_measured}$ (m) | $y_{s(pier)_calculated_HEC-18}$ (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0188-02-023 | 1932 | 2005 | 1994 | 1995 | 240 | 15 | 5.59 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 20 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 2.92 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 1.16 | 1.65 |
| | 1932 | 2005 | 1995 | 1997 | 240 | 2 | 5.59 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 20 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 2.92 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 1.16 | 1.65 |
| | 1932 | 2005 | 1997 | 1998 | 240 | 2 | 5.59 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 20 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 2.92 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 1.13 | 1.65 |
| | 1932 | 2005 | 1998 | 2001 | 240 | 3 | 5.59 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 20 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 2.92 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 1.07 | 1.65 |
| | 1932 | 2005 | 2001 | 2005 | 240 | 5 | 5.59 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 20 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 2.92 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 0.79 | 1.65 |
| 0072-04-020 | 1932 | 2000 | 1998 | 2000 | 68 | 8 | 8.91 | 1.83 | 14.02 | 10 | 4.24 | 7.67 | 2.73 | 0.29 | 1.00 | 1.73 | 1.10 | 1.92 | 7.12 |
| 170-0177-05-119 | 1970 | 2006 | 1999 | 2001 | 129 | 8 | 5.21 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 0.20 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.55 | 1.20 |
| | 1970 | 2006 | 2001 | 2003 | 129 | 7 | 5.21 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 0.20 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.41 | 1.20 |
| | 1970 | 2006 | 2003 | 2005 | 129 | 4 | 5.21 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 0.20 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.59 | 1.20 |
| | 1970 | 2006 | 2005 | 2006 | 129 | 1 | 5.21 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.43 | 0.20 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.44 | 1.20 |
| 0382-05-021 | 1956 | 2005 | 1994 | 1996 | 22 | 7 | 5.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 2.95 | 0.42 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.68 | 1.52 |
| | 1956 | 2005 | 1996 | 1998 | 22 | 3 | 5.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 2.95 | 0.42 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.89 | 1.52 |
| | 1956 | 2005 | 1998 | 2001 | 22 | 6 | 5.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 2.95 | 0.42 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.89 | 1.52 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | 2005 | 2001 | 2003 | 22 | 8 | 5.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 2.95 | 0.42 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.32 | 1.52 |
| | 1956 | 2005 | 2003 | 2005 | 22 | 3 | 5.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 2.95 | 0.42 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.47 | 1.52 |
| B13001-1EA | 1955 | 2010 | 1989 | 1996 | 28 | 11 | 5.83 | 1.22 | 11.89 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.75 | 2.50 | 0.33 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.98 | 2.59 |
| | 1955 | 2010 | 1996 | 2002 | 28 | 6 | 5.83 | 1.22 | 11.89 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.75 | 2.50 | 0.33 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.01 | 2.59 |
| | 1955 | 2010 | 2002 | 2005 | 28 | 146 | 5.83 | 1.22 | 11.89 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.75 | 2.50 | 0.33 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.07 | 2.59 |
| | 1955 | 2010 | 2005 | 2007 | 146 | 20 | 7.31 | 1.22 | 11.89 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.75 | 2.90 | 0.34 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.07 | 2.85 |
| | 1955 | 2010 | 2007 | 2010 | 146 | 68 | 7.31 | 1.22 | 11.89 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.75 | 2.90 | 0.34 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.01 | 2.85 |
| B28032-0JC | 1954 | 2010 | 2004 | 2007 | 10 | 29 | 5.56 | 3.22 | 15.24 | 0 | 3.22 | 4.73 | 2.05 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.34 | 4.45 |
| | 1954 | 2010 | 2007 | 2010 | 29 | 8 | 6.43 | 3.22 | 15.24 | 0 | 3.22 | 4.73 | 2.26 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.46 | 4.74 |
| D06002-0U4 | 1932 | 2012 | 1996 | 2002 | 68 | 8 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 3.20 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2002 | 2003 | 68 | 1 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.59 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2003 | 2004 | 68 | 4 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.93 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2004 | 2005 | 68 | 22 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.87 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2005 | 2006 | 68 | 4 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.74 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2006 | 2007 | 68 | 3 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.65 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2007 | 2008 | 68 | 2 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.99 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 68 | 8 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.71 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 68 | 2 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.83 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2010 | 2011 | 68 | 2 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.90 | 5.95 |
| | 1932 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | 68 | 2 | 9.40 | 4.88 | 24.38 | 0 | 4.88 | 5.00 | 1.82 | 0.19 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.93 | 5.95 |
| B28009-0JD | 1954 | 2009 | 1992 | 2001 | 10 | 7 | 6.11 | 3.66 | 23.16 | 10 | 7.62 | 6.33 | 1.61 | 0.21 | 0.90 | 1.61 | 1.10 | 2.26 | 7.11 |
| | 1954 | 2009 | 2001 | 2006 | 10 | 29 | 6.11 | 3.66 | 23.16 | 10 | 7.62 | 6.33 | 1.61 | 0.21 | 0.90 | 1.61 | 1.10 | 2.23 | 7.11 |
| | 1954 | 2009 | 2006 | 2009 | 29 | 8 | 7.07 | 3.66 | 23.16 | 10 | 7.62 | 6.33 | 1.77 | 0.21 | 0.90 | 1.61 | 1.10 | 1.75 | 7.56 |
| D10005-367 | 1922 | 2014 | 2009 | 2014 | 34 | 30 | 3.21 | 1.22 | 11.28 | 0 | 1.22 | 9.25 | 2.54 | 0.45 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.13 | 2.68 |
| D12026-1XX | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1992 | 1995 | 29 | 2 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 1.88 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.91 | 2.22 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1995 | 1998 | 29 | 5 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 1.88 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.28 | 2.22 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 1998 | 2001 | 29 | 4 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 1.88 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 2.22 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2001 | 2004 | 29 | 5 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 1.88 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.13 | 2.22 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2004 | 2007 | 29 | 247 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 1.88 | 0.28 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.74 | 2.22 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2007 | 2010 | 247 | 30 | 6.04 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 2.28 | 0.30 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.83 | 2.51 |
| | 1930 (1984) | 2013 | 2010 | 2013 | 247 | 2 | 6.04 | 1.22 | 18.29 | 0 | 1.22 | 12.00 | 2.28 | 0.30 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.29 | 2.51 |
| E01001-41Q | 1946 | 2004 | 1992 | 1998 | 47 | 14 | 2.61 | 0.30 | 13.72 | 12 | 1.06 | 12.00 | 0.85 | 0.17 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 1.10 | 0.45 | 1.49 |
| | 1946 | 2004 | 1998 | 2001 | 47 | 8 | 2.61 | 0.30 | 13.72 | 12 | 1.06 | 12.00 | 0.85 | 0.17 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 1.10 | 0.60 | 1.49 |
| | 1946 | 2004 | 2001 | 2004 | 47 | 2 | 2.61 | 0.30 | 13.72 | 12 | 1.06 | 12 | 0.85 | 0.17 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 1.10 | 0.54 | 1.49 |

Note: all parameters are defined in HEC-18 (Arneson et al., 2012).

## EVALUATING PROBABILITY OF FAILURE AND PRIORITIZING REPAIRS

TAMU-OMS can also be used to evaluate the probability of failure due to scour for a bridge over water. The risk defined as the product of the probability of failure times the value of the consequence can then be evaluated separately by using allowable risk targets of 0.001 fatalities per year and $1000 per year as proposed by Briaud (2013). The probability of failure presented in Figure 11 and Table 4 is based on a comparison between the future scour depth predicted by TAMU-OMS, $Z_{fut}$, and the allowable scour depth $Z_{all}$. In this case the scour depth $Z_{fut}$ is calculated based on the design flood, say the 100 year flood and the allowable scour depth $Z_{all}$ is established on the basis of safe local practice. For example in Texas and for a one time flood, the allowable pier scour depth is taken as one half the original embedded pile length. Actually, two allowable scour depth are identified, $Z_{af}$ and $Z_{bf}$. The scour depth $Z_{af}$ is the allowable scour depth after the flood and is the same as $Z_{all}$, but $Z_{bf}$ is the scour depth which would lead to a scour depth equal to $Z_{all}$ should the bridge be subjected to the design flood. The relationship between $Z_{bf}$ and $Z_{af}$ is obtained from the charts in TAMU-OMS with the following input. The $RI_{mo}$ is the one for the bridge until the present, $RI_{fut}$ is the design RI value, and all other parameters (soil, scour type, and so on) are the ones for the specific bridge site. Fig. 11 and Table 4 give a proposed probability of failure rating for bridges. It also indicates what action might be needed for each probability level.





*Figure 11. Probability of failure evaluation chart for scour at bridges based on TAMU-OMS.*

The recommendations of Table 4 summarize the following opinions. If the future scour depth calculated by TAMU-OMS for the chosen future flood is less than half the allowable scour depth, the bridge is considered to have a "low probability of failure" and no repair is required. If the future scour depth calculated by TAMU-OMS for the chosen future flood is between half the allowable scour depth and the allowable scour depth, the bridge is considered to have a "moderate probability of failure", the bridge should be on a scour watch list, and close monitoring is required especially after the next big flood. If the future scour depth calculated by TAMU-OMS for the chosen future flood is higher than the allowable scour depth, but the maximum observed scour depth is less than the allowable scour depth, the probability of failure is high and action to repair the scour hole is a high priority. If the future scour depth calculated by TAMU-OMS for the chosen future flood is higher than the allowable scour depth and the maximum observed scour depth is also higher than the allowable scour depth, the probability of failure is very high and immediate action to repair the scour hole is required.

*Table 4. Probability of failure evaluation for scour at bridges based on TAMU-OMS.*

| SCOUR DEPTH COMPARISON | PROBABILITY OF FAILURE | ACTION |
|---|---|---|
| $Z_{fut} < 0.5\ Z_{all}$ | Low | Continue regular inspections |
| $0.5\ Z_{all} < Z_{fut} < Z_{all}$ | Moderate | Increase inspection frequency. Consider repair |
| $Z_{fut} > Z_{all}$ but $Z_{mo} < Z_{all}$ | High | Repair is high priority |
| $Z_{fut} > Z_{all}$ and $Z_{mo} > Z_{all}$ | Very High | Repair immediately |


The evaluation of the 11 bridges in the database according to the probability of failure if these bridges were subjected to a 100 year design flood is presented in Table 5. Out of 11 bridges, 4 bridges are found to have a low probability of failure according to TAMU-OMS, 3 bridges are found to have a moderate probability of failure, 3 bridges are found to have a very high probability of failure with immediate repair needed and the last one cannot be evaluated because the foundation depth is unknown. Drawings for all bridge scour situations are presented in Fig. 12. An example of the evaluation procedure for bridge B13001-1EA is presented next.


Evaluation for Bridge B13001-1EA

- Bridge B13001-1EA was built in 1955. The observed scour depth and the observed flow were available from 1955 to 2016. The records indicated that the value of $Z_{mo}$ from 1955 to 2016 was 2.07 m.
- During that period, the maximum observed recurrence interval $RI_{mo}$ was 146 year and the $RI_{fut}$ would be 100 since the evaluation consisted of finding out what would happen should the bridge be subjected to the 100 year design flood. The corresponding ratio of $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ was calculated to be 0.975.
- The borings indicated that the soil erosion category was 3, the scour type was pier scour, and the pier diameter was 1.22 m.
- For the 100 year design flood as the future flood, the $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was calculated to be 1.06 based on the soil erosion category, the value of $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ and the scour type.
- Since the value of $Z_{mo}$ was 2.07 m and since the ratio of $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ was 1.06, the predicted value of the scour depth $Z_{fut(predicted)}$ was 2.19 m.
- The allowable pier scour depth, $Z_{all}$ or $Z_{af}$ in this case was taken as one half the embedded foundation depth. The foundation was a spread footing embedded 3.28 m into the soil; therefore $Z_{all}$ was 1.64 m.
- The comparison between $Z_{all}$ and $Z_{fut}$ shows that this bridge is in the "high probability of failure" category based on Fig. 11 and Table 4. Indeed $Z_{fut} > Z_{all}$.


*Table 5. Probability of failure for the database of 11 bridge scour case histories in Texas and Massachusetts.*

| Bridge# | Erosion Category | $RI_{mo}$ (year) | $V_{fut}/V_{mo}$ | $Z_{mo}$ (m) | $Z_{fut}/Z_{mo}$ | $Z_{fut(OMS)}$ (m) | $Z_{af}$ (m) | $Z_{bf}$ (m) | Scour Probability of Failure | Action required |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0188-02-023 | I & II | 240 | 0.91 | 1.16 | 1.000 | 1.16 | 3.96 | 3.96 | Low | No |
| 0072-04-020 | I & II | 68 | 1.07 | 1.92 | 1.105 | 2.12 | 2.59 | 2.34 | Med | No |
| 170-0177-05-119 | I & II | 129 | 0.98 | 2.59 | 1.000 | 2.59 | 5.33 | 5.33 | Low | No |
| 0382-05-021 | I & II | 22 | 1.42 | 2.47 | 1.855 | 4.58 | 5.33 | 2.88 | Med | No |
| B13001-1EA | III | 146 | 0.98 | 2.07 | 1.060 | 2.19 | 1.64 | 1.55 | Very High | Yes |
| B28032-0JC | III | 29 | 1.12 | 1.49 | 1.115 | 1.66 | 1.37 | 1.23 | Very High | Yes |
| D06002-0U4 | I & II | 68 | 1.04 | 3.20 | 1.055 | 3.38 | 2.99 | 2.83 | Very High | Yes |
| B28009-0JD | III | 29 | 1.12 | 2.26 | 1.115 | 2.52 | 3.11 | 2.79 | Med | No |
| D10005-367 | III | 34 | 1.11 | 0.16 | 1.110 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 0.48 | Low | No |
| D12026-1XX | IV | 247 | 0.95 | 2.29 | 1.005 | 2.30 | Unknown sheet pile depth | Unknown sheet pile depth | N/A | N/A |
| E01001-41Q | I & II | 74 | 1.03 | 0.60 | 1.080 | 0.65 | 5.37 | 4.97 | Low | No |



0188-02-023
PROB. OF FAILURE : LOW
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = I&II
RImo = 240
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 0.91
Zfut/Zmo = 1.00
Zmo = 1.16 m
Zfut(OMS) = 1.16 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 1.56 m
Zfound/2 = 3.96 m
Zfound = 7.92 m
(a)
0072-04-020
PROB. OF FAILURE : MED
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = I&II
RImo = 68
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.07
Zfut/Zmo = 1.105
Zmo = 1.92 m
Zfut(OMS) = 2.12 m
Zfound/2 = 2.59 m
Zfound = 5.18 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 7.28 m
(b)
170-0177-05-119
PROB. OF FAILURE : LOW
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = I&II
RImo = 129
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 0.975
Zfut/Zmo = 1.00
Zmo = 2.59 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 1.19 m
Zfut(OMS) =2.59 m
Zfound/2 = 5.33 m
Zfound =10.66 m
(c)
0382-05-021
PROB. OF FAILURE : MED
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = I&II
RImo = 22
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.415
Zfut/Zmo = 1.855
Zmo = 2.47 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 1.66 m
Zfound/2 = 5.33 m
Zfut(OMS) =4.58 m
Zfound =10.66 m
(d)


B13001-1EA
PROB. OF FAILURE : HIGH
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = III
RImo = 146
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 0.975
Zfut/Zmo = 1.06
Zmo = 2.07 m
Zfound/2 = 1.64 m
Zfut(OMS) = 2.19 m
Zfound = 3.28 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 2.79 m


*(e)*


B28032-0JC
PROB. OF FAILURE : HIGH
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = III
RImo = 29
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.12
Zfut/Zmo = 1.115
Zmo = 1.49 m
Zfound/2 = 1.37 m
Zfut(OMS) = 1.66 m
Zfound = 2.74 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 5.09 m


*(f)*


D06002-0U4
PROB. OF FAILURE : HIGH
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = I&II
RImo = 68
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.035
Zfut/Zmo = 1.055
Zmo = 3.20 m
Zfound/2 = 2.99 m
Zfut(OMS) = 3.38 m
Zfound = 5.98 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 6.08 m


*(g)*


B28009-0JD
PROB. OF FAILURE : MED
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = III
RImo = 29
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.12
Zfut/Zmo = 1.115
Zmo = 2.26 m
Zfound/2 = 3.11 m
Zfut(OMS) = 2.52 m
Zfound = 6.22 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 8.11 m


*(h)*


D10005-367
PROB. OF FAILURE : LOW
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = III
RImo = 34
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 1.105
Zfut/Zmo = 1.110
Zmo = 0.16 m
Zfound/2 = 0.53 m
Zfut(OMS) = 0.18 m
Zfound = 1.06 m
Zfut(HEC-18) = 2.85 m

*(i)*


D12026-1XX
PROB. OF FAILURE : N/A
Zfut(OMS)
Zfut(HEC-18)
TAMU-OMS Results
Soil Category = IV
RImo = 247
RIfut = 100
Vfut/Vmo = 0.945
Zfut/Zmo = 1.005
Zmo = 2.29 m
Zfound/2 = N/A
Zfut(OMS) = 2.30 m
Zfound = N/A
Zfut(HEC-18) = 9.55 m

*(j)*




*(k)*

*Figure 12. Scour situation for 11 bridges in Texas and Massachusetts. (a) bridge 0188-02-023, (b) bridge 0072-04-020, (c) bridge 170-0177-05-119, (d) bridge 0382-05-021, (e) bridge B13001-1EA, (f) bridge B28032-0JC, (g) bridge D06002-0U4, (h) bridge B28009-0JD, (i) bridge D10005-367, (j) bridge D12026-1XX, (k) bridge E01001-41Q.*

## ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF TAMU-OMS

The limitations of TAMU-OMS include:

1. TAMU-OMS cannot be used for new bridges because it is based on observations made at the bridge. However, the lessons learned and the observations gathered by using TAMU-OMS on existing bridges can be useful for the scour design of new bridges, particularly if the new bridge is close to the existing bridge as in a replacement project.
2. TAMU-OMS requires a good network of flow gages in the State.
3. The maximum observed scour depth $Z_{mo}$ may include infilling of the scour hole thereby representing a scour depth which is smaller than the scour depth at the peak of the flood. The estimated infilling thickness should be added to $Z_{fut}$. Briaud et al. (2016) suggest the largest of 1.2 m or 40% of the maximum observed scour depth.
4. The TAMU-OMS has not been developed yet for layered systems and one should be very cautious when using that method in the case of an erosion resistant layer over a more erodible layer.
5. The TAMU-OMS prediction of $Z_{fut}$ is only valid for the next future flood. If this flood occurs, TAMU-OMS must be used again for any future prediction.

The advantages of TAMU-OMS include:

1. There is no need to conduct erosion tests such as the EFA test on samples retrieved from the bridge site. There is a need however to know what soil type is involved within the zone of influence of the potential scour depth.
2. The soil that is being eroded is the actual soil at the site with its own critical velocity. It is not a man-made soil created in a flume and tested to develop prediction equations.
3. The flow history is the actual flow history at the site including all the series of floods which take into account the proper scour rate effect. It is not an assumed constant velocity in a flume lasting long enough to create the maximum scour depth.
4. The geometry of the obstacle provided by the bridge is the actual geometry with all its complexities. It is not a simplified cylinder placed in the middle of a flume with a limited width and associated scaling issues.
5. The method is based on actual observations at the site.
6. TAMU-OMS can be used as a risk management tool. It represents another tool in the scour engineer toolbox. It gives information which is helpful for scour critical bridges as well as for unknown foundation bridges.
7. TAMU-OMS can be used as a bridge scour management tool and a tool to prioritize repairs.

Table 6 summarizes the advantages and drawbacks of TAMU-OMS and the current practice.

*Table 6. Advantages and drawbacks of HEC 18 and TAMU-OMS.*

| HEC 18 ADVANTAGES | DRAWBACKS | TAMU-OMS ADVANTAGES | DRAWBACKS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Used for 30 years | Very conservative on the average | Eliminates over conservatism as predictions are close to measurements | Requires a good network of gages |
| Well documented in guidelines | Very large scatter | Low scatter | Limited use for new bridges |
| Based on many years of research | Based on flume tests | Based on full scale bridge behavior | Need to estimate infilling |
| | Based on fine sand behavior | Based on the in situ soil | Not yet developed for layered soils |
| | Based on simplified geometry | Based on exact geometry | |
| | Based on simplified constant velocity | Based on exact hydrograph | |
| | | Can be used as management tool, to evaluate risk, and prioritize repairs | |

## CONCLUSION

A new method for predicting the future scour depth at existing bridges called the Observation Method for Scour or TAMU-OMS is evaluated by comparing predicted and measured scour depth at 11 bridges in Texas and Massachusetts. The results show that, on average, the OMS eliminates the overconservatism associated with the current practice and significantly decreases the scatter in the predictions. The main limitation of the OMS is that it requires that the user estimates the possibility and magnitude of infilling. More detailed advantages and drawbacks are listed in Table 6. Research on the OMS is continuing.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was originally sponsored by the Texas Department of Transportation where Mr. John Delphia was the technical contact and then by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation where Mr. Richard Murphy was the technical contact. Dr. Chen and Dr. Oliveira at Texas A&M University are thanked for their contribution to the development of the observation method.

## REFERENCES

Arneson L.A., Zevenbergen L.W., Lagasse P.F., and Clopper P.E. (2012). “Evaluating scour at bridges”, Hydraulic Engineering Circular no. 18, Fifth Edition, Publication no. FHWA-HIF-12-003-HEC18, Federal Highway Administration, Washington DC. , USA, 340 pages.

Benedict S. F. (2015). “Evaluation of abutment-scour equations from NCHRP projects 24-15(2) and 24-20 using laboratory and field data”, Project NCHRP 24-20(2), Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

Briaud J.-L. (2006). "Bridge Scour", *Geotechnical News*, BiTech Publishers Ltd, 24(3).


Briaud J.-L., Govindasamy A.V., Kim D., Gardoni P., Olivera F., Chen H.-C., Mathewson C., and Elsbury K. (2009). “Simplified method for estimating scour at bridges”, Texas A&M Transportation Institute report to the Texas Dpt. of Transportation, FHWA/TX-09/0-5505-1, 482 pages.

Briaud, J.-L., Gardoni, P., Yao, C. (2014). "Statistical, Risk, and Reliability Analysis of Bridge Scour", *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 140(2).

Briaud J.-L., Chen H.C., Kim D., Kim H.S., Shidlovskaya A., Jung I., Govindasamy A., and Rezai S. (2016). “The observation method (OMS): a new tool for the bridge scour engineer in Massachusetts”, Final report for phase 1 and 2, Research conducted by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute for the Massachusetts Dpt of Transportation, 185 pages.

Govindasamy A.V., Briaud J.-L., Kim D., Olivera F., Gardoni P., and Delphia J. (2013). "Observational Method for Estimating Future Scour Depth at Existing Bridges", *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, ASCE Reston Virginia, 139(7), 1165-1175.

Landers, M. N., and Mueller, D. S. (1996). "Evaluation of selected pier-scour equations using field data." Transportation Research Record (1523), 186-195.



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
GEOENGINEERING
CASE HISTORIES

***The Journal's Open Access Mission is generously supported by the following Organizations:***

dar
a Sidara company

Geosyntec consultants
engineers | scientists | innovators

ConeTec

MUD BAY DRILLING
LANKELMA
Geotech DRILLING

ENGEO
Expect Excellence

*Access the content of the ĪSSMGE Īnternational Journal of Geoengineering Case Histories at:*
*www.geocasehistoriesjournal.org*

Downloaded: Thursday, November 19 2026, 08:27:32 UTC