

# **Introducing, Examining and Optimising Flow Diversion Structure as an Innovative Countermeasure against Local Scour around Bridge Piers**

**by Mohsen Ranjbar-Zahedani**

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for  
the degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

under the supervision of Associate Professor Hadi Khabbaz

University of Technology Sydney  
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

September 2019

## **CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP**

I, Mohsen Ranjbar-Zahedani declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of PhD degree, in the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature: Production Note:  
Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 06/04/2020

*Sincerely dedicated to  
my wonderful wife*

## **Acknowledgement**

Studying PhD abroad was a challenging but valuable experience for me, and it could not be completed without the support and guidance that I received from many people. Hence, I wish to express my sincere appreciations to those who helped me during this experience.

I greatly appreciate my supervisor, Associate Professor Hadi Khabbaz, for the nonstop support of my PhD study and his patience, motivation, and knowledge. It is my grand chance of expressing my truthful thankfulness to my external supervisor Professor Alireza Keshavarzi for his leadership, expert suggestions, continuous and strong support, and warm encouragement during my PhD study. Besides, I would like to have special thanks to my knowledgeable co-supervisor Associate Professor James Edward Ball, for his valuable advice and constant support from the commencement of this project to the end.

I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Graduate Research School at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) during my PhD study.

The major parts of my experimental tests have been conducted at the University of Wollongong (UOW) and also Western Sydney University (WSU). Therefore, I would like to greatly appreciate Associate Professor Brian Jones from the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences at UOW, who kindly permitted me to have access to their laboratory. I would also like to have exceptional thanks to Professor Bijan Samali, the director of the Centre for Infrastructure Engineering at WSU for granting me to have access to the advanced hydraulic laboratory at WSU.

Furthermore, I am very thankful to my friends and technical staff especially, Mr Rami Haddad, Mr Peter Tawadros, Mr James Tawadros, Dr Farshad Oveissi, Dr Lam Nguyen, and Mr Geoff Hurt who assisted and supported me to set-up the flume, assemble the required apparatus, design the experimental tests and build the physical models. I also want to thank my friend, Dr Mehdi Aghayarzadeh, for his friendship and frequent help and support.

My deepest and sincere gratitude goes to my dearest parents and my beloved siblings. Their unconditional love, support and encouragement have led me through the challenges of life. I would like to appreciate them with all my heart, sincerely.

Last but not least, I am really indebted to my wonderful wife, Shabnam, for being an endless source of love and encouragement. Her understanding of the demands required to complete this work has been inspirational. She supported me since I intended to commence this journey and travelled along thousands of miles away from our home country to make my dream come true.

## List of Publications

- **Journal Papers**

1. **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.**, Keshavarzi, A., Khabbaz, H. & Ball, J. 2018, 'Protecting bridge pier against local scour using flow diversion structure', *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Water Management*, vol. 171, No. 5, pp. 271-280.
2. **Ranjbar-Zahedani M.**, Keshavarzi A, Khabbaz H, & Ball J., 'Optimising Triangular Prism Flow Diversion Structure as an Effective Local Scour Countermeasure around a Pier'. Accepted for publication in the Journal of Hydraulic Research.

- **Peer-Reviewed Conference Papers**

3. **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.**, Keshavarzi, A. & Khabbaz, H. 2017, 'Control of local scour at vicinity of bridge piers using flow diversion structure', *Proceedings of the 37th IAHR World Congress*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
4. **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.**, Keshavarzi, A., Khabbaz, H., & Ball, J. 2019, 'Submerged flow diversion structure as an effective countermeasure to protect bridge piers from scour', *9th Australian Small Bridges Conference*, Gold Coast, Australia.
5. **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.**, Keshavarzi, A., Khabbaz, H., & Ball, J. 2019, 'Flow structures around a circular bridge pier with a submerged prism at upstream', *Proceedings of the 4th World Congress on Civil, Structural, and Environmental Engineering (CSEE'19)*, Rome, Italy

- **Other Papers, Not Directly Related, to this Study**

6. Keshavarzi, A., Shrestha, C.K., **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.**, Ball, J. & Khabbaz, H. 2017, 'Experimental study of flow structure around two in-line bridge piers', *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Water Management*, vol. 171, No. 6, pp. 311-327.
7. Keshavarzi, A., Shrestha, C.K., Melville, B., Khabbaz, H., **Ranjbar-Zahedani, M.** & Ball, J. 2018, 'Estimation of maximum scour depths at upstream of front and rear piers for two in-line circular columns', *Environmental Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 537-50

## **Table of Contents**

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP .....	I
Acknowledgement.....	III
List of Publications .....	V
Table of Contents .....	VI
List of Figures .....	X
List of Tables.....	XVI
Abstract .....	XVII
<b>CHAPTER 1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background .....	2
1.2. Problem Statement .....	2
1.3. Research Objectives .....	3
1.4. Research Significance and Innovation .....	5
1.5. Research Methodology.....	5
1.6. Scope and Limitations.....	6
1.7. Layout of Thesis.....	7
<b>CHAPTER 2. Literature Review .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. Introduction.....	10
2.2. Analysis of Bridge Collapses .....	10
2.3. Bridge Scour .....	12
2.3.1. General Scour.....	13
2.3.2. Contraction Scour.....	13
2.3.3. Local Scour .....	13
2.4. Classification of Studies on Local Scour around Bridge Piers .....	15
2.5. Turbulent Flow Field and Local Scour Mechanism around Piers .....	15
2.5.1. Turbulent Flow.....	16
2.5.2. Local Scour Mechanism around a Single Pier .....	17

2.5.3. Group of Piers .....	21
2.6. Countermeasures against Local Scour around Bridge Piers .....	27
2.6.1. Local Scour Countermeasures Using Armouring Devices .....	27
2.6.2. Local Scour Countermeasures Using Flow Altering Devices.....	36
2.7. Summary .....	53
<b>CHAPTER 3. Preliminary Experimental Investigation of Flow Diversion Structure as a Pier Scour Countermeasure .....</b>	<b>55</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	56
3.2. Selection the Shape of Flow Diversion Structure .....	56
3.3. Experimental Setup and Procedure .....	59
3.3.1. Laboratory Flume.....	59
3.3.2. Design of Experiment Conditions.....	60
3.3.3. Experimental Procedure .....	61
3.4. Results and Discussion.....	64
3.4.1. Determination of the Maximum Scour Depth.....	65
3.4.2. Determination of the Scour Hole Volume .....	70
3.4.3. Flow Field Analysis .....	71
3.4.4. Performance of the Proposed Flow Diversion Structure.....	78
3.5. Summary .....	79
<b>CHAPTER 4. Experimental Optimisation of Hydrodynamic Performance of Flow Diversion Structure to Reduce Local Scour .....</b>	<b>81</b>
4.1. Introduction .....	82
4.2. Review of Bridge Pier Protection against Local Scour.....	82
4.3. Materials and Methods.....	85
4.3.1. Dimensional Analysis and Definition of Dimensionless Variables.....	85
4.3.2. Experimental Design Using Taguchi's Method.....	88
4.4. Experimental Setup and Procedure .....	92
4.4.1. Flume and Its Components .....	92
4.4.2. Designing Experiment Conditions .....	93
4.4.3. Procedure of Local Scour Experiments.....	99



4.5. Results and Discussion.....	102
4.5.1. Sensitivity Analysis of the Dimensionless Parameters .....	104
4.5.2. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Maximum Scour Depth .....	107
4.5.3. Analysis of Scour-Hole Volume .....	109
4.5.4. Confirmation Test .....	112
4.6. Conceptual Field Application of FDS.....	115
4.7. Conclusions.....	116
<b>CHAPTER 5. Flow Field around a Circular Pier with Optimised Flow Diversion Structure at Upstream .....</b>	<b>117</b>
5.1. Introduction.....	118
5.2. Review of Flow Structures near Bridge Piers.....	118
5.3. Experimental Setup and Procedure .....	119
5.3.1. Flume and Its Components .....	119
5.3.2. Physical Models of Bridge Pier and Flow Diversion Structures.....	120
5.3.3. Hydraulic Conditions .....	122
5.3.4. Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) .....	123
5.3.5. Procedure of Flow Field Experiments.....	124
5.3.6. Image Processing .....	127
5.3.7. MATLAB Programming for PIV Data Analysis .....	127
5.4. Results and Discussion.....	128
5.4.1. Time Average Velocity Components.....	129
5.4.2. Flow Pattern .....	137
5.4.3. Turbulence Intensity Components .....	142
5.4.4. Turbulent Kinetic Energy.....	149
5.4.5. Reynolds Shear Stress .....	153
5.5. Conclusions.....	157
<b>CHAPTER 6. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>158</b>
6.1. Summary .....	159
6.2. Conclusions.....	160
6.2.1. Proof of Concept .....	160

6.2.2. Optimisation of Concept .....	161
6.2.3. Flow Field .....	163
6.3. Recommendations .....	165
References .....	167
<b>APPENDIX A. The Captured Models of Scour Holes and Photographs of Scour Tests.....</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>APPENDIX B. Flow Field Plots.....</b>	<b>207</b>
B.1. Plots of Streamwise Velocity Component.....	208
B.2. Plots of Vertical Velocity Component .....	220
B.3. Plots of Absolute Flow Velocity and Streamlines.....	232
B.4. Plots of Streamwise Turbulence Intensity .....	244
B.5. Plots of Vertical Turbulence Intensity.....	256
B.6. Plots of Turbulent Kinetic Energy.....	268
B.7. Plots of Reynolds Shear Stress .....	280
<b>APPENDIX C. F-Distribution Table.....</b>	<b>292</b>
<b>APPENDIX D. Developed Code in MATLAB for PIV Data Analysis.....</b>	<b>295</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Schematic diagram of a flow diversion structure .....	4
Figure 2.1. Various types of potential scour around bridge piers (modified from Melville & Coleman, 2000) .....	12
Figure 2.2. Local scour around bridge piers (taken by the candidate).....	14
Figure 2.3. Temporal velocity fluctuations at a point in turbulent flow .....	16
Figure 2.4. Main features of flow around a bridge pier (Hamill, 1998) .....	18
Figure 2.5. Two circular piers in cross-flow; a) tandem configuration; b) side-by-side configuration; c) staggered configuration .....	21
Figure 2.6. Tandem piers flow classification (modified from Sumner, 2010).....	22
Figure 2.7. Alternative armouring devices for pier scour protection (Melville & Coleman, 2000) .....	28
Figure 2.8. Collar on pier (modified from Kumar et al., 1999) .....	36
Figure 2.9. Bridge Pier with Slot; a) slot near bed; b) slot near water surface (modified from Chiew, 1992) .....	38
Figure 2.10. Bridge Pier with Slot; a) straight slot; b) T-shaped slot; c) Y-shaped slot (modified from Hajikandi & Golnabi, 2017) .....	39
Figure 2.11. Sacrificial piles upstream of a circular pier (Melville & Hadfield, 1999)..	40
Figure 2.12. Transverse sacrificial piles upstream of a pier (modified from Haque et al., 2007) .....	41
Figure 2.13. The use of Iowa vanes as a pier scour countermeasure (modified from Melville & Coleman, 2000) .....	42
Figure 2.14. Schematic of a delta wing (modified from Gupta & Gangadharaiah, 1992) .....	43
Figure 2.15. Permeable sheet pile upstream of a pier (Parker et al., 1998) .....	44
Figure 2.16. Internal openings through the pier (modified from El-Razek et al., 2003)	45
Figure 2.17. Surface guide panel; a) side view; b) plan view (modified from Huang et al., 2005).....	46

Figure 2.18. Threaded pier - helical wires or cables wrapped spirally on the pile to form thread (modified from Dey et al., 2006) .....	47
Figure 3.1. Wake width behind different structures (Roshko 1954).....	57
Figure 3.2. Schematic diagram of the preliminary experimental setup .....	61
Figure 3.3. Schematic diagram of grid points positions for measuring velocity components (longitudinal view).....	63
Figure 3.4. Photographs of measuring velocity components by ADV; a) control test; b) test with $d/D=1.5$ .....	63
Figure 3.5. Scour depth vs. normalised distance to the pier; a) maximum scour depth; b) trend of maximum scour depth reduction .....	66
Figure 3.6. Maximum scour depth vs. normalised distance a) maximum scour depth at rear pier and b) maximum scour depth reduction at rear pier for the two in-line piers case.....	69
Figure 3.7. Scour hole volume against normalised distance; a) scour hole volume; b) scour hole volume reduction .....	71
Figure 3.8. Comparison plot of streamwise velocity component ( $u$ ) in Test 1 (without FDS) and Test 4 (FDS with $d/D=1.5$ ) .....	73
Figure 3.9. Contour plots of time-averaged streamwise velocity component; a) Test 1; b) Test 4.....	74
Figure 3.10. Comparison of the depth-averaged of $u$ in Test 1 and Test 4.....	75
Figure 3.11. Comparison plot of vertical velocity component ( $w$ ) in Test 1 (without FDS) and Test 4 (with FDS) .....	76
Figure 3.12. Contour plots of time-averaged vertical velocity component; a) Test 1; b) Test 4.....	77
Figure 3.13. Comparison of the depth-averaged of $w$ in Tests 1 and 4 .....	77
Figure 3.14. Contour plots of mean flow velocity and streamlines; a) Test 1; b) Test 4	78
Figure 3.15. Streamlines diversion by triangular flow diversion structure.....	79
Figure 4.1. Schematic diagram of the pier and the flow diversion structure (FDS) .....	84

Figure 4.2. The effect of clear distance between the pier and FDS or between two in-line piers on local scour reduction around the rear pier .....	87
Figure 4.3. Schematic diagram of the laboratory flume.....	93
Figure 4.4. Sieve analysis of the sand used.....	95
Figure 4.5. Local scour depth variation with flow intensity (after Melville & Coleman, 2000) .....	96
Figure 4.6. Schematic diagram of pier and FDSs used in this experimental study.....	98
Figure 4.7. a) A photograph of an FDS; b) a photograph of pier on its position in the plexiglass sheets .....	100
Figure 4.8. A typical photograph of the test preparation (Test 10).....	100
Figure 4.9. Photographs of Artec Eva 3D scanner.....	101
Figure 4.10. Main-effect plots of the maximum pier scour depth .....	105
Figure 4.11. Effects of the height of FDS on the maximum pier scour depth .....	107
Figure 4.12. Main-effect plots of the scour-hole volume.....	110
Figure 4.13. Photographs of scour-hole; a) control test; b) optimum test.....	113
Figure 4.14. 3D models of scour-hole; a) control test; b) optimum test.....	114
Figure 5.1. Flow field around a bridge pier .....	119
Figure 5.2. A photograph of the flume and its components.....	120
Figure 5.3. a) FDS models; b) installation of the models into the plexiglass sheets on the flume bed.....	122
Figure 5.4. Schematic diagram of the PIV technique (Goharzade & Molki, 2014) .....	123
Figure 5.5. Experimental setup; a) a schematic diagram of the pier and FDS; b) different planes of PIV measurements (plan view).....	125
Figure 5.6. A photograph of experimental set up and PIV system in the laboratory....	125
Figure 5.7. Normalised streamwise velocity for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ .....	131
Figure 5.8. Normalised streamwise velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	131

Figure 5.9. Normalised streamwise velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	132
Figure 5.10. Normalised streamwise velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	132
Figure 5.11. Normalised streamwise velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	133
Figure 5.12. Normalised vertical velocity for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ .....	134
Figure 5.13. Normalised vertical velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	135
Figure 5.14. Normalised vertical velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	135
Figure 5.15. Normalised vertical velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	136
Figure 5.16. Normalised vertical velocity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	136
Figure 5.17. Normalised absolute flow velocity and Streamlines in wide frame at $Y/D = 0$ ; a) single pier case; b) single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ .....	139
Figure 5.18. Normalised absolute flow velocity and Streamlines in tight frame at $Y/D = 0$ ; a) single pier case; b) single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ .....	140
Figure 5.19. Normalised absolute flow velocity and Streamlines for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	141
Figure 5.20. Normalised absolute flow velocity and Streamlines for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	141
Figure 5.21. Normalised absolute flow velocity and Streamlines for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	142
Figure 5.22. Normalised streamwise turbulence intensity for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ .....	144
Figure 5.23. Normalised streamwise turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	144

Figure 5.24. Normalised streamwise turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	145
Figure 5.25. Normalised streamwise turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	145
Figure 5.26. Normalised streamwise turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	146
Figure 5.27. Normalised vertical turbulence intensity for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ .....	147
Figure 5.28. Normalised vertical turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	147
Figure 5.29. Normalised vertical turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	148
Figure 5.30. Normalised vertical turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	148
Figure 5.31. Normalised vertical turbulence intensity for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	149
Figure 5.32. Normalised turbulent kinetic energy for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ .	150
Figure 5.33. Normalised turbulent kinetic energy for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	151
Figure 5.34. Normalised turbulent kinetic energy for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	151
Figure 5.35. Normalised turbulent kinetic energy for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	152
Figure 5.36. Normalised turbulent kinetic energy for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	152
Figure 5.37. Normalised Reynolds Shear Stress for the single pier case at $Y/D = 0$ ....	154
Figure 5.38. Normalised Reynolds Shear Stress for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.25$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	154
Figure 5.39. Normalised Reynolds Shear Stress for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.50$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	155

Figure 5.40. Normalised Reynolds Shear Stress for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y=0.75$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	155
Figure 5.41. Normalised Reynolds Shear Stress for the single pier case and FDS with $H/y>1$ at $Y/D = 0$ .....	156



## List of Tables

Table 2.1. Number of failed bridges vs. Causes of failure, by 10 year intervals (modified from Lee et al., 2013).....	11
Table 2.2. Summary of flow field results for the longitudinal plane at centreline (after Keshavarzi et al., 2017).....	24
Table 2.3. Equations for sizing riprap around bridge piers.....	29
Table 2.4. Methods to estimate riprap extent, grading and filter requirements (after Melville & Coleman, 2000) .....	33
Table 2.5. Summary of different flow-altering devices as a pier scour countermeasure	51
Table 3.1. Shape factors for different pier shapes (modified from Melville & Coleman 2000) .....	58
Table 3.2. Characteristics of the preliminary tests .....	64
Table 3.3. Tests conditions and scour depth characteristics .....	65
Table 3.4. Scour depth characteristics at rear pier in tandem arrangement (after Keshavarzi et al., 2018).....	68
Table 3.5. Scour hole volume characteristics.....	70
Table 4.1. Experimental variables and their values and levels .....	88
Table 4.2. Experimental design based on Taguchi's method.....	90
Table 4.3. Mutually orthogonal of any two variables' weighing factors .....	91
Table 4.4. The results of local scour tests .....	103
Table 4.5. Variable level averages for the maximum pier scour depth (mm).....	104
Table 4.6. Comparison of the best d/D for different cases and hydraulic conditions ...	106
Table 4.7. Analyses of variance for the maximum scour depth.....	109
Table 4.8. Variable level averages for the scour-hole volume (1000 mm <sup>3</sup> ) .....	110
Table 4.9. Analyses of variance for the scour-hole volume.....	111
Table 5.1. Flow conditions for experimental tests on flow field .....	122
Table 5.2. The details of the flow field tests configurations.....	126

## **Abstract**

Previous studies have shown that local scour around bridge piers and abutments is a common cause of waterway bridge failures, and around 60% of bridge collapses are due to this phenomenon. To control and reduce local scour, different engineering methods have been proposed by the researchers which can be classified into two distinct categories, including (i) armouring devices, which is a conventional way, and (ii) flow-altering devices. Armouring devices such as riprap is placed around a pier to armour the riverbed grains against shear stresses and reduces the local scour. However, riprap layers often fail to protect bridges during floods because it cannot be stable to withstand the high approaching stream velocities. The second category is flow-altering devices that change the flow field around the bridge piers in a manner that reduces the potential for erosion.

In this study, a new flow-altering device named flow diversion structure (FDS) has been introduced and experimentally examined and optimised. Different criteria were considered to select the shape of this FDS including diverting streamlines from the vicinity of pier, creating a relatively wide wake region behind the FDS, and having a low amount of local scour around itself. Theoretically, by comparison different shapes according to the above criteria, triangular prism was recognised as a proper shape. The effectiveness of this innovative countermeasure was examined through a wide-ranging series of experimental studies. Firstly, a number of preliminary laboratory tests were conducted to prove whether proposed FDS can reduce the local scour around a circular bridge pier. An introductory FDS was built with a lateral base of  $0.2D$ , longitudinal base of  $0.5D$  (where  $D$  is the pier diameter), and full-depth (unsubmerged) height. Seven tests were conducted for situations of a single pier and a single pier plus the FDS, which was installed at six alternative locations upstream of the pier (namely  $d/D = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5$  and  $3.5$ , where  $d$  is the clear distance between the pier and FDS). All tests were conducted under steady state and clear-water scour conditions. After achieving the equilibrium bed condition, the bed profile was measured, and the maximum scour depth and volume of the scour hole were determined for each experimental test. In addition, to determine the influence of the FDS on the flow field upstream of the pier, the velocity components were measured by an Acoustic Doppler Velocimetry (ADV). Analysis of the results indicated that the proposed FDS could change both the magnitude and direction of the velocity components upstream of the pier, and consequently reduce the scour depth around the pier

up to 38%. Besides, the clear distance between the pier and the FDS affected the performance of this new countermeasure.

Secondly, to optimise the dimensions of FDS including the lateral base (B), longitudinal base (L), and height (H), and its clear distance from the upstream face of a circular pier (d), different FDS dimensions and locations were examined experimentally. Taguchi's method, which is an efficient statistical approach to design experimental tests, was employed here to determine the parameter combination to minimise the numbers of alternative tests. Therefore, 27 FDSs were tested to find the optimum size and installation location of the FDS. An advanced technology of 3-D printing was employed to build accurate physical models. At the end of each test, to measure the topography of the scoured bed a precise 3-D scanner was used. Similar to the preliminary tests, these experiments were also conducted in a steady flow and under clear water scour conditions. However, the hydraulic conditions were adjusted in such a way to produce almost maximum possible local scour. After achieving equilibrium condition, the scour hole was scanned, and the maximum scour depth and the volume of the scour hole were extracted from the 3-D model for each experimental test. The outcomes clearly demonstrated that the best lateral base, longitudinal base, and height of FDS were equals to  $0.4D$ ,  $0.6D$ , and  $0.25y$  (where  $y$  is the water depth), respectively. Furthermore, the best clear distance between FDS and the pier is approximately between  $1D$  and  $1.5D$ . In the optimum situation, the scour depth and the volume of the scour hole around the pier reduced by 40% and 60%, respectively.

Finally, to find out how the optimised FDS affected the flow field around a circular pier, an experimental study of flow field was conducted using a Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) system. All tests were conducted under fixed bed condition with no sediment. The optimised FDS was installed at the best location upstream of the pier ( $d/D = 1.5$ ), and the velocity components were measured at five vertical planes (i.e.,  $Y/D = 0, 1, 2, 3$  and  $4$ , where  $Y$  is the transverse direction). A similar test was carried out with only a single pier as a control test. The PIV images, collected during the individual experiments, were processed to determine the streamwise ( $u$ ) and vertical ( $w$ ) velocity components. A code was developed using MATLAB software to calculate the turbulence characteristics of the flow. Analysis of the results indicated that the optimised FDS significantly affected the flow field and changed the complicated vortices systems, including down-flow, horseshoe vortex, and wake vortex around the pier. Consequently, the pier-scour was significantly reduced by the substantial changes in the flow field. This novel device is a simple and easy option for mitigating local scour around the piers supporting existing and new bridges.