

GUIDELINES FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF RIVER TRAINING AND CONTROL WORKS FOR ROAD BRIDGES

(Second Revision)



**INDIAN ROADS CONGRESS
2019**

GUIDELINES FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF RIVER TRAINING AND CONTROL WORKS FOR ROAD BRIDGES

(Second Revision)

Published by:

INDIAN ROADS CONGRESS

Kama Koti Marg,
Sector-6, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi-110 022

DECEMBER, 2019

Price : ₹ 600/-
(Plus Packing & Postage)

IRC:89-2019

First Published	:	November, 1985
First Revision	:	April, 1997
Reprinted	:	October, 2000
Reprinted	:	December, 2004
Reprinted	:	July, 2006
Reprinted	:	September, 2008 (Incorporating Amendments issued vide Notification No.25 dated 30th November, 2006 and Errata issued vide Notification No.29 dated 28th March, 2007)
Reprinted	:	May, 2012
Reprinted	:	February, 2016
Second Revision	:	December, 2019

(All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication shall be reproduced, translated or transmitted in any form or by any means without the permission of the Indian Roads Congress)

CONTENTS

S. No.	Description	Page No.
	Personnel of the Bridges Specifications and Standards Committee	i-ii
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Scope	2
3.	Terminology	3
4.	Site Data	4
5.	Guide Bunds	6
6.	Spurs	21
7.	River Bank Protection	37
8.	Approach Road Protection	43
9.	Design of River Training and Control Works in Sub-Montane Regions	48
10.	Floor Protection	50
11.	Physical Model Studies	51
12.	Mathematical Modeling	55
13.	Inspection	57
14.	Maintenance Aspects of River Training and Protective Works	58
 APPENDIXES		
Appendix 1 (a)	Formula for Computation of Afflux	62
Appendix 1(b)	Method For Computation of Backwater or Afflux at Bridge Piers for Rivers Carrying Discharge more than 3000 m ³ /sec.	64
Appendix 2	Model Limitations	75
Appendix 3	Design of Guide Bund Length	77
References		81

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Description	Page No.
Fig. 5.1	Type of Guide Bunds according to Form in Plan	8
	(a) Divergent, (b) Convergent, (c) Parallel, and (d) Elliptical	8
Fig. 5.2	Extent of protection provided by Parallel and Convergent Guide bunds	8
Fig. 5.3	Guide Bunds according to Geometrical Shape	9
Fig. 5.4	(a) Straight Guide Bund with Circular Head, (b) Elliptical Guide Bund followed by Circular Arc	9
Fig. 5.5	Sketch showing a loop in a river	10
Fig. 5.6	Nomograph from Lagasse 1995 to Determine Length of Guide Bunds	12
Fig. 5.7	Sketch showing Stone Pitching with Filter Beneath	16
Fig. 5.8	Cylindrical Gabion application to Fill Deep Scour Hole	17
Fig. 5.9	Typical Cylindrical Gabion Sketch	17
Fig. 5.10	Details of Guide bunds	19
Fig. 6.1	Types of Spurs or Groynes	22
Fig. 6.2	Placement of Spur / Gyrone along the bank of the river	28
Fig. 6.3	Orientation of Spurs / Gyrones upstream	29
Fig. 6.4	Graphical representation for determining Spur / Gyrone spacing	30
Fig. 6.5	Plan showing depth of scour of Spurs / Groynes	32
Fig. 6.6	Typical design of Spur / Groyne	33
Fig. 6.7	Tree Spurs	34
Fig. 6.8	Typical Plan of Pile Spurs (Bamboo, Shawl)	35
Fig. 6.9	Cross section of Pile Spur (Bamboo, Shawl)	35
Fig. 6.10	Wooden Piles over River Jhelum	36
Fig. 6.11	Details of Pile Spurs	36
Fig. 7.1	Typical section of gabion retaining wall with launching apron	37
Fig. 7.2	Bank lining with revet mattress installed under the water	38
Fig. 7.3	(a) Steel Jetty-Kellner Jack, (b) Porcupine Spur	38
	(c) & (d) Prismatic type RCC Porcupine	39
Fig. 7.4	(a) Upstream facing Bed Bar, (b) Downstream facing Bed Bar	40
Fig. 7.5	Typical design of stud	41
Fig. 7.6	Lateral mitigation of a meander and stream cross sections in a bend	42
Fig. 8.1	Typical Sections of Stone Slope Protection	44
Fig. 8.2	Details of cut-off at terminals of rip-rap blanket	45
Fig. 8.3	Polar diagram of different inclination of a straight spur showing type and extent of projection	46
Fig. 8.4	Length requiring protection as a function of the spur inclination	47
Fig. 9.1	Typical Example of Check Dam	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1	Minimum Weight of Loose and Isolated Stones for Pitching on River Slopes	14
Table 6.1	Types of Spur/Groyne along with Advantages and Disadvantages	23
Table 6.2	Depth of Scour	31

PERSONNEL OF THE BRIDGES SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

(as on 16th July, 2019)

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Pandey, I.K.
(Convenor) | Director General (Road Development) & Special Secretary to Govt. of India, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 2. | Balakrishna, Y
(Co-convenor) | Additional Director General, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 3. | Kumar, Sanjeev
(Member-Secretary) | Chief Engineer (R), S, R & T, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Transport Bhavan, New Delhi |

Members

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|
| 4. | Bagish, Dr. B.P. | Chief Engineer (Retd.), Road Construction Department, Bihar |
| 5. | Banerjee, A.K. | Member (Technical) (Retd.), National Highway Authority of India |
| 6. | Basa, Ashok | Managing Director, CEM Consultant (P) Ltd. |
| 7. | Bhide, D.A. | Vice President (Design), MRMPL |
| 8. | Bhowmick, Alok | Managing Director, B&S Engineering Consultants Pvt. Ltd., UP |
| 9. | Chakrapani, R.V. | Managing Director, Aarvee Associate |
| 10. | Gairola, Co.I Pradeep | GM (Project), BRIDCUL, Dehradun |
| 11. | Garg, Sanjay | Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 12. | Ghoshal, A. | Principal Advisor, STUP Consultants (P) Ltd. Kolkata |
| 13. | Gupta, Dr. Supratic | Assistant Professor, IIT Delhi |
| 14. | Heggade, V.N. | CEO, STUP Consultants Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai |
| 15. | HOD Bridge Division, CRRI | (G.K. Sahu), CSIR-CRRI, New Delhi |
| 16. | Jaigopal, R.K. | MD, Struct Geotech Research Laboratories (P) Ltd. Bangalore |
| 17. | Jatkar, Mohan | Advisor, Gammon India Ltd. |
| 18. | Kataria, Ranjan | Executive Director (Technical), Delhi Metro |
| 19. | Koshi, Ninan | DG(RD)&AS (Retd.), Ministry of Surface Transport, New Delhi |
| 20. | Maheshwari, Dr. B.K. | Professor, IIT Roorkee |
| 21. | Managing Director, RSRDC | (M.G. Maheshwari, MD) RSRDC |
| 22. | Managing Director, UPSBC | (Ranjan Mittal, MD) UPSBC, Lucknow |
| 23. | Manisekar, Dr. R. | Sr. Scientist, CSIR-SERC, Chennai, Tamil Nadu |
| 24. | Mishra, Dr. Sudhir | Professor, IIT Roorkee |
| 25. | Nirmal, S.K. | Secretary General, IRC |
| 26. | Patankar, V.L | Addl. Director General (Retd.), Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 27. | Prasad, Mathura | Superintending Engineer, PWD Delhi |
| 28. | Puri, S.K. | DG(RD)&SS (Retd.), Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 29. Rao, P. Ravinder | Engineer-in-Chief (R&B) State Roads, CRN, PPP & RDC, Telangana |
| 30. Director General, BRO | (Anil Kumar, Chief Engineer) Border Road Organization |
| 31. Sharan, G. | DG(RD)&SS (Retd.), Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 32. Sharma, R.S. | Managing Director, M/s Sugam Technocrats Pvt. Lt., New Delhi |
| 33. Sinha, B.K. | Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 34. Sinha, N.K. | DG(RD)&SS (Retd.), Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, New Delhi |
| 35. Subbhiya, Ravindra | Chief Design Engineer, L&T, Chennai |
| 36. Tandon, Prof. Mahesh | Managing Director, Tandon Consultants (P) Ltd., New Delhi |
| 37. Tawade, D.O. | Member (Technical), National Highway Authority of India (NHAI), New Delhi |
| 38. The Engineer-in-Chief, MES
(Sharma AVSM, Lt. Gen. Suresh) | Military Engineer Service (MES), New Delhi |
| 39. Viswanathan, T | Consultant, Delhi |

Corresponding Members

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Manjure, P.Y. | Director, Freyssinet Prestressed Concrete Co. Ltd, Mumbai |
| 2. Sinha, Prof. Ravi | Professor, IIT Mumbai |
| 3. Subbarao, Dr. Harshavardhan | Chairman & Managing Director, Construma Consultancy (P) Ltd. Mumbai |

Ex-Officio Members

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. President,
Indian Roads Congress | (Basar, Toli)
Chief Engineer
Highway Zone, PWD
MOWB-II, ITANAGAR |
| 2. Honorary Treasurer,
Indian Roads Congress | (Pandey, I.K.)
Director General (Road Development) & Spl. Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways |
| 3. Secretary General,
Indian Roads Congress | Nirmal, Sanjay Kumar |

GUIDELINES FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF RIVER TRAINING AND CONTROL WORKS FOR ROAD BRIDGES

1. INTRODUCTION

“The Guidelines for Design and Construction of River Training and Control Works for Road Bridges” was first published in 1985 and a first revision was published in April 1997. The first revision included the floor protection works and maintenance of protective works. Two Amendments were issued in 2006 and 2007 and the guidelines were reprinted in 2012 incorporating these amendments. The guidelines needed revision to incorporate the updated research and model studies for design of guide bunds, slope protection, and spur. The introduction of new materials such as geosynthetics for slope protection and filter material also needed incorporation in the guidelines. Considering the requirement, the task of review and revision of IRC:89 was assigned by BSS Committee to B-3 Committee. A Sub-Committee comprising Shri R. Prakash, Convenor, Dr. Ratnakar R. Mahajan, Shri P.V. Mayur, Shri Shahrokh Bagli as Member and Prof. S.K. Mazumder, Shri R.G Patil as Corresponding Member was constituted to review the existing guidelines and suggest modifications.

The Sub-committee met a number of times and finalized the draft revision. Prof S.K. Majumdar and Volunteers Ms Jyoti Maan and Mr. Ishfaq Hamid contributed significantly in drafting the document. The draft document was considered by B-3 Committee in its meetings dated 14.12.2018, 02.03.2019 and 26.04.2019. The draft was modified by the Sub-Committee based on the discussions held in B-3 Committee meetings. The B-3 Committee in its meeting dated 11.05.2019 approved the document and authorized the Convener to edit the document and forward to IRC for approval of BSS and Council.

The personnel of the Foundation, Sub-Structure Protective Works and Masonry Structures Committee (B-3) for the tenure 2018-20 are as given below:

Sharma, R.S.	Convenor
Basa, Ashok	Co-Convenor
Gaharwar, Dr. S.S.	Member-Secretary

Members

Arora, Daljit Singh	Mahajan, Dr. Ratnakar R.
Bagli, Shahrokh	Maheshwari, Dr. B.K.
Bongirwar, P.L.	Marwah, M.P.
Chadha, Neeraj	Mayur, P.V.
Das, S.K.	Prakash, R.
Garg, Sanjay	Rana, Dr. Sanjay
Gupta, Navneet	Rep. of BRO (Yadav, P.N.)
Jaigopal, R.K.	Sinha, A.K.
Jain, Sanjay Kumar	Subbarao, Dr Harshavardhan
Khanna, Ms. Shobha	

Corresponding Members

Kanhere , Dr. D.K.

Viswanathan, T.

Ex-Officio Members

President,
Indian Roads Congress

(Basar, Toli), Chief Engineer, PWD
Arunachal Pradesh

Director General (Road Development) & Special Secretary to Govt. of India

(Pandey, I.K.), Ministry of Road Transport
and Highways, New Delhi

Secretary General,
Indian Roads Congress

Nirmal, Sanjay Kumar

The draft was considered by the Bridges Specifications and Standards Committee (BSS) in its meeting held on 16.07.2019 and approved the document. Subsequently, the Executive Committee approved the document on 8th August, 2019 for placing it before the IRC Council. Finally, the document was considered by the IRC Council in its meeting held on 9th & 10th August, 2019 during the 218th Mid-term Council Meeting of IRC held at Goa and was approved for publication.

2. SCOPE

2.1 The guidelines cover the layout and design of river training works and approach embankment protection works for ensuring safety of the bridges and their approaches. These guidelines also deal with some of the construction and maintenance aspects. Protection works for open and shallow foundations are also covered. These guidelines also cover the river training works for rivers in mountainous regions.

2.2 The scope of these guidelines is limited only to some salient aspects of design and construction of the protection works mentioned above and does not extend to the much wider associated problems of river behavior, control and bridge hydraulics, etc.

2.3 The necessity or otherwise of the guide bunds, spurs and other protective works must be decided judiciously after observing the behavior of the river at the site under consideration. Data about the protection works at other sites on upstream or downstream of the site under consideration can also be a good guide.

River training works are costly and their maintenance cost is also very high. In case, their location, configuration and size are not decided properly, these works can cause damaging effects also. Therefore, these must be provided judiciously.

The river behavior near bridges must be studied and analyzed for proper design of river training works. For bridges across major rivers like Brahmaputra, Kosi, Yamuna and Ganga, the extent and configuration of the protective works should be decided with the help of physical models. For accuracy, the results obtained from physical models may be further checked on mathematical models preferably, by the same research station which carried out physical model studies.

2.4 Given inadequate knowledge of uncertainties about many aspects of bridge hydraulics and river behavior and characteristics in general, these guidelines cannot obviously claim to

have any general validity of application. These are to be deemed as a guide to good practice of design and construction of the protection works compatible with the current experience and knowledge in the subject area. For particular applications, these guidelines may have to be modified and supplemented in each case based on subjective and objective judgement of the engineer, to cater for site, river and specific requirements of a bridge structure.

3. TERMINOLOGY

The following definitions shall apply for the purpose of these guidelines.

- (i) **Afflux/backwater:** The rise in flood level of the river immediately on the upstream of the bridge as a result of obstruction to natural flow caused by the construction of the bridge and its approaches.
- (ii) **Alluvial streams:** A stream whose bed and banks are composed of loose granular material, that has been deposited by the stream and can be picked up and transported again by the current during the floods, and is said to flow through incoherent alluvium, may be briefly referred to as an alluvial stream.
- (iii) **Approach road protection:** Approaches are protected by means of pitching, gabions and turfing against ravages due to wind, rain-cuts, wave action, erosive action of parallel flow or frontal attack of a river. Further, where a bridge with constricted waterway is located in a wide khadir, guide bunds alone may not afford protection to the entire length of approaches from the river flow. In such cases, approaches beyond the influence zone of guide bunds may need protection.
- (iv) **Floor protection works:** Protection in the form of flooring where adoption of shallow foundations, becomes economical by restricting the scour.
- (v) **Guide bunds:** These are embankments meant to confine and guide the river flow past a bridge without causing damage to it and its approaches. These are generally constructed in the direction of flow on one or both flanks, depending on the site conditions.
- (vi) **Khadir:** The maximum width over which the river meanders during high floods is known as Khadir width of the river.
- (vii) **Meander:** The curvature of flow, established in a stream either due to its own characteristics or due to impressed external forces.
- (viii) **River bank protection:** Bank protection is afforded directly in the form of slope pitching, gabions and turfing or indirectly in the form of spurs.
- (ix) **Spurs or Groynes:** These are structures constructed transverse to the flow of the river and extend from the bank into the river. These are intended to induce silting and diverting the flow away from the point of attack.
- (x) **Design Flood level:** It is the high flood level corresponding to design flood pertaining to different return periods
- (xi) **Meandering river:** A meander is one of a series of regular sinuous curves, bends, loops, turns, or windings in the channel of a river, stream, or other watercourse. It is produced by a stream or river swinging from side to side as it flows across its floodplain or shifts its channel within a valley.

- (xii) **Braiding river:** A braiding river, or braiding channel, consists of a network of river channels separated by small, and often temporary, islands called braid bars. Braided streams occur in rivers with low slope and/or large sediment load.
- (xiii) **River Morphology:** The term river morphology and its synonym fluvial geomorphology are used to describe the shapes of river channels and how they change in shape and direction over time. The rivers of India reveal certain special characteristics because they undergo large seasonal fluctuations in flow and sediment load. The rivers are adjusted to an array of discharges, and most rivers exhibit morphologies that are related to high-magnitude floods. Major large rivers in India, namely Brahmaputra, Kosi, Ganga, Yamuna and Narmada, have received greater attention from fluvial geomorphologists. Understanding of river behavior is complicated due to integrated geo-morphologic, hydrologic, hydraulic and sediment parameters. It may be observed that the different plan forms i.e. straight, meandering, braided etc. depend on the river geometry, sediment load, slope and flow in the river.

4. SITE DATA

The following details are a general guideline for the data to be collected for design purpose. However, the nature and extent of the data to be collected would vary depending upon the importance of the bridge/project.

4.1 Topographical Data

- (i) **An Index map,** to a suitable small scale (topo sheets from Survey of India scale 1 in 50,000 or 1 in 250,000 would do in most cases) showing the proposed project location, reach under consideration, the existing means of communication, the general topography of the country and important towns, any other existing or proposed structure across or along the river, etc., in the vicinity of the proposed works. The satellite imageries of 30 m resolution are apt to understand the reach under consideration. The satellite imagery shows the present general topography and recent changes in the reach of the river. A record of satellite imaginaries can be collected from National remote Sensing Centre in Hyderabad or from any other agency.
- (ii) **River survey plans,** preferably to a scale 1/10,000 for a river reach of at least two meander lengths upstream and one meander length downstream. In case the bridge is situated immediately downstream of the confluence of two rivers, the reach to be considered in respect of both should be at least 1.5 km upstream of the extent of back water influence in the tributaries under highest flood level.
- (iii) **A contoured site plan,** to a suitable scale showing the location of the bridge and covering approaches to a sufficient distance (not less than 500 m on either side beyond the Khadir width in the case of a bridge across major river), the direction of flow, names of nearest inhabited localities, references to the bench marks used as datum, location of trial pits for borings and the location of nullahs, wells and outcrop of rocks and the existence of structures upstream and downstream of the river. The site plan should extend for a distance of at least 3 km upstream and 1 km downstream and should indicate river course during high floods and dry season duly superimposed in

different colours for as many years as available. The contours or spot levels should extend over this area at a contour interval varying from 0.5 m in flat terrain to 2 m for steep terrain.

The nodal points which are not affected by meandering action of the river should be suitably marked on the plan.

- (iv) **Cross sections**, showing bed and bank levels, L.W.L. and H.F.L. at the bridge site and at L/10 interval for 1.5 L on upstream and for a distance of L on downstream subject to a maximum spacing of 30 m intervals where L is the length of the bridge.

4.2 Hydrological Data

- (i) The size, shape and surface characteristics of the catchment area including percolation and interception, area drainage pattern and the likely effect of proposed protective works on the same.
- (ii) The possibility of subsequent changes in the catchment like the regrouping or canalization of the streams, afforestation, deforestation, urban development, extension of or reduction in cultivated areas.
- (iii) Storage in the catchment area, artificial or natural.
- (iv) The slope of the catchment both longitudinal and cross.
- (v) The intensity duration and frequency of rainfall in the catchment.
- (vi) Hydrographs for one or more years if possible and in the absence of such data, fluctuations of the water level observed during different months of the year.
- (vii) The highest flood level (on record for a period not less than 50 years) and the year of its occurrence. If the flood is affected by the back water, details of the same.
- (viii) A chart showing High Flood Levels, corresponding discharges and their duration for as many as years as available together with maximum and mean velocities corresponding to the aforesaid flood discharges.
- (ix) The influence of afflux on areas in the vicinity likely to be affected.
- (x) Low water level.
- (xi) River bed slope, flood slope and natural ground slopes of flood plain, if any.
- (xii) Direction of the main current during low, medium and high floods.
- (xiii) In case the reach of river to be trained is tidal, information regarding High Tide Level (H.T.L.) and Low Tide Level (L.T.L), of spring as well as high tides both during freshets and dry season.
- (xiv) Nature and extent of bank erosion noticed for 2 meanders or 1 km whichever is more upstream and 1 meander downstream for meandering rivers and 5 L or 1 km whichever is more upstream and 3 L downstream for non-meandering rivers.
- (xv) The observed maximum depth of scour with corresponding H.F.L. and details of obstruction or any other special causes responsible for this scour.
- (xvi) Studies of channel trends based on experience with comparable situations and based on maps and published reports, if any.
- (xvii) Description regarding terrain, slope, stability of river banks, natural or artificial.
- (xviii) Details of change, in the river course, if any, found near the proposed structure.

4.3 Geotechnical Data

- (i) Soil strata chart/trial pit/bore hole available, if any, near the proposed structures.
- (ii) Bore hole data along the length of proposed protective works up to maximum anticipated scour level along with shear strength parameters (cohesion and angle of internal friction), consolidation characteristics of sub-soil strata, the particle size distribution and mean diameter.
- (iii) Sediment load characteristics, river behavior near the bridge i.e. whether aggrading, degrading, senile or braided, etc. Specific limitations, if any, imposed by the type of the river may also be indicated.

4.4 Environmental/Ecological Data

Existing environmental/ecological conditions in the immediate vicinity of the structure and the effect of the proposed river training and control works on the same.

4.5 Other Data

- (i) The extent of land available beyond the deep channel banks on both upstream and downstream within the reach shown on site plan together with details as to whether land is vacant, cultivated, etc.
- (ii) Availability of borrow-pit facilities, type and characteristics of local soil, stone quarry having 40 kg (or 300 mm size) boulders and other materials suited for river training and control works.
- (iii) Need for plying of tippers on the top of guide bunds.
- (iv) Availability of local labour and machines for construction and maintenance works.
- (v) Aerial photographs or maps for different years to study the meandering characteristics of the stream.
- (vi) Rate of aggradation for streams in sub-montane regions.

4.6 Design Data

4.6.1 Discharge: The design discharge for which the river training works are to be designed shall be in accordance with the recommendations of IRC:5.

4.6.2 Scour depth: The mean depth of scour (dsm) below the highest flood level, shall be calculated in accordance with provisions of IRC:5.

4.6.3 Afflux: Afflux shall be calculated as per formula given in **Appendix 1 (a)** for rivers carrying discharges less than 3000 m³/sec. For bridges across rivers carrying discharges more than 3000 m³/sec afflux shall be calculated as per the method given in **Appendix 1(b)** also and a reasonable value shall be adopted.

5. GUIDE BUNDS

The provisions given hereunder apply only to guide bunds for bridges across alluvial rivers. Guide bunds for bridges across sub-montane rivers need special consideration which are discussed in Clause 9.

5.1 Functions of guide bunds: The guide bunds are provided to serve one or more of the below functions:

- i) Uniform distribution of flow over the waterway of the bridge
- ii) Reduction in scour under piers and abutments
- iii) Reduction in afflux
- iv) Reduction in cost of bridge and approach embankments
- v) Increases the safety and design life of the bridge
- vi) Guiding the flow through waterway under the bridge
- vii) Protecting the approach embankment against erosion

5.2 General Design Features

5.2.1 Alignment: The alignment shall be such that the pattern of flow remains as uniform through all the spans of the bridge as may be possible with minimum return currents.

5.2.2 Alignment of approach embankment: The alignment of approach embankment should be so chosen that it is not affected by the worst possible embayment which is influenced by the length of guide bunds. In general, these are aligned in line with the axis of bridge up to high defined banks. In case the alignment of road must be given a curve before reaching the high defined banks, it has to be provided towards the downstream side and not towards upstream side.

5.2.3 Classification of guide bunds: Guide bunds can be classified:

- (i) According to their form in plan, and
- (ii) According to their geometrical shape.

5.2.3.1 According to form in plan: The guide bunds can be divergent, convergent, parallel and elliptical as shown in **Fig. 5.1**.

- (i) **Divergent guide bunds:** They exercise an attracting influence on flow and they may be used where the river has already formed a loop and the approaching flow has become oblique. However, they have a tendency of shoal formation at center due to larger waterway between the curved heads. The approach embankment gets comparatively lesser protection in the case of worst possible embayment compared to equal bank length of parallel guide bunds, (**Fig. 5.2**). therefore, require a longer length in comparison to parallel guide bunds for the same degree of protection to approach embankments and so, shall be used, only when found necessary.
- (ii) **Convergent guide bunds:** Convergent guide bunds have disadvantage of excessive attack and heavy scour at the head and shoaling all along the shank, rendering the end bays inactive. These should be avoided as far as possible.
- (iii) **Parallel guide bunds:** Parallel guide bunds with suitable curve heads have been found to give uniform flow from the head of the guide bund to the axis of the bridge and so these are generally preferred.
- (iv) **Elliptical guide bunds:** These are best suited as the results obtained by using Guide bunds with a plan form shape in the form of a quarter of an ellipse, with the

ratio of the major axis (Length L_s) to minor axis (offset) of 2.5H :1V by allowing gradual constriction of flow. Thus, if the length of the guide bund measured perpendicularly from the approach embankment to the upstream nose of the guide bund is denoted as L_s , the amount of expansion of each guide bund (offset), measured from the abutment parallel to the approach roadway, should be $0.4L_s$.

The Plan view orientation can be determined using the equation mentioned below, which is the equation of an ellipse with origin at the nose of the guide bund.

$$\frac{X^2}{L_s^2} + \frac{Y^2}{(0.4L_s)^2} = 1$$

It is important that the face of the guide bund match the abutment so that the flow is not disturbed where the guide bund meets the abutment.




Fig. 5.1 Type of Guide Bunds according to Form in Plan




Fig. 5.2 Extent of protection provided by Parallel and convergent Guide Bunds

5.2.3.2 According to geometrical shape: Guide bunds can be straight or elliptical with a circular or multi radii curved head as shown in **Fig. 5.3**. In case of acute curved channel approaches, it has been found that the flow after striking the mole head does not follow the profile of parallel guide bunds with circular heads but separates from the boundary as illustrated in, **Fig. 5.4**. It results in an oblique approach of flow to the bridge thereby making some of the end spans completely ineffective while increasing the intensity of flow in the remaining bays. To improve the flow conditions the provision of elliptical guide bunds is suggested. The ratio of major to minor axis is generally kept in the range of 2 to 3.5. Elliptical guide bunds have generally been found more suitable in case of wide flood plain/ rivers as compared to straight guide bunds.

5.2.3.3 Any other type of guide bund differing in form or shape may be provided, warranted by site conditions and supported by the model studies.





Fig. 5.3. Guide Bunds according to Geometrical Shape



(a) Straight Guide Bund with Circular Head

(b) Elliptical Guide Bund followed by Circular Arc

Fig. 5.4 Flow Pattern in Acute Curved Channels

5.2.4 Length of guide bunds on upstream side

5.2.4.1 For wide alluvial belt, the length of guide bund should be decided from two important considerations, namely the maximum obliquity of the current and the permissible limit to which the main channel of the river can be allowed to flow near the approach embankment in the event of river developing excessive embayment behind the guide bunds.

5.2.4.2. The radius of the sharpest loop should be ascertained from the data of the acute loops formed by the river during the past. If survey plans do not reveal the presence of a sharpest loop, it may be calculated as follows:

Of available loops (**Fig. 5.5**) calculate radius (r) of each at centre line by formula.




Fig. 5.5 Sketch showing a Loop in a River

$$r_1 = (0.25 m_1)^2 + [0.5 (m_b - b)]^2 / m_b - b$$

where r_1 = radius of loop in metre

m_1 = meander length in metre

m_b = meander belt in metre

b = bankful width when flood level touches bank of main/deep channel in metre

From the above, calculate the average radius of the loop. This average radius divided by 2.5 for rivers having maximum discharge up to 5000 m³/ sec and by 2.0 for maximum discharge above 5000 m³/sec gives radius of the sharpest loop. After having determined the radius of the sharpest loop, the single or double loop are laid out on survey plan that contains the alignment of approach embankments and high banks and it may be ensured that the safe distance between the anticipated sharpest loop and approach embankment is not less than $L/3$ where L is the length of the bridge. However, especially in the case of meandering rivers, this safe distance may be suitably increased.

5.2.4.3 The length of parallel Guide bund on upstream side is assumed to equal to Lacey's waterway

$$L = 4.75 \sqrt{Q}$$

where L is the regime waterway in meter, Q is the design discharge in m³/s.

5.2.4.4 **The length of elliptical guide bund on upstream and downstream side:** Guide bunds should start at and be set parallel to the abutment and extend upstream from the bridge opening. The distance between the Guide bunds at the bridge opening should be equal to the

distance between bridge abutments. Best results are obtained by using Guide bunds with a plan form shape in the form of a quarter of an ellipse, with the ratio of the major axis (length L) to the minor axis (offset) of 2.5:1. The length of the guide bund is determined by the nomograph (Lagasse 1995) as shown in **Fig. 5.6**. The nomograph is dependent on the discharge and the velocity parameters. It is rational since more is the return flow more should be the guide bund length. For design purposes the utilization of the nomograph involves the following parameters:

Q	-	Total discharge of the stream, m^3/s
Q_f	-	Lateral or floodplain discharge of either floodplain intercepted by the embankment, m^3/s
Q_{30m}	-	Discharge in 30 m of stream adjacent to the abutment, m^3/s
B	-	Length of the bridge opening, m
A_{n2}	-	Cross-sectional flow area at the bridge opening at normal stage, m^2
V_{n2}	=	Q/A_{n2} Average velocity through the bridge opening, m/s
Q_f/Q_{30}	-	Guide bund discharge ratio
L_s	-	Projected length of Guide bund, m

A detailed example is mentioned in **Appendix 3** showing the procedure to determine the length for the elliptical Guide bunds.

Guide bunds will generally not be able to protect the approach bank within the Khadir for more than three times its lengths, as evolved above, beyond the abutments on the upstream side. Where approach banks are more than three times the length of guide bunds, additional training/protective measures may be necessary to protect the approach banks.

5.2.5 Length of guide bund on downstream side: On downstream side of the structure, the river tries to fan out to regain its natural width. Here the function of guide bund is to ensure that the river does not attack approach embankments. Length equal to 0.2 L is generally found to be adequate for parallel guide bunds. The length on downstream for elliptical guide bunds to be computed using the nomograph shown in **Fig. 5.6**.

5.2.6 *Curved head and tail for straight guide bunds*

5.2.6.1 Function of curved head is to guide river flow smoothly and axially through the bridge keeping the end spans active. A too small radius gives a kick to the river current making it oblique and so larger radius to attract and guide the river flow is needed. However, as it is uneconomical to provide a very large radius, it may be kept as small as possible consistent with proper functioning of guide bund.

5.2.6.2 Radius of upstream mole head may be kept 0.4 to 0.5 times the length of the bridge between abutments, but it should not be less than 150 m nor more than 600 m unless indicated otherwise by model studies.

5.2.6.3 Radius of curved tail may be from 0.3 to 0.5 times the radius of upstream mole head.

5.2.6.4 **Sweep angle:** The angle of sweep of the upstream mole head is kept 120° to 140° and that for the curved tail is kept 30° to 60° .




Fig. 5.6. Nomograph from Lagasse 1995 to determine Length of Guide Bunds

5.2.7 Curved head for elliptical guide bunds: In case of elliptical guide bunds, the elliptical curve is provided up to the quadrant of an ellipse and is followed by multi-radii or single radius circular curve, **Fig. 5.3**. The shape should be finalized preferably based on model studies.

5.2.8 For guide bunds of bridges across major rivers like Brahmaputra, Kosi, Yamuna and Ganga hydraulic model studies are suggested for deciding the various design features.

5.3 Design of Guide bund

5.3.1 Top width: The top width of guide bunds for bridges across major rivers is generally kept at least 6 metre to permit passage of vehicles for carriage of materials.

5.3.2 Free Board: The minimum free board to top of guide bund above the design flood level is generally kept as 1.8 m. This may be suitably increased in the case of guide bunds for bridges across major rivers. The top of guide bund should follow the slope of river flow.

5.3.2.1 In case where model studies are conducted for guide bunds, the model studies will also indicate the highest anticipated design flood level immediately behind the guide bunds and at suitable intervals along the approaches, wherever, significant ponding up is anticipated.

5.3.2.2 In cases where rivers have aggrading tendencies i.e. deposition of silt/sand in bed over the years, suitable extra provision will have to be made while working out the design flood level to allow for the effect of aggradation.

5.3.3 Side slope: The side slope of the guide bunds may be determined from the consideration of slope stability of embankment and from hydraulic gradient considerations. Generally, a side slope of 2 (H): 1 (V) is adopted for predominantly cohesionless materials.

5.3.4 Slope protection: The river side earthen slope of guide bund is protected against river action by covering them with stones/concrete slabs or mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions. The pitching is intended to remain in its laid position. It should be extended up to the top of guide bund and tucked inside for a width of at least 0.6 m.

5.3.4.1 Rear slopes of guide bunds are not subjected to direct attack of the river and may be protected against ordinary wave splashing by 0.3 - 0.6 m thick cover of clayey or silty earth and turfed. Where moderate to heavy wave action is expected slope pitching should be laid up to a height of 1 m above the design flood level.

5.3.5 Pitching on the river side slope: For the design of pitching on the river side, the factors to be taken into consideration are size/weight of the individual stone, its shape and gradation, thickness and slope of pitching and nonwoven geotextile filter underneath. The predominant flow characteristic which effects the stability of the pitching is velocity along the guide bund. Other factors like obliquity of flow, eddy action, waves, etc. are intermediate and may be accounted for by providing adequate margin of safety over the size obtain from velocity considerations. Pitching with mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or revet mattress shall be designed as per provisions of IRC: SP: 116.

5.3.5.1 *Size and weight of stone for pitching:*

Size and weight of stones lying on side slope should be sufficient so that it does not get dislodged from its position due to erosive forces owing to forward flow drag as well as the component of its own weight trying to pull down the stone along the slope. The size of stone required on the sloping face of guide bunds to withstand erosive action of flow is worked out from the drag approach:

$$D = KV^2$$

Where, D = equivalent diameter of stone in meter

V = mean design velocity in m/s

K = $\left[\left\{ \frac{3}{2} C_d (k_v^2 / k_o) \right\} / \{ 2g(S_s - 1) \} \right]$

where C_d is coefficient of drag;

S_s = Specific gravity of stones,

k_o = slope factor = $(\cos^2 \theta \tan^2 \phi - \sin^2 \theta)^{0.5}$,

θ = angle of inclination of the side slope with horizontal

(ϕ) = angle of internal friction

k_v = velocity factor = $V_s / V = 0.9$ where V_s is the surface velocity above stone surface and V is mean velocity of flow near bank. The formula is applicable for normal turbulence when $K_t = 1$

g = acceleration due to gravity = 9.8 m/sec^2

Coefficient of drag varies mainly with shape. It is assumed as 0.5 for spherical stone for turbulent flow. It may be taken as 0.25 for concrete blocks with rectangular shapes

Applying the values for various variables as $C_d = 0.5$, $S_s = 2.65$, $k_o = 0.7$ (for $\theta = 26.5^\circ$, and $\phi = 43^\circ$) and $K_v = 0.9$ the value of K is computed as 0.026. Putting a value of K in the above formula size of stone is computed as

$D = 0.026V^2$ for 2:1 & $D = 0.023V^2$ for 3:1

The weight of stone can be determined by assuming spherical stone having specific gravity of 2.65 (average). For velocities up to 5m/sec, the size and weight of stone is given below in **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1: Minimum Weight of Loose and Isolated Stones for Pitching on River Slopes

Mean Design velocity (m/s)		Slope 2:1	Slope 3:1
		Minimum Weight (kg)	Minimum Weight (kg)
up to	2.5	40	40
	3	40	40
	3.5	45	40
	4	100	70
	4.5	200	140
	5	380	260

Notes:

- No stone weighing less than 40 kg and diameter 300 mm shall, however, be used in case of loose isolated stones.
- Where the required size stones are not economically available, cement concrete blocks of equivalent weight or stones in mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions may be used in place of loose isolated stones.
- When stones are confined in mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabion or mattress, weight & size of stone should be in accordance with provision of IRC:SP:116.

5.3.5.2 Thickness of pitching: Minimum thickness of pitching is required to withstand the negative head created by velocity. This may be determined by the following relationship:

$$t = \frac{V^2}{2g(S_s - 1)}$$

Where,

- t = Thickness of pitching in m,
 V = Velocity in m/s,
 g = Acceleration due to gravity in m/s²,
 S_s = Specific gravity of stones.

However, thickness of stone pitching computed from the above formula shall subject to a lower limit of 0.3 m in case of loose isolated stones.

Thickness of pitching with mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabion or mattress shall be determined as per Cl. 7.2 and annexure II of IRC:SP:116.

5.3.5.3 Shape of stones: Quarry stone is preferable to round boulders as the latter roll off easily. Angular stones fit into each other better and have good inter-locking characteristics. However, in case of gabion or mattress either rounded or angular stones can be used.

5.3.5.4 Placing of stones: In hand placed pitching, the stone of flat stratified nature should be placed with the principal bedding plane normal to the slope. The pattern of laying shall be such that the joints are broken, and voids are minimum by packing with spalls wherever necessary and the top surface is as smooth as possible. Filling of gabion or mattress shall be performed as per procedure mentioned in IRC:SP:116. In the case of guide bunds for bridges across major rivers, stone masonry bands may be provided at suitable intervals if considered necessary.

5.3.6 *Filter design*

5.3.6.1 Filter shall consist of either sound gravel/stone/Jhama (overburnt) brick ballast/ coarse sand or nonwoven geotextiles. The non-woven geotextile, wherever used should conform to Cl. 4.3 of IRC:SP:116.

5.3.6.2 Provision of a suitably designed filter is necessary under the slope pitching to prevent the escape of underlying embankment material through the voids of stone pitching/cement concrete slabs/mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabion and revetment mattress as well as to allow free movement of water without creating any uplift head on the pitching when subjected to the attack of flowing water and wave action, etc. to achieve the above requirement, the filter may be provided in one or more layers satisfying the following criteria:

$$\frac{D_{15}(Filter)}{D_{85}(Base)} < 5$$

$$< \frac{D_{15}(Filter)}{D_{15}(Base)} < 20$$

$$\frac{D_{50}(Filter)}{D_{50}(Base)} < 25$$

Notes:

- (i) Filter design may not be required if embankment consists of CH or CL soils with liquid limit greater than 30 resistant to surface erosion. In this case, if a layer of material is used as bedding for pitching, it shall be well graded and its D_{85} size shall be at least twice the maximum void size in pitching.
- (ii) In the foregoing D_{15} means the size of that sieve which allows 15 per cent by weight of the filter material to pass through it and similar is the meaning of D_{50} and D_{85} .
- (iii) If more than one filter layer is required, the same requirement as above shall be followed for each layer. The finer filter shall be considered as base material for selection of coarser filter.
- (iv) Where brick bats are used as filter material, normally the grading is not possible, and, in such cases, a layer of graded gravel shall be provided below the brick bats.
- (v) The filter shall be compacted firmly. The thickness of filter shall be 300 mm and provided in two layers of 150 mm each.
- (vi) Permittivity and maximum apparent opening size of nonwoven geotextile shall be as per **Table 11** of IRC:SP:116.

5.3.7 Toe protection

5.3.7.1 Launching apron shall be provided for the protection of toe and it shall form a continuous flexible cover over the slope of the possible scour hole in continuation of pitching up to the point of deepest scour. The stone in the apron shall be designed to launch along the slope of the scour hole to provide a strong layer that may prevent further scooping out of river bed material. The size and shape of apron depends upon the size of stone, thickness of launched apron, the depth of scour and the slope of launched apron. At the junction of slope pitching with launching apron, a toe wall shall be provided as shown in **Fig. 5.7**, so that pitching does not rest directly on the apron. It will protect the slope pitching from falling during the launching of apron even when the apron is not laid at low water level.




Fig. 5.7: Sketch showing Stone Pitching with Filter Beneath

In places where geotechnical stable bed slope is not available due to deep scour hole for placing the launching apron, geotextile bags or cylindrical gabions are used for filling of scour holes as shown in **Fig. 5.8** and **Fig. 5.9** [as per IRC:SP:113 & IRC:SP:116]. These systems are dumped on the river bank toe to provide stable surface for placement of apron and controls the further erosion. The cylindrical gabions can be either filled with stones or lined with geotextile material filled with sand. The cylindrical gabion system works as a composite system at places where

geotextile bags alone would not be able to withstand the shear stresses induced by the water on the system components.




Fig 5.8: Cylindrical Gabion application to fill Deep Scour Hole




Fig 5.9: Typical Cylindrical Gabion Sketch

5.3.7.2 Size and weight of stone for apron: The size of loose stone required for launching apron to resist mean design velocity would be same as for slope pitching. **Table 5.1** may be referred for size and weight of stones for launching apron, considering a slope of 2H:1V.

5.3.7.3 IRC:SP:116 shall be referred for specifications of mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or revet mattresses.


5.3.7.4 Depth of scour: The extent of scour depends on angle of attack, discharge intensity, duration of flood and silt concentration. It is important that maximum probable depth of scour should be assured as realistically as possible. The depth of scour for different portions of guide bunds may be adopted as under.

Location	Maximum scour depth to be adopted (D_{max})
Upstream curved mole of guide bund	2_{dsm}
Straight reach of guide bund including tail on the downstream of guide bund	1.5_{dsm}
Where dsm is mean depth of scour below HFL.	


5.3.7.5 Shape and size of launching apron: It has been observed that shallow and wide aprons launch evenly if the scour takes place rapidly. If the scour is gradual, the effect of width on launching of apron is marginal. A width of launching apron equal to $1.5 D_{\max}$ is generally found satisfactory (where D_{\max} is the maximum anticipated scour depth below bed level in metres). Thickness of launching apron at inner end may be kept as $1.5 t$ and at outer end as $2.25 t$ in case of loose stone pitching due to possible loss in stones while launching as shown in **Fig. 5.10**.

When mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or revet mattresses are used the thickness of launching apron may be kept same as that of thickness of pitching as per Clause 5.3.5.2.

5.3.7.6 Slope of launching apron: The slope of the launching apron may be taken as 2 (H): 1 (V) for loose boulders or stones and 1.5 (H): 1 (V) for cement concrete blocks or stones in mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions.



ENLARGED SECTION X-X



DETAIL - A

Fig. 5.10 Details of Guide Bunds

LEGEND

F	=	FREE BOARD
Y_0	=	RISE OF FLOOD ABOVE LWL AT GUIDE BUND
D_{max}	=	DEPTH OF SCOUR BELOW LWL
t	=	THICKNESS OF STONE PITCHING
s	=	THICKNESS OF FILTER
d_{sm}	=	MEAN DEPTH OF SCOUR BELOW HFL

An apron may fail to provide protection to the guide bund if the river bed contains high percentage of silt or clay or where the angle of repose of the bed material is steeper than that of stone as in such a case the apron may not launch properly.

5.3.7.7 Certain types of kankar blocks develop cementing action under water and such types of kankar blocks may be used with caution.

5.4 Constructional Aspects

5.4.1 Co-ordination is necessary for tagging together guide bunds of road and rail bridges on the same river or streams where located in close vicinity of each other is likely to be influencing one or the other and for the same appropriate combined, if necessary, hydraulic model studies for both should be carried out to evolve properly tagging design.

5.4.2 Trial pits should be taken in borrow area to examine suitability of soil for construction and to decide the type of earth moving machinery to be arranged.

5.4.3 Guide bunds may be made of locally available materials from the river bed preferably cohesionless materials. Low density cohesionless soils (loamy soils) are susceptible to liquefaction and should be avoided.

5.4.4 Every effort should be made to complete the work of guide bund in one working season.

5.4.5 For the construction of embankments for guide bunds provisions of IRC: 36 shall be followed unless otherwise stated in these guidelines. For high embankments provisions of IRC:75 may be followed.

5.4.6 Dispatch of stone: Transport of stone from the quarries to the river bank and from the river bank to the site of work is an important task. The quantities of stone required to be

transported every day must be worked out and trains/ trucks, etc., arranged accordingly. Similarly, prior arrangements may be made for taking the stones across the river by ferry or boats.

5.4.7 *Earthwork*

5.4.7.1 For construction of guide bunds, four operations are involved:

- (i) excavation of the pit for the apron
- (ii) completion of the earth work for guide bunds
- (iii) construction of approach banks
- (iv) laying stones in apron and on slopes

5.4.7.2 It is necessary that sufficient length of pit along the guide bund should be ready within one or two months of commencement of work so that placing of stones in the apron and on slope can be started at the earliest. About 70 per cent working season should be available for pitching. Earthwork should be completed within 80 per cent of working season. Good compaction of guide bunds is necessary as any slip during the flood can be disastrous. No portion of the guide bund should be left below HFL before the onset of monsoon. Bottom of apron pit should be excavated to a minimum depth up to thickness of apron.

5.4.7.3 Sufficient labour and/or earth moving machinery of the right type with spare parts and trained staff is necessary.

5.4.7.4 Borrow pits: No borrow pits should be dug on the rear of guide bunds. It is preferable to take all earth for construction of the guide bunds from the river side. The borrow pits should be away from the edge of launching apron at least 0.5 times of width of launching apron ensuring geotechnical stability is not compromised.

5.4.8 Adequate labour for unloading of pitching stone, carrying and laying it at site within the time available will have to be carefully worked out.

5.4.9 Construction of guide bunds should be taken in hand along with piers and abutments. Where there is any doubt about completion of whole guide bund within one working season, it is essential that the construction of guide bund be started from abutment towards upstream. Where full guide bund cannot be constructed in one working season suitable protective measures may be taken.

5.4.10 On slopes, care should be taken in placing the stone not to have big voids through which water will cause swirling. Comparatively smaller stones should be at the bottom and larger ones at the top.

5.4.11 The top of the guide bunds should be protected with a layer of 150 mm thick gravel against rain cuts.

5.4.12 While on river side, stone protection is provided up to the full length of guide bunds, on the rear side this protection is just carried around mole head beyond which usually good turfing is provided.

5.4.13 **Closure of branch channels of a river:** In case the alignment of guide bund or the approach embankment crosses a branch channel of the river, the usual practice under such circumstances is either to divert the branch channel to the main channel of the river with the help of spurs, etc., or to construct closing dyke or closure bund across the branch channel. In

situations where diversion of channel is to be resorted to, then action in this regard should be taken during the receding floods and in advance of the construction of guide bund/ embankment. In situations where closing of the branch channel is considered unavoidable, then the closure bund closing dyke or the armoring of the approach embankment should be properly designed and closing operation should be carried out as a continuous one. While using the mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or mattress for pitching in slope and apron, the construction sequences shall be followed as detailed in the IRC: SP:116.

6. SPURS

6.1 Functions of Spurs and their Classifications

6.1.1 Function of spurs

Spurs are provided to take care of one or more of the following functions:

- (i) Training the river along a desired course by attracting, deflecting or repelling the flow of a channel.
- (ii) Creating a slack flow with the object of silting up the area in the vicinity.
- (iii) Protecting the river bank by keeping the flow away from it.
- (iv) Contracting a wide river channel, usually for the improvement of depth for navigation.

6.1.2 Classification of spurs: Spurs can be classified as follows:

- (i) Classification according to method and materials of construction: Permeable and impermeable (solid).
- (ii) Classification according to the height of spur with respect to water level: Submersible or non-submersible.
- (iii) Classification according to the function served: Attracting, deflecting, repelling and sedimenting, **Fig. 6.1**.
- (iv) Special type-T-headed, Hockey or Burma type and kinked type stepped type, etc., **Fig. 6.1**.

6.1.2.1 Permeable spurs: Permeable spurs obstruct flow and slacken it to cause deposition of sediment carried by the streams. These are, therefore, best suited for sediment carrying streams and are also preferable in hilly regions. Generally used permeable types of spurs are pile, tree or porcupine.

In comparatively clear rivers their action results in damping erosive effect of the current and thus prevents local bank erosion. The percentage permeability is defined as area of openings of the gross area normal to flow and should not be less than 35% and more than 45%.

6.1.2.2 Impermeable spurs: Impermeable spurs consist of rockfill or earth core armored with resistant material like stone mattress and stones in gabion or revet mattress or concrete blocks. They are designed to attract, repel or deflect the flow away from the bank along a desired course.




Fig. 6.1 Types of Spurs or Gyrones

6.1.2.3 Submersible spur: A submersible spur is the one whose top level is above the normal water level in the river but gets submerged during the highest design floods.

6.1.2.4 Non-submersible spur: This is the type of spur which remains above water even under the highest floods.

6.1.2.5 Attracting spur: These are the spurs which attract flow towards the bank and are aligned in a direction pointing downstream. In a river where there is a heavy attack on one bank, it may be desirable to construct the attracting spurs on the opposite bank in conjunction with a repelling spur on the affected bank.

6.1.2.6 Repelling spur: A spur pointing upstream has the property of repelling the river flow away from it and hence it is termed as repelling spur.



6.1.2.7 Deflecting spur: Where the spur, usually of short length changes only the direction of flow without repelling it, is known as a deflecting spur and gives only local protection.



6.1.2.8 Sedimenting spur: The spurs located at right angles to the river flow fall under this category.



6.1.2.9 Special type spur: These spurs have been named after their builders and have special design features like Denhey's T Headed, Hockey or Burma type and kinked type, etc. A spur with a curved head is known as a Hockey or Burma type spur whereas a spur with a short straight head normal to spur direction is known as a Denhey's T Headed spur and a spur with a slight angular head is known as a kinked type spur.



6.1.2.10 Over the past years as per construction feasibilities and ease below spurs as shown in **Table 6.1** are also designed.


Table 6.1: Types of Spur/Groyne along with Advantages and Disadvantages

Configuration	Sketch	Comments
Spur/groyne pointing upstream	 <p>The sketch shows a cross-section of a river channel with a groyne pointing upstream. The groyne is perpendicular to the main channel flow. Sediment is shown accumulating on the upstream side of the groyne. An eddy current is shown forming downstream of the groyne.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attracts silt upstream and downstream of structure • Pushes main current away from bank • Has great potential for scour hole at head.
Spur/groyne pointing downstream	 <p>The sketch shows a cross-section of a river channel with a groyne pointing downstream. The groyne is perpendicular to the main channel flow. Sediment is shown accumulating on the downstream side of the groyne. A small eddy current is shown forming downstream of the groyne.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attracts only silt downstream of structure. • Does not form much eddy current and pulls main current to bank • Has relatively low potential for scour at head

Configuration	Sketch	Comments
Spur/groyne perpendicular to the flow direction		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spur attracts moderate amount of sediment upstream and downstream • Keeps current more or less parallel to bank • Has medium potential for scour at head
Spur/groyne straight in plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeps main current away from bank • Has medium potential for sedimentation

Configuration	Sketch	Comments
Spur/groyne has Hammer Head (T-shape) in plan		Wide head creates greater eddies which encourage the deposition of more silt
Spur/groyne has Hockey in plan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upstream cranked head causes spur to behave as an 'upstream oriented' spur, but has lower cost

Configuration	Sketch	Comments
Whole Spur/groyne above high flow level		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good deflection of water for all flow depths • Vortices formed at head are greater than for stepped or sloping spur
Only root of the Spur/groyne above high flow level the rest is progressively lower		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good deflection of water only for smaller and medium floods – effectiveness for large floods is possibly less • Strength of vortices formed at head are less than for when the whole spur built to above maximum flood height

Configuration	Sketch	Comments
<p>Only root of the spur above high flow level the rest slopes gently to the head</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good deflection of water only for smaller floods – effectiveness for larger floods is less • Under test conditions Maza Alvarez found that this spur (with trapezoidal section) had virtually no head scour • Can only be implemented in very wide rivers

6.2 General Features

6.2.1 Location and length:

6.2.1.1 Location: Spurs/groynes placed on the outside of a bend usually begin at the start of the curve and continue to one spur spacing beyond the end of the curve as shown in **Fig. 6.2**. One extra spur is placed beyond the downstream end of the curve as it is needed to define the straight after the bend (otherwise the flowing water tends to erode the bank after the last spur).




Fig. 6.2 Placement of Spur/Groyne along the bank of river

6.2.1.2 Length: When the bank is irregular, spur length should be adjusted to provide even curvature of the thawleg. The length of the impermeable spurs is generally considered from 15% to maximum 20% of the width of the channel while for permeable spurs it is considered between 20%- 25% of the width of the channel. The model studies suggest that if the groyne length is equivalent to $1/5$ of the river width it had given a better protection length along the river bank.

6.2.2 Orientation: The spurs/groynes oriented slightly upstream is the best option as it traps more sediment upstream and downstream of spur than those perpendicular to the flow direction. It also repels flow away from the bank. The spur inclined upstream is generally 20-30 degrees upstream from line normal to flow direction as shown in **Fig. 6.3**.




Fig. 6.3 Orientation of spurs/Groyne upstream

6.2.3 Spacing: In a straight reach the spacing is about three times the length of spur. Spurs are spaced further apart (with respect to their length) in a wide river than a narrow one, if their discharge are nearly equal. In a curved reach a spacing of 2 to 3.5 times the length of spur is recommended. Larger spacing (3 to 3.5 times) can be adopted for concave banks and smaller spacing (2 to 3 times) can be adopted for convex banks. Sometimes the spurs are spaced further apart from consideration of cost or for enabling construction of more spur at the later date. An alternative graphical method based on the geometry of the river is proposed and explained below. The spacing of a pair of spurs depends on the length of the upstream spur, the orientation of the spur and the location of the bank. The water flowing past the head of the spur deflects back to the bank by an angle 'Beta' of 9 to 14 degrees. Thus, the calculation of the second spur position is based on a line 0 to 14 degrees off the line tangential to the revised edge of channel line as shown on Diagram 6.4 below. The spacing between the spurs at the nose is expressed in equation below.

$$S = L \cot \theta$$

Where S = spacing between spurs/groyne at the nose
 L = effective length of spur/groyne or distance between arcs describing toe of spurs and desired bank line
 θ = expansion angle downstream of spur nose, degrees




Fig. 6.4 Graphical representation for determining Spur/Groyne spacing

6.2.4 Location, length, orientation and spacing can best be finalized from model test.

6.3 Design of Impermeable Spurs/Groynes

6.3.1 Top width: The top width of embankment spurs should be 3 m to 6 m at the formation level. However, in many cases the top width will be dictated by the width of any earth moving equipment used to construct the spur.

6.3.2 Free board: The minimum free board above the design flood level on upstream of spur is generally kept as 1.8m.

6.3.3 Side slopes: For cohesionless soil, slope on upstream and downstream face of 2(H):1(V) may be adequate. For spur constructed wholly in stones or mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or mattress, steeper slopes may be adopted.

6.3.4 Size and weight of stone for pitching: same as guide bund (as per clause 5.3.5.1).

6.3.5 Thickness of pitching: same as guide bund (as per clause 5.3.5.2).

The thickness 't' of the pitching should be provided in one third of total length or for such a length of upstream shank up to which the river action prevails (whichever is more) at the semi-circular nose. In the next one third of the total length of the spur the thickness of pitching may be reduced to $2/3 t$ on upstream and rest of the shank length 0.3 m thick stone pitching may be provided. On the downstream of stone pitching may be reduced $2/3 t$ in last one third length of the spur and rest of the shank length a nominal stone pitching or turfing may be provided.

6.3.6 Filter: Sound gravel/ stone/ jhama (overburnt) brick ballast/ coarse sand or nonwoven geotextile is provided as a filter media below the pitching at nose and on the upstream face for one third of the length of spur. After two third of the length of spur, the upstream shank the filter may be eliminated.

6.3.7 Launching apron

6.3.7.1 Size and weight of stone: Same as for guide bunds (see para 5.3.7.2 & 5.3.7.3).

6.3.7.2 The depth of scour for different portions of spur can be adopted as given in **Table 6.2** and shown **Fig. 6.5**.

Table 6.2 Depth of Scour

S. No.	Location	Maximum scour depth to be adopted
(i)	Nose	$2-2.5 D_{\max}$
(ii)	Transition from nose to shank and first portion of L/3 on upstream	$1.5 D_{\max}$
(iii)	Next portion of L/3 in upstream	$1.27 D_{\max}$
(iv)	Transition from nose to shank and first portion of L/3 on downstream	$1.27 D_{\max}$

Where D_{\max} is the maximum depth of scour measured below low water level.





Fig. 6.5. Plan showing depth of Scour of Spurs/Groynes

6.3.7.2 Shape and size of launching apron: A width of launching apron equal to $1.5 D_{\max}$ (where D_{\max} is the maximum anticipated scour depth below low water level in metres) should be provided at semi-circular nose and should continue up to one third length of the spur on the upstream or for such a length of upstream shank up to which the river action prevails (whichever is more). In the next one third length of the spur on the upstream the width of launching apron may be reduced to $1.0 D_{\max}$. In the remaining reach, nominal apron or no apron may be provided depending upon the flow conditions.

The width of the launching apron on the downstream should be reduced from $1.5 d_{\max}$ to $1.0 d_{\max}$ in next one third length of the spur and should continue in last one third length of the spur. If the return flow prevails beyond the above specified reaches, the apron length may be increased to cover the region of return flow. Thickness of launching apron may be kept as $1.5 t$. A typical design of spur is illustrated in **Fig. 6.6**.

When mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions or revet mattresses are used the width of launching apron is to be followed as above. However, the thickness of launching apron may be kept same as that of thickness of pitching.






Fig. 6.6. Typical design of Spur/Gyryone (Para 6.3.7.3)

6.3.8 Alternatively, spurs can also be designed with the help of polar diagrams discussed in para 8.

6.4 Permeable Spurs

6.4.1 Tree spurs: The objects of the tree spurs are to:

- (i) Divert or deflect the current which is directly threatening erosion of a bund;
- (ii) Deaden the flow in one channel of the river near the bund to open out another channel away from the bund; and
- (iii) Silt up a channel of the river at its source by checking the flow in it.

6.4.1.1 Initially, the tree spurs should be laid pointing upstream at an angle between 60° to 70° so that when the spur launches and becomes sand bound, it assumes a position facing slightly upstream. Unlike an impermeable spur, which is generally made to face 60° upstream, a permeable spur should make a larger angle with the bank upstream, since it would collect floating debris against the face, converting it to an almost impermeable one with attendant disadvantages. Care should be taken that after launching, it is not bodily shifted to assume a position of an attracting spur, which would induce accretion only downstream of it.

6.4.1.2 Tree spurs consist of a thick wire rope firmly tied at one end to the bank and tied at the other end to a heavy concrete block. Leafy trees with large branches are suspended from the wire rope. Alternatively, the tree spurs are also constructed as detailed below:




Fig. 6.7 Tree Spurs (Para 6.4.2.2)

Vertical stakes are driven 1.5 to 2.5 m into the river bed at 3 m intervals along the cross section of river (see **Fig. 6.7**). Each row of such stakes are placed about 9 m apart. These stakes are held in position by diagonal stays and guy ropes secured to strong pegs well embedded in* the firm banks. The verticals (stakes) are connected to each other by transverse pieces having holes drilled in them to take the tapered end of intermediate verticals of 75. to 100 mm dia, placed in between the main verticals at 0.3 m centres. The entire structure is made watertight by lining the vertical stakes on their upstream side by bundles of local grass and the space between two such rows of spurs is thickly filled with trees. Holes are drilled 0.3 m up their stem through which a ring is fitted. The trees are held in position by a wire rope 2.5 cm dia. attached to the rings, the wire rope being firmly anchored to the bank.

6.4.2 Pile spurs: Spurs of this type can be constructed out of bamboo, timber, sheet piles or even R.C.C. piles. In pile spurs (**Fig. 6.7** to **Fig. 6.11**) the piles constitute the main verticals: they are driven down 6 to 9 m inside the river bed, 2.4 to 3.0 m apart and in at least 2 similar rows. The rows of verticals are not more than 1.2 to 1.8 m apart. Between the main verticals, there can be two intermediates, embedded at least 1.2 m below the bed. Each row is either closely inter-twined with brush wood branches, going in and out around each vertical or horizontal railings. The upstream row is braced back to the downstream row by trans verses and diagonals. Every other main vertical of the rear row has to be strutted. The strut being embedded a minimum of 2.4 m below bed. Between the two rows, the space is filled with brush-wood branches, closely packed and tamped. The filling may comprise alternate layers of 1.8 m thick brush wood weighted down by 0.6 m thick stones and sand bags. However, debris collects upstream and the spur becomes sand bound and functions subsequently, like and impermeable spur. To guard against scour occurring under such conditions, it is desirable to protect the bed, both up-stream and downstream of the spur and around the nose with a stone apron, 0.9 m thick, 3 m wide along the shank and 6 m wide around nose.




Fig. 6.8 Typical Plan of Pile Spurs (Bamboo, Shawl)




Fig. 6.9 Cross section of Pile Spurs (bamboo, shawl)



Fig. 6.10 Wooden piles over River Jhelum




Fig. 6.11 Details of pile spurs

7. RIVER BANK PROTECTION

Normally river bank protection is the prime responsibility of flood control authorities. However, for protection of a road embankment running along a river course or for protection of bridge abutment close to the river edge, bank protection measures are sometimes required to be adopted.

7.1 Causes of Bank Failure

For the purpose of design of bank protection, the causes of bank failure have first to be identified as listed below:

- (i) Washing away of soil particles from the bank by a strong current.
- (ii) Undermining the toe of the bank by eddies, currents, etc., followed by a collapse of overhanging material deprived of support.
- (iii) Sloughing of slope when saturated with water by floods of long duration.
- (iv) Piping in sublayers due to movement of ground water towards the river which carries away material with it.
- (v) Due to secondary current developed at outer bank.

7.2 Type of Protection Work

7.2.1 Direct method: Flood embankments and banks can be protected by means of loose stone pitching, concrete blocks or stone filled gabion or mattress revetment with as per Clause 5.3.5, 5.3.6 and 5.3.7




Fig. 7.1 Typical section of gabion retaining wall with launching apron




Fig. 7.2 Bank lining with revet mattress installed under the water

7.2.2 Indirect method: Spurs, porcupines, bed bars and studs/ dampeners and cut offs.

7.2.2.1 Spurs: These have been discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

7.2.2.2 Porcupines: These are permeable spurs which help to induce siltation along the banks. These are made of steel, bamboo or timber and are provided on a scouring bank in a line normal to the flow. These spurs increase the roughness of the channel thereby deflecting the eroding current away from the bank. In course of time, vegetation grows within the jacks and action of spur is enhanced further.

One type of porcupine, known as Kellner Jack comprises three steel angles about 5 m long bolted together at the centre with the wire string between the legs. A typical unit of porcupine looking from the bank is shown in **Fig. 7.3 (a)**.




Fig. 7.3(a) Steel Jetty – Kellner Jack




Fig. 7.3(b) Porcupine Spur (Para 7.2.1.2)

Other type of porcupine used for similar purpose is made of bamboo. These are made of 3 to 6 m long bamboo of 75 mm diameter tied together at the centre in the form of a space angle and are weighed down by tying boulder stones packed in wire cage at the centre. A typical bamboo type porcupine spur is shown in **Fig. 7.3 (b)**. RCC porcupines are used commonly on sites as shown in **Fig. 7.3 (c/d)**




Fig. 7.3(c) Prismatic type RCC Porcupine



Fig. 7.3(d) Prismatic type RCC Porcupine

7.2.2.3 Bed Bars: Bed bars are submerged structures which help to divide the flow horizontally.

Row above the top of the bed bars can be compared to flow over the submerged weir while flow below the top level of the bar is obstructed by it and is directed towards the nose as in the case of a full height spur. When the alignment of a bed bar is skewed, a pressure gradient is set up. The bed bars can be placed either facing towards upstream of the direction of flow or facing towards downstream of the flow direction.

When the bed bar is facing towards upstream of the flow, the pressure gradient developed helps to deposit sediment on the upstream side of the bar and thus is useful for bank protection. This is shown in **Fig. 7.4(a)**.

When the bed bar is facing towards downstream of the flow, the pressure gradient directs the bottom current away from the bank while surface flow is directed towards the bank. This is provided upstream of an offtake point for sediment exclusion and is shown in **Fig. 7.4(b)**.




Fig. 7.4(a) Upstream Facing Bed Bar




Fig. 7.4(b) Downstream Facing Bed Bar

7.2.2.4 Studs: These are short spurs provided between the regular long spurs to provide local protection to the river bank. Thus, the studs are useful device of bank protection where embayments occur between the T-head spurs. A typical design of stud is given in **Fig. 7.5**.

7.2.2.5 Submerged vanes which neutralizes the anticlockwise vortex by superimposition of clockwise vortex developed by the vanes. Vane-induced secondary current eliminates the naturally occurring secondary current and stabilizes the bank.




Fig. 7.5. Typical Design of Stud

7.2.2.6 Cut-offs

Meandering river tends to shift laterally (**Fig. 7.6**) on the outer bank side (concave side) with time due to secondary current which scour away material on the outer side of meandering bend and deposits the same on the inner (convex side) side of the bend. In this process, curvature of flow goes on increasing with time and the bend becomes sharper. Secondary current in the bend becomes stronger. As a result, there is more scour and greater lateral shifting. The process continues till there is a formation of natural cut-off and formation ox-bow type lake. There is a lot of head losses in the consecutive sharp bends of a typical meandering river resulting in afflux and rise in High Flood Level (HFL). Sharp bends deteriorate the navigability of the river. Cut-offs – natural or artificial - help in straightening a river, fall in HFL and improvement in navigability of the river




Fig. 7.6 Lateral Migration of a Meander and Stream Cross Sections in a Bend

7.3 Before undertaking the work of permanent river bank protection, some sort of temporary protection work must be done near the abutments of the bridges located on the downstream. Only after observing the behavior of the river for sometimes permanent river bank protection works should be taken up.

7.4 Design of Bank Protection

7.4.1 Grading: Trees, brushwood, grass, etc., must be removed both above and below the water level for clearing the bank. The cleared bank slope has then to be graded so that it is flatter or at least equal to the angle of repose of the soil under water to prevent sloughing. The landside slope of the pitched bank made in the form of an embankment should be flat enough to

be stable. The top width of the embankment may be at least 1.5 m.

7.4.2 Free board: A minimum free board of 1.0 m above HFL is generally provided.

7.4.3 Pitching: Same as for guide bunds (refer clause 5.3.5)

7.4.4 Filter Material: Same as for guide bunds (refer clause 5.3.6)

7.4.5 Apron: As the attracting influence of the pitched bank depends on the extent to which scour occurs at its toe, the revetment must be provided with elaborate toe protection in the form of launching apron. The apron must be designed for the maximum depth of scour likely to occur. Generally, the maximum anticipated depth of scour is assumed to be 1.5 dsm in a straight reach and at a moderate bend where dsm is the mean depth of scour measured below highest flood level to be calculated as per IRC:5. In the case of bank at severe bend, it is assumed as 1.75 dsm and in the case of bank at right angled bend, it is assumed as 2 dsm. The design of launching apron should be made in the same way as for guide bunds (see para 5.3.7.1.).

8. APPROACH ROAD PROTECTION

8.1 Different Categories of Approaches to Bridges - Protection Thereof


Nature of protection to be provided for approach embankment of highway bridges depends upon its location which can be divided into the following broad categories:

- (i) Approach embankments subjected to flooding but where the velocity of flow is insignificant (not exceeding 1 m/sec.) to cause erosion.
- (ii) Approach embankments which are under direct and frontal attack of the river flow or otherwise subjected to velocity of flow exceeding 1 m/sec.
- (iii) Approaches to bridges located in the beds of meandering rivers with large Khadir width requiring guide bands, etc.

8.2 Approach Embankments subjected to Flooding but where the Velocity of Flow is Insignificant (not exceeding 1 m/sec.) to Cause Erosion


8.2.1 These cases occur where the river flows through flat terrain with large spills. In such cases, bridges must be provided with adequate waterway to allow for quick and easy flow of the flood water to prevent undue afflux and consequent submergence of valuable agricultural and other lands. Further where the bed material is scourable, flooring with curtain walls is often provided. In case spill-through type abutments are provided in conjunction with the flooring, the sloping embankments in front of the abutments, often extending into the river causing some obstruction in the flow, need to be adequately protected against the erosive attack of the flow across the embankment.

8.2.1.1 Apart from the above, cases may also arise wherein spill- through type abutments may be adopted from economic consideration for bridges with open foundations in non-scourable or rocky bed. In such cases also, the approaches will need to be adequately protected. In either case, the treatment should be on the lines discussed in para 8.2.2



A - STONE PITCHING AND TOE DETAIL

(Recommended for alluvial bed without flooring)



B - STONE PITCHING AND TOE TRENCH DETAIL

(Recommended for floored structure/rocky bed)

Fig. 8.1 Typical Sections of Stone Slope Protection

8.2.2 For a particular bank slope and velocity of flow, the thickness of the slope pitching, size of the stone, its gradation and filter design should be worked out in accordance with the recommendations made in para 5.3. However, the designed values arrived at should not fall below those indicated in **Figs. 8.1(A)** or **8.1(B)**.

8.2.2.1 The slope pitching should terminate either in a short apron at the bed level as indicated in **Fig. 8.1(A)** or the pitched slope anchored in the flooring/rock as shown in **Fig. 8.1 (B)**. However, along the length of the approach, the bank protection should begin and end at a stable section on the approach subject to a minimum of 15 m. In cases where the river banks must be protected they should also be protected in a similar manner and if such stable sections are not available, suitable terminal treatment of pitching should be provided at the ends as shown in **Fig. 8.2**.




Fig. 8.2 Details of cut-off at terminals of rip-rap blanket (Para 8.2.2.1)

8.2.3 For the embankment where velocity of the flow is not exceeding 1m/s, Geomats may also be used to control the surface erosion. Geomats are made of synthetic material filaments, tangled together to form a highly deformable layer 10-20 mm thick, featured by a very high porosity (greater than 90% on average).

8.3 Approach Embankments which are under Direct and Frontal attack of the River or otherwise subjected to velocity of flow exceeding 1 m/sec.

8.3.1 These cases occur where the flow is confined within banks during ordinary floods but spills during high floods without meandering. In such cases, waterways provided are often less than the bank to bank width of the river, which is very wide during high floods and the approaches to the bridges protrude into the river tending to act like spurs. There will be parallel flow with increase in velocity along the embankment. The distance of the embankment so affected depends directly upon the percentage of constriction adopted and the angle of crossing. Large constrictions will not only result in excessive cost of protection consequent to deepening of bed but would also entail deeper foundation of bridges, as well as change in channel profile both upstream and downstream. The final decision as to the percentage of constriction to be adopted should be such that the cost of the bridge plus the protection to be provided is the minimum. The

various parameters that affect the design of protective works of the approaches are as under:

- (i) Intensity of discharge,
- (ii) Angle of crossing
- (iii) Velocity of flow
- (iv) Scour pattern around the approaches; and
- (v) Soil in the embankment fill.

8.3.2 Under the above conditions, the approach embankment protruding into the river is under the direct attack of the river flow and this needs to be protected like a spur. It is seen that the scour reduces as one moves along the spur towards the bank for which the extent of protection could be curtailed towards the bank. The polar diagrams given in **Fig. 8.3** show the centre line of spur as base and the ratio of deepest scour depth to mean depth of scour as ordinates. These ratios can be made use of to ascertain the maximum scour depth once the mean depth of scour is known. Thereafter, once the points of deepest scour are known, the apron widths for the approach embankments can be designed in accordance with the provisions contained in para 5.3.




Fig. 8.3 Polar diagrams of different inclination of a straight spur showing type and extent of projection (Para 8.3.2)

8.3.3 Another aspect is the length along the approach embankments which needs to be protected. The length on the upstream and downstream side of the spurs needing protection bears a linear relationship with the angle of spur as shown in **Fig. 8.4**. On the analogy of the approach embankments acting as short spurs, the upstream and downstream lengths needing protection may be divided into two categories as shown in **Fig. 8.3** viz., category 'X'

extending from the bank to the point of mean depth of scour and category 'Y' extending from the point of mean depth of scour to the point of deepest scour towards the deep channel. The portion covered under category 'Y' could be assessed based on the corresponding values of the lengths of spurs requiring to be protected, i.e., 'Lx' given as fraction of total length 'L1' of approach embankment projecting into the river and obtained by taking the angle of spur to the direction of flow and reading the values from **Fig. 8.4**. The length of the approach $L_x - L_1$ gives the length of the approach under category 'X'. Design of the slope pitching, filter backing and apron under category 'X' and category 'Y' could be made on basis of recommendations given in para 5.3. The apron width for category 'X' may be designed as a normal one and its width reduced uniformly from that required the end of category 'Y' to 2.5m (minimum)




Fig. 8.4 Length requiring protection as a function of spur inclination (para 8.3.3.)

8.4 Approaches to Bridges located in the Beds of Meandering Rivers with large Khadir width requiring Guide bunds, etc.

8.4.1 These cases pertain to rivers which meander in the alluvial plains and have large Khadir widths even under ordinary flood conditions. From economic considerations, it is, however, imperative to provide waterways much less than the width between ends of the Khadir of the river. This is achieved with the help of guide bunds, the treatment of which has been discussed in para 5, which restrict the river to flow within an artificial gorge. The section of the approach embankment beyond the Khadir portion is subjected to flooding but there is no significant flow to cause scour due to parallel flow or draw down conditions and balancing of water on both sides of the embankment. For these conditions to be satisfied, however, the alignment of the approach embankment and its distance from the worst possible embankment loop should be fixed as indicated in paras 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.3.1 respectively.

8.4.2 In view of still water conditions, nominal slope pitching, mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabions and revetment mattresses e.g., 0.3 m thick may be provided for embankment height up to 7.5 m increased to 0.5 m in the lower portion where its height exceeds 7.5 m. The minimum weight of stones used shall be 40 kg.

8.4.3 The design of filter backing is dependent on the voids in the stone pitching and the gradation of bank material. For the nominal nature of pitching suggested in the preceding sub-para, geotextile needs to be provided as a filter media.

8.4.4 The slope pitching should extend well above the pond level considering the exigencies of abnormal floods and wave action. The free board in any case, should not be less than 1.2 m. A higher free board would be advisable in case of aggrading rivers.

8.4.5 The pitched slopes should be provided with nominal toe for velocity less than 1m/s. In case toe walls are not provided a nominal apron of at least 2.50 m width and 0.80 m thickness should be provided at bed level. No protection of downstream slope is ordinarily necessary and provision of turfing/erosion control blanket of synthetic/natural material etc. may suffice.

In case other types of pitching and filter materials as well as toe protection measures are required to be adopted as per site conditions, a suitable design as recommended in para 5.3 may be adopted.

8.4.6 For construction of approach embankments within the khadir area, no borrow pits shall be permitted within the area bounded by the guide bund on one side, natural bank on the other side and the lines drawn tangentially to the top of upstream and downstream curved heads parallel to approach embankment. Moreover, the edge of the nearest borrow pits shall be not less than 200 metre from the toe of the embankment both on the upstream and downstream side in any case.

8.4.7 As far as possible, no opening should be provided in the bridge approaches falling in the khadir portion of the river. However, if these are unavoidable, only floored structures should be provided with revetment in immediate approaches on either side of the structure. These structures should be provided with sluice gates which should be kept closed during flood season.

8.4.8 Where the approach embankment in the Khadir terminates in a marginal bund or at any protective embankment/afflux bund constructed by irrigation/flood control department, the adequacy of the latter within the zone of influence of embankment should be checked and if need be, the same should be got suitably raised/strengthened in that stretch.

8.5 Special Consideration

The aforesaid guidelines do not cover the provision where the approach embankments are under the attack of sea waves or tidal bores, etc. In such cases, the protective measures may be evolved based on expert literature/ model experiments. Stability of embankments to be protected should be ensured based on local experience and/or slope stability analysis related to appropriate soil data.

9. DESIGN OF RIVER TRAINING AND CONTROL WORKS IN SUB-MONTANE REGIONS

9.1 The rivers in sub-montane regions do not present a regular pattern of meanders as in the case of alluvial rivers in plains. The bed slopes of the rivers in the hilly regions are very steep which create tremendous velocities and bed materials being unable to

withstand such velocities are scoured and transported down the river. They carry very heavy charge of coarse sand, shingle and boulders, which are accentuated by large slips and landslides that take place in the hill slopes and result in heaps of deposits on flatter slopes. In the North-Eastern part of this country, it is further aggravated by the seismic character of the Himalayan zone. Due to seismic disturbances the friable rock loosens and landslides occur and the sediment load of the Himalayan rivers increases substantially. The channels become shallow and owing to the reduced velocity, obstructions in the form of heaps result in diversion of the channel itself. As the river bed upstream through the bridge itself rises, the flood cannot pass through the bridge quickly and it heads up-above the bridge submerging low lying areas. The bed level of the river upstream of the bridge thus rises progressively with consequent rise in the flood levels resulting in increase in flooding of areas upstream of the bridge. The protection works for submontane regions merit special consideration besides the points already covered in earlier paras. It is, therefore, necessary that protection works for bridges in sub-montane regions are decided judiciously by the Engineer-in-charge keeping in view the site conditions and other relevant factors.

9.2 Most of the rivers in sub-montane terrain are subject to the phenomenon of rolling boulders during high floods. Huge boulders hitting the piers and abutments may cause enormous damage. In such cases, heavy protection around piers/abutments may be necessary which may be in the form of stone facing mechanically woven double twisted stronger wire mesh gabion or steel plate lining. The same may be decided by the Engineer-in-charge keeping in view the site conditions. In case heavy floating debris is anticipated, necessary traps may be provided to prevent the same from reaching the structure.

9.3 Permeable spurs and toe walls with launching apron may also be, considered for protection works.

9.4 The flow control in steep sloping rivers is provided by use of check dams. A series of check dams create backwater by flattening the river slopes and reducing the velocities.



Fig. 9.1. Typical Example of Check Dams

10. FLOOR PROTECTION

10.1 For bridges where adoption of shallow foundations becomes economical by restricting the scour, floor protection to bridges must be provided. The floor protection will comprise of rigid flooring with curtain walls and flexible apron to check scour, washing away or disturbance by piping action, etc. Usually performance of similar existing works is the best guide for finalizing the design of new works.

10.2 Suggested Specifications

10.2.1 Excavation for laying foundation and protection works shall be carried out as per specifications under proper supervision. Before laying the foundation and protection works the excavated trench shall be thoroughly inspected by the Engineer-in-charge to ensure that:

- (i) There are no loose pockets, unfilled depressions left in the trench.
- (ii) The soil at the founding level is properly compacted to true lines and level.
- (iii) All concrete and other elements are laid in dry bed.

10.2.2 Rigid flooring: The rigid flooring shall be provided under the bridge and it shall extend for a distance of at least 3 m on upstream side and 6 m on downstream side of the bridge. However, in case the splayed wing walls of the structure are likely to be longer, the flooring shall extend up to the line connecting the end of wing walls on either side of the bridge.

10.2.2.1 The top of flooring shall be kept 300 mm below the lowest bed level.

10.2.2.2 Flooring shall consist of 150 mm thick flat stone or bricks on edge, with cement mortar 1:3 laid over 300 mm thick cement concrete M-30 grade laid over a layer of 150 mm thick cement concrete M-15 grade. Joints at suitable spacings (say 20 m) may be provided.

10.2.3 Curtain walls: The rigid flooring shall be enclosed by curtain walls (tied to the wing walls) with a minimum depth below floor level of 1.27 times of depth of scour on upstream side and 1.27 times the depth of scour + 0.5 m on downstream side. The curtain wall shall be in cement concrete M-30 grade/brick/stone masonry in cement mortar 1:3. The curtain off wall can be attached with raft slab and should not be less than 300 mm thick with M 30 grade concrete. It should be designed as normally reinforced PCC wall with 0.12% steel of Fe 500 grade in each direction on both faces, with clear cover of 75 mm. These walls should not have structural continuity or moment connection with RCC slab, but the joint should be leak tight. The cutoff wall should be taken at least 300 mm below the mean depth of scour calculated as per IRC:5. However, the total minimum depth below floor shall not be less than 2 m on upstream side and 2.5 m on the downstream side below the top of the floor. In case the substratum with continuous layer of stiff non-securable clay in the neighborhood of downstream of cut-offs a judicious adjustment in the depth of upstream and downstream cut-offs shall be made to avoid building up pressure under the raft (refer clause 15.1.1 of IS:6966).

10.2.4 Flexible apron

10.2.4.1 The thickness of flexible apron shall be 0.6 m for Manning's velocity up to 3 m/s at raft top and for velocity more than 3 m/s the same shall be 1.0 m comprising loose stone boulders (weighing not less than 40 Kg). Flexible apron shall be provided beyond the curtain

walls for a minimum distance of 3 m on upstream side and 5 m on downstream side. Where required size stones are not economically available, cement concrete blocks or stones in mechanically woven double twisted wire mesh gabion or mattress with rockfill properties as per **Table 6** of IRC:SP:116 shall be used in place of isolated stones.

10.2.5 Wherever scour is restricted by provision of flooring/flexible apron, the work of flooring/apron etc., should be simultaneously completed along with the work on foundations so that the foundation work completed and left to itself is not endangered.

10.2.6 One dimensional mathematical model like water routing and backwater models to solve problems such as dam break, flood wave transmission, effect of bridge constriction etc. were commonly in use before the introduction of computers. Now with the easy access to mainframe computer and personal computers with large memories, it has become possible to develop software and study the morphological changes of short and long duration by simulation models. Institutes such as Central Water Commission, Central Water and Power Research Station, Pune, National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee, and some of the State Irrigation Research Institutes and Indian Institute of Technology at Delhi, Bombay etc. have developed suitable software to study these aspects in river engineering.

11. PHYSICAL MODEL STUDIES

11.1 Objects of Model Studies

The river has its own characteristics depending on its size, flow of water and sediment, the terrain through which it flows and the nature of the bed and banks. Hence, each case is to be considered individually for its training. Despite our efforts to improve the design of training measures, we are still to go a long way before understanding the river mechanics and its behaviour. Till then one has to cater for unknown parameters with a factor of safety. It is here that model studies offer a handy tool at supplementing the work of designer by providing an insight into conditions likely to obtain in the prototype.

11.2 Situations Warranting Model Studies

11.2.1 River flow being a very complex phenomenon, eludes easy analysis in many cases. This is more so near the bridges, barrages and other hydraulic structures built on the alluvial rivers where normal river waterway is often constricted for economy. In some cases where the structures are not located on the straight reaches or where it is required to study the effects of other structures viz., an existing bridge, a weir, a new dam or flood embankments or Ghats along the river, it is not possible to visualize the river behavior accurately in respect of flow pattern, velocity distribution, etc., after the construction of the structure. In all such cases, model studies will be helpful in understanding river response to these structures.

11.2.2 In cases where the cost of a new bridge/barrage project or additional river training works for existing bridge/barrage is substantial, model studies are advisable. Cost of model studies in such cases is a very insignificant percentage of the total cost of the project. It has the added advantage of suggesting improvements which may sometimes lead to reduction in the cost of the project.

11.2.3 The importance of the bridge/barrage viz., its location on strategic routes or its proximity to major industrial complexes, towns, etc. is yet another consideration for resorting to model studies.

11.3 Design Aspects Requiring Model Studies

11.3.1 *Model studies may be required for one or more purposes as mentioned below.*

- i) Selection of suitable site and alignment of bridge/barrage in relation to river configuration and flow.
- ii) Adequacy of waterway provided for the bridge/barrage in relation to velocities, flow distribution, afflux etc.
- iii) Layout, length and shape of guide bunds
 - a. **Layout:** Different types of layouts of guide banks are discussed under para 5.
 - b. **Length:** Length of upstream and downstream guide banks in relation to velocities and discharge distribution across the bridge/barrage and in relation to all possible conditions of approach of the river for safety of bridge/barrage and to ensure smooth flow conditions. Details of parallel and elliptical guide banks are given in para 5.
 - c. **Water levels & Afflux:** Water levels behind the guide bunds and along the approaches-both upstream and downstream for design flood to find maximum Afflux and areas likely to be affected by design flood.
- iv) **scour:** Scour level in piers and abutments, along the length of guide bund and approach embankments, protection works etc under design flood condition.
- v) River bank protection: Protection Works like flood embankments, spurs, bank pitching etc., required if any, upstream or downstream sides of the bridge/barrage.
- vi) **River behaviour:** To study the effects of existing or future structures like dams, bridges, barrages, ghats, spurs, embankments, etc., on river behaviour in the vicinity of such structures.

11.4 Data Required for Model Studies

The following data including ground survey data, hydraulic and sediment data are required for model studies.

11.4.1 *Report: This should include:*

- (i) Enunciation of the problem, its history and probable causes of river erosion, meandering, change in river course etc. if any.
- (ii) Previous remedial measures taken, if any, their details and behavior.
- (iii) Details along with design and hydraulic calculations of existing/ proposed structures such as dam, weir, bridge, causeway, embankments, etc., which affect the river regime, in or near the problem reach of the river.
- (iv) Photographs depicting behavior of the river during floods, and

- (v) In case of erosion problems:
 - (a) The stage of the river at which the erosion is most pronounced; and
 - (b) Whether damage to bank occurs while gauge is rising or falling.

11.4.2 *Survey data*

- i) **Index map:** As indicated in para 4.1(i).
- ii) **River survey plan:** As indicated in para 4.1 (ii), this plan should show:
 - (i) A close traverse covering the entire reach to be modelled
 - (ii) Latitudes and longitudes
 - (iii) Dry weather channel
 - (iv) Formation of rapids, pools, etc.
 - (v) Position of existing and proposed structures like bridges, dams, weirs, barrages, ghats, spurs and other pucca structures, etc.
 - (vi) Location of the problem area, and
 - (vii) Various channels in case of a braided river.
- iii) **Aerial Survey plan:** Same as indicated in para 4.5(v).
- iv) **Cross sections:** In addition to data as indicated in para 4.1(iv), the cross-sections should cover the entire reach to be modelled (cross section interval would be specified in individual cases as this will depend on model scales). Positions of cross sections with their zero chainages should be indicated on survey plan referred to in para 11.4.2(2).
- v) **Contour plan:** Same as indicated in para 4.1 (iii). This should, however, cover the entire reach mentioned in para 11.4.2(2).

11.4.3 *Hydrologic, Hydraulic and Stream data*

- i) Hydrologic Data:
 - Rainfall and Flood data: Same as indicated in paras 4.2 (vi), 4.2 (vii) and 4.2 (viii),
- ii) Hydraulic Data
 - (a) RLS of flood marks on structures and depth of spill flow and its course.
 - (b) Discharge distribution in various channels and corresponding stages
 - (c) Daily gauge and discharge data at all existing stream gauging sites for one or more flood seasons. If such sites are absent, a minimum of three new stations should be located, one each at either end of the reach to be modelled and one in the middle and data collected and furnished for at least one flood season. The positions of all gauge stations should be shown on plan mentioned in para 11.4.2(2) and their co-ordinates given.
- iii) River cross-section at discharge site, indicating nature of river bed (sandy, boulders or rocky) and sample discharge calculations.
- iv) Catchment characteristics: As indicated in para 4.2 (i) to (iv).

Note: All gauge and discharge sites should coincide with cross sections and should be marked on survey plan referred to in para 11.4.2(ii).

11.4.4 *Sediment data*

- (i) **Bed material data:** Samples may be taken at three sections one at either end and one in the centre of river reach under consideration. These samples may be analyzed for determination of particle size distribution and mean diameter.
- (ii) **Bore hole data:** Same as indicated in para 4.3(ii).
- (iii) **Bank material data:** Material of which both banks are made is to be collected on the same sections from which bed samples are collected and/or in the reach where active erosion is noticed as indicated in para 4.2(xiv). The sample may be analyzed for determination of following properties.
 - (iv) Particle size distribution and weighted mean diameter
 - (v) Field density
 - (vi) Moisture content at field density
 - (vii) Plasticity index and liquid limit
 - (viii) Cohesion and angle of internal friction, and
 - (ix) Angle of repose under water, if material is non-cohesive.
- (x) **Suspended sediment data:** In addition to data as indicated in para 4.3 (iii), the following data is also required:

Suspended sediment data may be collected using suitable samplers near the central gauge station in the reach. Samples should be collected at medium and high flood stages. Samples may be analyzed to estimate percentage of coarse, medium and fine fractions.

Note: Position of bed-bank material samples, bore-holes and sampling particles should be marked on survey plan referred to in para 11.4.2(2).

11.4.5 *Other data*

- (i) Lines of flow at specific flood stages, low, medium and high.
- (ii) Design discharge, maximum flood discharge, waterway proposed, deepest scour and afflux.-remove since already mentioned.
- (iii) The drawing of piers, abutments, etc. and their foundation.
- (iv) Design and drawings of guide bunds.
- (v) Plan and sectional views of bridges/barrages

11.4.6 *Terms of reference*

- (i) Terms of reference should be stated clearly by sponsoring authority.
- (ii) In case reach to be modelled includes tributaries or branches or confluence of two rivers, similar data would be required for each of the concerned reaches.

11.5 **Model Limitations**

11.5.1 While some type of problems can be solved with the aid of model studies with a high degree of accuracy, certain aspects of studies connected with the rivers flowing in alluvium present difficulties. In the mobile bed river models, the results lack scalar transformation to the

prototype. They cannot, therefore, be applied quantitatively but can be regarded as qualitative. Some of these aspects are described in **Appendix-2**. Suitable model techniques have been devised to reduce the gap between model results and natural occurrence showing what may be reasonably expected from the model results and what should not be expected. Models are always helpful in that, they make it easier to visualize the problems and evaluate the relative effects of different treatments making allowance for model limitations, but the success depends primarily on correct diagnosis and evaluation of all factors causing change. Moreover, model scale is to be often distorted since flow depth in a homogeneous scale model may be so low that the flow may be laminar and there is surface tension effect. A physical model of river is made on Froude law. In such a situation, model Reynolds number of flow is considerably less than that in prototype. Modeler has to ensure that the model flow is at least turbulent. Even then the prototype Reynolds number is far more than that in the model. Under such a situation, the prototype turbulence/eddies is much higher than that in prototype. Therefore, scour and similar phenomena in prototype can not be quantified. However, qualitative results can be predicted.

11.5.2 In the final analysis, the validity of results of model study and interpretation of its results depends on experience, sound judgement and reasoning of the modeller.

12. MATHEMATICAL MODELLING

12.1 General

One dimensional mathematical model like water routing and backwater models to solve problems such as dam break, flood wave transmission, effect of bridge constriction etc. were commonly in use before the introduction of computers. Now with the easy access to mainframe computer and personal computers with large memories, it has become possible to develop software and study the morphological changes of short and long duration by simulation models. Institutes such as Central Water Commission, Central Water and Power Research Station, Pune, National Institute of Hydrology, Roorkee, and some of the State Irrigation Research Institutes and Indian Institute of Technology at Delhi, Bombay etc. have developed suitable software to study these aspects in river engineering.

12.2 Mathematical Model Techniques

Commonly used techniques in mathematical modelling are given below:

12.2.1 Water Routing

Water routing provides temporal and spatial variations of the stage, discharge, energy gradient and other hydraulic parameters in the channel. The “water routing component has the following major features:

- (a) Numerical solution of the continuity and momentum equations for longitudinal flow,
- (b) Evaluation of flow resistance due to longitudinal and transverse flows, and
- (c) Upstream and downstream boundary conditions.

- (d) The continuity and momentum equations in the longitudinal direction are derived as follows:

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial X} - q = 0 \quad \dots 1$$

$$\frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} + g \frac{\partial H}{\partial X} + \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial (Q/A)}{\partial X} + gS - \left(\frac{Q}{A^2} \right) q = 0 \quad \dots 2$$

Where Q = discharge
 A = Cross sectional area of flow
 t = time
 x = longitudinal direction along the discharge center line measured from the upstream entrance.
 q = lateral inflow rate per unit length
 H = stage of water surface elevation
 g = acceleration due to gravity

The upstream boundary condition for water routing is the inflow hydrograph and the downstream condition is the stage discharge relation.

The longitudinal energy gradient can be evaluated using any valid flow resistance relationship. If Manning's formula is employed, the roughness coefficient V must be selected according to the bed diameter and river conditions.

12.2.2 Sediment Routing

The sediment routing component has following major features:

- Computation of sediment transport capacity using a suitable formula for the physical conditions.
- Determination of actual sediment discharge by making corrections for availability, sorting and diffusion.
- Upstream/conditions for sediment inflow.
- Numerical solution of the continuity equation for sediment.
- These features are evaluated at each time step and results so obtained are used in determining the changes in channel configuration. To treat at the time dependent and non-equilibrium sediment transport the bed material at each section is divided into several size fractions and sediment transport is computed using suitable formula.

The equation of continuity for sediment in the longitudinal direction is given by:

$$(1 - \lambda) \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q_s}{\partial X} - q_s = 0 \quad \dots$$

Where, λ = porosity of the bed material
 Q_s = bed material discharge
 q_s = lateral inflow rate of sediment per unit length

According to this equation, the time change of cross-sectional area is related to the longitudinal gradient in sediment discharge and lateral sediment inflow. In the absence of lateral sediment inflow, longitudinal imbalance in Q , is absorbed by channel adjustments towards establishing uniformity in Q .

The change in cross sectional area for each section at each time step is obtained through numerical solution of Equation 3. This area change will be applied to the bed and banks following correction techniques for channel width and channel bed profile.

13. INSPECTION

13.1 Purpose

The successful functioning of any river training and protective work depends on its proper design, construction and maintenance. After completion of river training and protective works, a close watch must be kept on their performance so that timely action, wherever necessary, can be taken to avoid major damages and difficulties later.

13.2 Frequency and scope

The protective works like guide bunds spurs, pitching around abutments, etc., shall be inspected about a month before the flood season during the floods and immediately after the floods.

The inspection before the floods shall be carried out to ensure that all flood protection measures have been carried out as per design in case of new works. In case of existing works, it will be ensured that these are intact and in position as per design and drawings.

Inspection during the floods shall be carried out to have information about HFL obtained, level of bed, and launching of apron etc., to take corrective measures as soon as required. The inspecting officer must look for aspects like launching of the apron, settling of the slopes, piping action, improper drainage of the rain water causing the slope to be disturbed, impact of waves, carrying away of the smaller particles and thus disturbing the slope, any undue scour at the nose of the bund and/ or at the toe of the pitching and give his recommendations to ensure that the protective works function adequately. The quantity of reserve stones available at site for meeting emergent situations shall be checked before floods against specified quantity and duly reported.

The floor protection shall also be inspected before, during and after the floods to ascertain the extent of scour, cracking and damage of the floor, if any and adequacy of the cut off walls and apron, etc. Specific recommendations for augmentation of the existing provisions, if any, shall also be given.

13.3 Points to be Kept in View

- (a) Most careful patrolling and watch is necessary during each flood season especially the first flood season to detect any weakness in construction and to take corrective action promptly.
- (b) The Engineer-in-charge should acquaint himself with the past history of the protective works and the behavior of the river as it is only when he possesses all this knowledge that he can deal effectively with any problem that may arise.
- (c) It is advisable to have a reserve quantity of stone which can be used in case of an emergency. A part of the stone may be stacked on the guide bund itself and a part in the nearest store from where it can be loaded and transported quickly to site. The quantity of reserve boulders would depend upon site conditions. However, 2 per cent of the total quantity of boulders used in apron and slope pitching may be kept as reserve in stock for emergent use.
- (d) It is necessary that during the flood season the field Engineers ' remain vigilant and keep a careful watch on the behavior of the river as it affects the training works. During flood season it is advisable to have regular patrolling of the guide bund and the approach banks and proper action taken when any abnormal swirls, eddies or scour are apprehended. Any small rain cuts or displacement by waves along the guide bund or the approach bank must be repaired immediately as there is always the danger of a small cut developing into a major disaster, if not, attended to.
- (e) Any settlement in the bank or bridge or slip in the slope needs immediate attention.
- (f) During winter or dry weather, survey of the river course must be carried out to a distance of 2 meanders (or 1 km whichever is more) upstream and 1 meander downstream for meandering rivers and 5 L (or 1 km whichever is more) upstream and 3 L downstream for non-meandering rivers.
- (g) Soundings preferably with the help of an echo sounder shall be taken near the guide bund when the river is in flood.

14. MAINTENANCE ASPECTS OF RIVER TRAINING AND PROTECTIVE WORKS

14.1 Proper maintenance of river training and protective works is extremely important as damages to them can be more dangerous than damages to bridges where no protective works are provided. It is, therefore, important that maintenance Engineers are made aware of the design principles underlying the various provisions made in different protective works as well as likely causes and nature of damages so that their significance is very well understood, and the maintenance is carried out effectively. They should also acquaint themselves with the history of the bridges, their protective works and behavior of the river as only when they possess all this knowledge that they can deal effectively with any maintenance problem.

Keeping the above in view the list of important records which should be available at site for proper maintenance has been drawn. But this list is by no means exhaustive and other records as necessary in each individual case should also be kept at site.

- (i) Longitudinal section, cross section and plan indicating the course of the channel.
- (ii) Plan showing location of bridge.
- (iii) Salient design details of bridge and protective works.
- (iv) Plan indicating layout and dimensions of the embankment slope pitching, filter layers, cut off walls turving launching apron, drains etc. and details of materials used in the construction grading, Liquid Limit, Plasticity Index Proctor Density and Optimum Moisture Content.
- (v) Record of observed High Flood Level, discharge, velocity of flow, obliquity of flow, functioning of the bridge and protective works including changes in the flow pattern. For important bridge gauge stations should be established to measure the discharge.
- (vi) Record of River Survey details up to a distance of 5 times the length of the bridge (or 1 km whichever is more) on upstream side and for a distance equal to 3 times the length of the bridge on downstream side along with cross sections at suitable intervals for the last ten years.
- (vii) Record by way of photographic evidence of the nature and extent of damages observed in the past and the remedial measures undertaken.
- (viii) Copy of the model study report if model tests were got carried out for location of bridge protective work.
- (ix) A record of satellite imagery for important bridges updated every five years through National Remote Sensing agency. In case any abnormal situation is observed then additional satellite imageries even at lesser intervals should be taken and record maintained.

14.2 The Maintenance Work can be classified under two Categories:

- (i) Pre-monsoon Maintenance Work
- (ii) Monsoon Maintenance Work

(i) Pre-Monsoon Maintenance Work

- (a) Repairing or reconditioning the existing protective works to the original design section in advance so that these can withstand the pressure of the ensuing flood.
- (b) Ensuring adequate free board to cater for any unexpected settlement with the aggradation of the river bed by wave action or occurrence of flood of higher intensity than the designed one, without any adverse effect on the performance of bridge and protective works.
- (c) Filling up all hollows and depressions in the embankment of the guide bunds wherever existing and ramming earth after clearing the site of all loose and vegetal materials.
- (d) Providing a cover of soil containing 10 per cent to 15 per cent of clay well rammed and rolled where the filled top material is sandy or silty.
- (e) Rodents and other animals make holes, cavities and tunnels through and under the embankment of the guide bunds. These are sources of danger causing

excessive seepage which may give rise to serious breaches during flood period. Such holes should be carefully located, examined and provided with inverted filter, filled with earth and rammed. Alternatively, such holes can be filled with well rammed stiff clay.

- (f) Planting of trees on the top of guide bunds should not be permitted because their roots tend to loosen the core of the guide bunds. Deep rooted bushy shrubs or short grass or both growing on the slopes of embankments is good protection against erosion and wave wash. Generally, the slopes should be turfed with grass sods.
- (g) Examining necessity of Protective measures by revetment/rip-rap, launching apron, floor protection, etc., and carrying out the same before onset of monsoon, for bridge foundations, approach embankments and guide bunds which are in imminent danger of erosion.
- (h) Top of guide bund wherever those are designed to carry vehicular traffic should be kept in good condition so that they effectively serve the purpose of transport of materials and inspection both during the monsoon and pre- monsoon periods.
- (i) All Departmental vehicles, boats and launches should be kept operational. All tools and plants including torch lights hurricane lamps and spades, etc., and firefighting articles as well as materials for erecting temporary sheds at the work sites for workers should be arranged and stored in a suitable place.
- (j) Advance collection of sand bags, stone boulders (about 2 per cent of total quantity used in apron) and GI wire for making wire crates, for use in the event of emergency.
- (k) To take soundings near the bridge and protective works particularly at locations where the river is showing a tendency to meander to compare actual observed scour near bridge foundations and protective works with designed scour.
- (l) Proper communication system should be installed for quick transmission of messages to higher authorities.

(ii) Monsoon Maintenance Work

- (a) During Monsoon very careful maintenance of the Protective Works is required as the flood water of river threatens safety of the guide bunds, spurs and approach embankments. It assumes further importance in case of new guide bunds. The establishment required to be engaged for proper maintenance will depend upon the importance and behavior of the river. As soon as the water touches the guide bunds and shows further rising trend in its level, a control room should be set up and round the clock patrolling should start. This should continue until water recedes the Low Water Level. During this period inspection by senior official should also be carried out.
- (b) Special vigilance is necessary towards the country side of the guide bund to detect any formation of boils due to seepage which call for immediate attention.
- (c) In the event of abnormal rise in water level threatening the washing away of the guide bund, the level of the top of the guide bund may be suitably raised. The

common method of building up the height is by providing dowel on the river side of the top of the guide bunds with bags filled with earth. These bags should be half full only so that these will fit closely against each other. Sand should not be used for filling the sacks, if clay or loamy soil is available.

- (d) During floods scour depth should be measured daily and in case it exceeds designed scour depth dumping of boulders in the scour hole should be resorted to with large size boulders as well as boulders in wire mesh gabion.
- (e) In case of displacement of slope pitching/filter media the same should be immediately restored wherever necessary with sand bags/stone boulders/stone in wire mesh gabion/ cement concrete blocks/multicellular geocomposite flood containment unit as per IRC:SP:113.
- (f) After the flood season when the water level has fallen, cross-sections should be taken at every 50 m interval along the length of the guide bund or spurs by probing wherever necessary to ascertain the position of the stone in the slope and the apron. The cross-sections will indicate the progress in launching of the apron, its ultimate position and reveal any defect that may require remedy. The cross-sections taken after each flood season should be compared with the original cross-sections, to examine the variations, if any. The damages to protection work should be restored to its original position by dumping further quantity of loose stone of required size or boulders in wire mesh gabion wherever necessary. Damaged wire mesh gabion should be replaced.
- (g) Model tests and field observations have confirmed that for satisfactory launching of apron the bed materials should scour easily and evenly. If an apron is laid on the riverbed consisting of alternate layers of sand and clay, the sand layers scour and clayey layers subside causing uneven cliffs as a result the apron cannot launch uniformly. Stones fall in the river bed and are washed away by the water current. Therefore, clayey beds cannot be used as dependable foundations for aprons. In places where clayey beds are unavoidable sufficient quantity of reserve stone at hand should be kept to fill the uneven depressions and scour holes as well as to repair the other damages.
- (h) The launching apron if damaged should be repaired by diverting the flow, if necessary. During such repairs the portion launched should not be disturbed and new crated sausage work should be provided over it.
- (i) In the case of major damages like slope failure or major changes in river behavior it may be necessary to close the bridge to traffic pending restoration on immediate basis which should be based on re-assessment of the damages noticed, design parameters past and present.
- (j) In the case of bridges and protective works which are in imminent danger every year, permanent remedial measures should be finalized only on the basis of model.

FORMULA FOR COMPUTATION OF AFFLUX

Afflux is approximately calculated using below formulae:

1. Molesworth formula given below for streams with non-erodible beds

$$h_1^* = [(v^2/17.88) + 0.015] * [(A/A_1)^2 - 1]$$

where

h_1^* = Afflux in metre

v = Average velocity of river prior to obstruction in metre/sec

A = unobstructed section area of river in sq. metre

A_1 = Sectional area of river at obstruction in sq. metre

2. Bradely formula for shallow channels with wide flood plains

$$h_1^* = 3(1-M) * V_n^2 / 2g$$

$M = Q_b/Q$, where Q_b is that portion of the total discharge Q in the approach channel within a width equal to the projected length of the bridge and $V_n^2 = Q/A_n^2$ and A_n^2 is the gross area of waterway under the bridge opening below normal stream depth corresponding to design flood discharge

Example: Computation of afflux at a bridge location for river Yamuna where the hydraulic details are as given below

Design flood discharge -11,000 m³/sec

Design HFL-216.50 m

Lowest bed level in main channel -208 m

Lowest bed level in Flood plain-212 m

Width of main channel-600 m

Flood plain width: Left-600 m, Right-1200 m

Depth of flow in main channel= 216.50-208=8.5 m

Area of flow in main channel (A_m) = 600X8.5=5100 m²

Area of flow in under bridge (A_1) = 600X8.5=5100 m²

Depth of flow in flood plain = y_f = 216.50-212=4.5 m

Area of flow in flood plain (A_f) = (600+1200)X4.5=8100 m²

Total area of flow upstream of bridge = $A = A_m + A_f$ = 5100+8100=13200 m²

Average velocity of flow upstream of bridge = $V = Q/A$ = 11000/13200=0.83 m/s

a) Afflux as per Molesworth formula

$$h_1^* = [(v^2/17.88) + 0.015] * [(A/A_1)^2 - 1] = [(0.83^2/17.88) + 0.015] * [(13200/5100)^2 - 1] = 0.306 \text{ m}$$

b) Afflux as per Bradely formula

$$h_1^* = 3(1-M) * V_n^2 / 2g$$

$$M = 5100/13200 = 0.386; V_n = Q/A_1 = 11000/5100 = 2.156$$

$$h_1^* = 3(1-0.386) * [(2.156^2)/(2*9.8)] = 0.436 \text{ m}$$

Since the bridge is located on wide flood plain Bradley formula is applicable.




Fig. 1: River cross section along with Bridge crossing

**Method for computation of Backwater or Afflux at Bridge Piers
for Rivers Carrying Discharge more than 3000m³/sec.**

1. BACKWATER OR AFFLUX

The profile along the center of stream at the bridge site is given in **Fig. 1** and **2**. The rise in water level above normal water surface at Section 1 due to construction of bridge is denoted by h_1 and is called the backwater or afflux.




Fig. 1. Normal Crossing-Wing Wall and Abutments




Fig. 2. Normal Crossing-Spill-through Abutment

2. EXPRESSION FOR COMPUTATION OF BACKWATER (AFFLUX)

A practical expression for backwater has been formulated by applying the principle of conservation of energy between the point of maximum backwater upstream from the bridge Section 1 and a point downstream from the bridge at which normal stage has been re-established in Section 4 (**Figs. 1 A** and **2 A**). The expression is reasonably valid if the channel in the vicinity of the bridge is essentially straight, the cross-sectional area of the stream is fairly uniform, the gradient of the bottom is approximately constant between sections 1 and 4, the flow is free to contract and expand, there is no appreciable scour of the bed in the constriction and the flow is in the sub-critical range.

The expression for computation of backwater h_1 upstream from a bridge constricting the flow, formulated based on model studies is as follows:

$$h_1 = K^* \alpha_2 \frac{V_{a2}^2}{2g} + \alpha_1 \left[\left(\frac{A_{s2}}{A_4} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{A_{s2}}{A_1} \right)^2 \right] \times \frac{V_{a2}^2}{2g} \quad \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

To compute backwater, it is necessary to obtain the approximate value of h^* by using the first part of expression (1)

$$h_1^* = K^* \alpha_2 \frac{V_{a2}^2}{2g} \quad \dots\dots\dots (1.1)$$

The value of h_1 in the second part of the expression (1) which depends on h_1 can then be determined and the second terms of expression (1) evaluated.

3. BACKWATER COEFFICIENT

3.1 The value of the overall backwater coefficient K^* is dependent on the following:

- (i) The bridge opening ratio M , i.e., the degree of stream constriction involved, expressed as the ratio of the flow which can pass unimpeded through the bridge constriction to the total flow of the river and type of bridge abutments.
- (ii) Number, size, shape and orientation of piers in the constriction.
- (iii) Electricity or asymmetric position of bridge with respect to the valley cross section and,
- (iv) Skew (bridge crosses stream at other than 90° angles).

Base coefficient K_b : K_b is a backwater coefficient for a bridge in which only the bridge opening ratio M is considered. Knowing the type of abutments, shape of wing walls and the value of M use **Fig. 3** for estimating K_b .




Fig. 3. Backwater Coefficient Base Curves (Sub-Critical Flow)


3.3 Effect of piers (normal crossing)

The introduction of piers in the bridge causes constrictions and consequential backwater. This incremental backwater coefficient is designated as ΔK_p which can be obtained from **Fig. 4** by entering chart-A with the proper value of J and reading upwards the proper pier type, ΔK is read from the ordinate. Obtain the correction factor σ from chart-B **Fig. 4** for opening ratios (M) other than unity. The incremental backwater coefficient is then

$$\Delta K_p = \sigma \Delta K$$

3.4 Effect of piers (Skewed crossings)

In the case of skewed crossings, the effect of pier is calculated as for normal crossings except the computation of J , A_{n2} and M . The pier area for a skewed crossing A_p is the sum of the individual pier areas normal to the general direction of flow as illustrated in **Fig. 4**. A_{n2} for a skewed crossing is based on the projected length of bridge $b \cos \Phi$ and also include the area occupied by the pier. The value of J is the pier area, A_p divided by projected gross area of the bridge constriction, both measured normal to general direction of flow. The computation of M for skewed crossing is also based on the projected length of bridge.



W_p = Width of pier normal to flow

h_{n2} = Height of Pier exposed to flow

N = Number of piers

$A_p = \sum W_p h_{n2}$ total projected area of piers normal to flow

A_{n2} = Gross water cross section in constriction based on normal water surface (use projected bridge length normal to flow for skew crossings)

$$J = \frac{A_p}{A_{n2}}$$




Fig. 4. Incremental backwater coefficient for piers

3.5 Effect of Eccentricity

The magnitude of the incremental backwater coefficient ΔK_e accounting for the effect of eccentricity can be calculated from **Fig. 5** Eccentricity is defined as 1 minus the ratio of the lesser to the greater discharge outside the projected length to the bridge.




Fig. 5. Incremental Backwater Coefficient for Eccentricity

(If the cross section is extremely asymmetrical so that $Q_a < 20$ percent of Q_c or vice versa, the afflux coefficient will be somewhat larger than for comparable value of M shown on the base curve).

3.6 Effect of Skew

The method of computation of incremental of backwater coefficient ΔK_s for the skewed crossing differ from that of normal crossing in the following respects:

The bridge opening ratio M is computed of the projected length of bridge rather than on the length along the center line. The length is obtained by projecting the bridge opening upstream parallel to the general direction of flood flow as it existed before the placement of the embankments in the stream. The length of constricted opening is $b_s \cos \Phi$ and the area A_{n2} is based on the length. The velocity head $v^2/2g$ to be substituted in expression (1) is based on the projected area A_{n2} .

Fig. 7 may be used for determining the incremental backwater coefficient (ΔK) for the effect of skew, for wing wall and spill through type abutments. It varies with opening ratio M , the angle of skew of the bridge Φ , with the general direction of flood flow and the alignment of the abutment faces as indicated by the sketches in **Fig. 7**.

3.7 K (Total backwater coefficient for sub critical flow)

$$K = K_b \text{ (Fig.3)} + \Delta K_p \text{ (Fig.4)} + \Delta K_e \text{ (Fig.5)} + \Delta K_s \text{ (Fig.7)}$$

4. KINETIC ENERGY COEFFICIENT

A weighted average value of the kinetic energy is obtained by multiplying the average velocity head computed as $(Q/A1)^2/2g$ by kinetic energy coefficient α_1 defined as

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{\sum(qv^2)}{QV_1^2}$$

A second coefficient α_2 is required to correct the velocity head for non-uniform velocity distribution under the bridge.




Fig. 6. Skewed crossings




Fig. 7. Incremental Backwater Coefficient for Skew

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{\sum(qv^2)}{QV_2^2} \quad \dots (6)$$

The values of α_1 can be computed but α_2 is not readily available, knowing the value of α_1 and opening ratio M , use **Fig. 8** for estimating α_2




Fig. 8 Aid for estimating α_2

NOTATIONS

Symbol	Definition	Reference to Fig.
A_1	= Area of flow including backwater in section 1	1(B) and 2(B)
An_1	= Area of flow below normal water surface in section	1(B) and 2(B)
A_2	= Area of flow including backwater in section 2	1(C) and 2(C)
An_2	= Gross area of flow in constriction below normal water surface at section 2	1(C) and 2(C)
A_4	= Area of flow at section 4 at which normal water surface is re-established	1(A) and 2(A)
A_p	= Projected area of piers normal to flow, between normal water surface and stream bed	4
b	= Width of constriction	1(C) and 2(C)
b_s	= Width of constriction of a skew crossing measured along centre line of roadway	6
e	= Eccentricity = $\left(1 - \frac{Qc}{Qa}\right)$ where $Qc < Qa$ or $\left(1 - \frac{Qa}{Qc}\right)$ where $Qc > Qa$	
g	= Acceleration due to gravity	
h_1	= Total backwater (afflux) or rise above normal stage at section 1	1(A) and 2(A)
J	= $\frac{A_p}{An_2}$ = Ratio due to area obstructed by piers to gross area of bridge	
	Waterway below normal water surface at section 2	
	Backwater coefficient from base incremental backwater coefficient for piers	4
K_b	= Backwater coefficient from base curve	3
ΔK_p	= Incremental backwater coefficient for piers	4
ΔK_e	= Incremental backwater coefficient for eccentricity	5

Symbol	Definition	Reference to Fig.
ΔK_s	= Incremental backwater coefficient for skew	7
K^*	= $K_b + \Delta K_p + \Delta K_e + \Delta K_s$ = Total backwater coefficient for sub-critical flow	
M	= Bridge opening ratio = $\frac{Q_b}{Q_a + Q_b + Q_c}$ $\frac{Q_b}{Q}$	
Q_b	= Flow in portion of the channel within projected length of bridge at section 1	1 and 2
Q_a Q_c	= Flow over that portion of the natural flood plain obstructed by the roadway embankment	1 and 2
Q	= $Q_a + Q_b + Q_c$ = Total discharge	
q	= Discharge in sub-section	
V_2	= $\frac{Q}{A_1}$ = Average velocity at Section-1	
V_1	= $\frac{Q}{A_2}$ = Average velocity in constriction at section 2	
V_{n_2}	= $\frac{Q}{A_{n2}}$ = Average velocity in constriction for flow at normal stage	
V	= Average velocity in a sub-section	
α_1	= Velocity head co-efficient at Section 1	
α_2	= Velocity head coefficient for constriction	8
σ	= Multiplication factor for influence of M on incremental backwater coefficient for piers	4(B)
ϕ	= Angle of skew (degrees)	6

MODEL LIMITATIONS

In the mobile bed river model, the results lack scalar transformation to prototype. They cannot be applied quantitatively, however, they can be considered as qualitative. Some of these are:

1.1 Exaggerated Scour Holes

Silting in model is much slower than in the prototype while the scouring takes place during the early stages of the hydrograph in model. Firstly, this suggested scour hole is due to dissimilar horizontal and vertical scales, scour holes tend to be proportional to vertical scale while the width tends to be proportional to horizontal scale. Secondly, in falling stages of the hydrograph bed movement in model is negligible, as such the scour hole which used to be filled up in prototype does not fill up in model. However, the scour depth obtained gives an idea of the formation and direction of new channels and is helpful for design of launching apron.

1.2 Non-reproduction of Silting in Model

In prototype, most of the sediment moves in suspension and very little as bed load. Silting is mostly due to suspended sediment, while in model, bed load is much higher than the suspended. Moreover, due to limited length and duration of run of model the suspended sediment does not settle down. The silting is only indicated by the slack flow or return flow of low intensities.

1.3 Incorrect Throw Off

Throw off in distorted model is different from the corresponding throw off in the prototype. This is partly due to the increased height in comparison to width of the structure, and partly due to very steep side slopes. Some of the research institutes have constructed MI width as well as part width river models to reproduce approximately similar effects. First full width river model is constructed to small scales, the entry conditions in part width model are adjusted to reproduce the lines of flow observed from full width model. The throw off in part width model obtained is reproduced in full width model. The process is repeated till approximate similarity is obtained.

1.4 Incorrect Meandering

Due to uncertainty of uniform bed movement, further development of meanders in case of meandering rivers, is not correctly reproduced in the distorted models, It is due to this reason that correct development of new channels, re-survival of old channels and further silting of islands is seldom depicted from these models.

1.5 Longitudinal Distortion

In vertically exaggerated models for bridges and barrages the thickness of the piers is much less and the width to depth ratio of model span and prototype span is not same. As such sometimes either number of piers are reduced to maintain the above ratio, or a few piers are combined to

form one pier, the shape of such piers differs from that in prototype and effects the coefficient due to changed shape.

1.6 Different Time Scale

To reproduce correct silting in model, the hydrograph in the model should be run for a longer time. This time is defined as hydraulic time and the time scale for hydraulic time is:

$$(T_2)_r = L_r h_r^{(-0.5)}$$

When the sediment movement is guided by tractive force and the sedimenting time scale could be obtained by tractive force method, this works out to $(T_2)_r = h_r^{1.5}$. The only solution to this is that h_r should be equal to $L_r^{0.5}$ which results in higher exaggerations so more departure from prototype. Generally, time scale adopted is hydraulic time. In the above formulae $(T_1)_r$ and $(T_2)_r$ are the time scales, L_r is the length scale and h_r is the height scale of the model.

DESIGN OF GUIDE BUND LENGTH

1. Introduction

The length of Guide bunds shall be decided based on the flood values in the construction area. The length of the guide bund is determined by the nomograph (Lagasse 19951) as shown in the **Fig. 2**. The nomograph is dependent on the discharge and the velocity parameters. It is rational since more is the return flow more should be the guide bund length. For design purposes the utilization of the nomograph involves the following parameters:

Q	- Total discharge of the stream, m^3/s
Q_f	- Lateral or floodplain discharge of either floodplain intercepted by the embankment, m^3/s
Q_{30m}	- Discharge in 30 m of stream adjacent to the abutment, m^3/s
b	- Length of the bridge opening, m
A_{n2}	- Cross-sectional flow area at the bridge opening at normal stage, m^2
V_{n2}	- Q/A_{n2} Average velocity through the bridge opening, m/s
Q_f/Q_{30}	- Guide bund discharge ratio
L_s	- Projected length of Guide bund, m

2. Working example

Problem statement: It is proposed to design Guide bunds on an alluvial river with the following data as shown in **Fig. 1**

Design flood discharge -11,000 m^3/sec

Design HFL-216.50 m

Lowest bed level in main channel -208 m

Lowest bed level in Flood plain-212 m

Width of main channel-600 m

Flood plain width: Left-600 m, Right-1200 m

Estimated discharge distribution: Main channel-6800 m^3/sec , left bank-1400 m^3/sec , right bank-2800 m^3/sec .

Solution:

1. Computation of left bank discharge

As per Lagasse:

Computation of left Guide bund length

Flood discharge in left flood plain $Q_f = 1400 \text{ } m^3/sec$

$Q_{30} = \text{discharge in 30 m length adjacent to pier} = (\text{total discharge/total width}) * 30 \text{ m}$

$$Q_{30} = (11000/600) \times 30 = 550 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$$

$$\frac{Q_f}{Q_{30}} = \frac{1400}{550} = 2.5$$

V_{n2} = Mean velocity of flow under the bridge

$V_{n2} = Q/A_2 = (\text{total discharge}/(\text{width of channel} \times \text{water depth under channel}))$

$$V_{n2} = 11000 / (600 \times 8.5) = 2.15 \text{ m/sec}$$

Referring the nomograph and entering the values of $Q_f/Q_{30} = 2.5$ and $V_{n2} = 2.15$ in **Fig. 2** left Guide bund length = 50 m.




Fig. 1: Cross Section of River Section

2. Computation of right Guide bund length
 Flood discharge in right flood plain $Q_f = 2800 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$
 $Q_{30} = 550 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$
 $Q_f/Q_{30} = 2800/550 = 5.09$
 $V_{n2} = 2.15 \text{ m/sec}$

Referring the nomograph and entering the values of $\frac{Q_f}{Q_{30}} = 5.09$ and $V_{n2} = 2.15$ in **Fig. 2**
 Therefore, Right Guide bund length = 80 m.




Fig. 2- Lagasse's Design curve for finding length of Guide bund

As per Lagasse's design offset of Guide bund on left = $0.25 \times 50 = 12.5\text{m}$ and on the right = $0.25 \times 70 = 17.5\text{m}$




Fig. 3- Offset length for Guide bunds

REFERENCES

1. Manual on River Behavior, Control and Training; Central Board of Irrigation and Power, publication No.60 (Revised) 1971.
2. Inglis, C.C., "The Behavior and Control of Rivers and Canals", Research Publication No.13, Central Water Irrigation and Navigation Research Station, Pune.
3. Spring, F.J.E., "River Training and Control on the Guide bund System", Government of India, Technical Paper No.153, 1903.
4. "Scour at Bridge Piers," Central Board of Irrigation and Power, Status Report No. 4, September, 1974.
5. "River Training and Bank Protection," Flood Control Series No. 4, United Nation Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok, 1953, pp. 16-17.
6. Sethi, H.K.L. (1960), "River Training and Control for Bridges", Technical Paper No.335, Research Designs and Standards Organization, Ministry of Railways, Lucknow.
7. Bardley, J.N., "Hydraulics of Bridge Waterways", Hydraulic Design Series No.1, U.S. Dept. of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration, (2nd edition revised March, 1978).
8. Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Roads Wing)'s Specification for Road and Bridge Works (Published in 1978).
9. Gales, R., "The Principles of River Training for Railway Bridges and their Application to the case of Harding Bridge over the Lower Ganga at Sora," Journal of the Institution of Engineers, December 1938.
10. Sharma, H.D. and Asthana, B.N., "Study of Waterway for Bridges and Barrages," Irrigation and Power Journal, Vol.33, No.3, July 1976, New Delhi.
11. Garg, S.P., Asthana, B.N. and Jain, S.K., "River Training of Bridges and Barrages." Journal of Institution of Engineers (India), Vol.5, May 1971.
12. Balwant Rao, B., Narain, A.D., and Motwani, S.C., "Protection to Approach Embankments of Highway Bridges," Indian Highways, December 1975.
13. Garg, S.P., Asthana, B.N. and Jain, S.K., "Design of Guide bunds for Alluvial Rivers." Journal of Institution of Engineers (India), Vol. 52, Sept. 1971.
14. Indian Standard No. IS: 8408, 1994, "Planning and Design of Groynes in Alluvial River Guidelines," (First Revision).
15. IRC:5 "Standard Specifications and Code of Practice for Road Bridges, Section I".
16. IRC:78 "Standard Specifications and Code of Practice for Road Bridges, Section-VII, Foundations and Substructure".
17. IRC Special Publication 18 "Manual for Highway Bridge Maintenance Inspection".

18. Indian Standard No. IS: 10751, 1994, Planning and Design of Guide bunds for Alluvial Rivers, Guidelines (First Revision).
19. Garde RJ (2006) "River morphology", New Age International (Pvt. Ltd), New Delhi
20. Mazumdar, S.K. (2017) "Behavior and Training of River Near Bridges and Barrages: Some Case Studies" pub in 'River System Analysis and Management' Ed. Nayan Sharma, pub. by Springer, pp.262-278
21. H E King (September 2004)" Introduction to the design of rock filled gabion Gyrones for riverbank erosion protection" pub at SAILI Symposium Pietermaritzburg
22. Mazumdar, S.K. (September 2018) "Hydraulic Considerations for Planning and Design of Guide bunds" pub in Indian Highways Letter volume 46 published by IRC.
23. Hydraulic Engineering Circular No 20 "Stream Stability at Highway Structures", Authors: P.F. Lagasse, J.D. Schall, F. Johnson, E.V. Richardson, F. Chang. US Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration.
24. IRC:SP:116-2018 Guidelines For Design and Installation of Gabion Structures
25. IRC:SP:54-2018 Project Preperation Manual for Bridges.

(The Official amendments to this document would be published by the IRC in its periodical, 'Indian Highways' which shall be considered as effective and as part of the Code/Guidelines/Manual, etc. from the date specified therein)