

**South Dakota
Department of Transportation
Office of Research**



**U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration**

SD2010-06-F



Evaluation of Ice Loads on Bridge Sub-Structures in South Dakota

Study SD2010-06
Final Report

Prepared by
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007

April 2017

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report, funded in part through grant(s) from the Federal Highway Administration, reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the South Dakota Department of Transportation, the State Transportation Commission, or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The South Dakota Department of Transportation provides services without regard to race, color, gender, religion, national origin, age or disability, according to the provisions contained in SDCL 20-13, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 and Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 1994. Any person who has questions concerning this policy or who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact the Department's Civil Rights Office at 605.773.3540.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was performed under the direction of the SD2010-06 Technical Panel:

Aaron Breyfogle	Research	Paul Nelson	Pierre Region
Steve Johnson	Bridge Design	Daris Ormesher	Research

This research project is a collaborative effort between SDSU and SDDOT. The researcher would like to acknowledge all participants of the installation and testing team during the period of this research, including the Project Technical Panel members Daris Ormesher, Aaron Breyfogle, Paul Nelson, and Steve Johnson; and the SDDOT and regional agency crew who helped tremendously during the installation, including Josh Olsen, Todd Hertel, Aberdeen bridge crew, Jason Stahl, SD Game Fish & Parks, Aberdeen sign crew; Pat Brueggeman, Justin Artz, and the SDDOT Office of Research.

TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE

1. Report No. SD2010-06-F	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
4. Title and Subtitle Evaluation of Ice Loads on Bridge Sub-Structures in South Dakota	5. Report Date 04/30/2017	6. Performing Organization Code
	8. Performing Organization Report No.	
7. Author(s) Shiling Pei, Nadim Wehbe, Brittney Ahrenstorff	10. Work Unit No. HRY006	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address South Dakota State University CEH 120, Box 2219 Brookings, SD 57005	11. Contract or Grant No. 311131	
	13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report August 2012 – April 2017	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address South Dakota Department of Transportation Office of Research 700 East Broadway Avenue Pierre, SD 57501-2586	14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
	15. Supplementary Notes An executive summary is published separately as SD2010-06-X.	

16. Abstract

A research study was conducted by South Dakota State University in cooperation with the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) to assess the applicability of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design calculations for the dynamic ice loads on bridge structures in the state of South Dakota.

Ice loads were measured at two sites for two consecutive winters (2013 and 2014) using a monitoring system designed and tested in the J. Lohr Structures Lab at SDSU. The sites were selected based on previous ice thickness and strength measurements, water level heights during spring thaw, feasibility of installation, and discussion with SDDOT personnel. The recorded data were analyzed using statistical approaches to develop a probabilistic model of ice impact load level for each site. The distribution of the maximum ice load for both sites over a 75-year period was then estimated. Based on these extreme ice load statistics, reliability indices were determined for the AASHTO formula ice load values. The reliability index showed that current load calculations adopted by SDDOT ensure a reasonably high reliability index for both sites based on the two years of data collected during the study. Thus, a recommendation was made regarding the calculation of small-stream ice load in South Dakota using the AASHTO formula. Additional data collection was also recommended for future studies.

17. Keywords

Ice load, bridge design, AASHTO ice load, ice impact

18. Distribution Statement

No restrictions. This document is available to the public from the sponsoring agency.

19. Security Classification (of this report)

Unclassified

20. Security Classification (of this page)

Unclassified

21. No. of Pages

67

22. Price

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
LIST OF TABLES	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	IX
TABLE OF ACRONYMS	XI
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CALCULATION OF ICE LOADS	2
FURTHER MONITORING EFFORTS	3
2.0 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION	4
3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	5
4.0 TASK DESCRIPTIONS	6
5.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
5.1 FIELD AND EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES	9
5.2 USGS – SDDOT STUDY OF ICE THICKNESS AND ICE-CRUSHING STRENGTH	10
5.3 SOUTH DAKOTA CURRENT PRACTICES AND AASHTO EQUATION	11
6.0 ICE LOAD MONITORING DEVICE	14
6.1 DESIGN OF ICE LOAD MONITORING SYSTEM	14
6.1.1 <i>Conceptual Design</i>	14
6.1.2 <i>Structural Design of the Monitoring System</i>	14
6.1.3 <i>Data Acquisition System</i>	16
6.1.4 <i>Impact Protection</i>	18
6.2 LABORATORY TESTING AND VALIDATION OF THE MONITORING SYSTEM	20
6.2.1 <i>Laboratory Testing Setup</i>	20
6.2.2 <i>System Accuracy Validation</i>	22
7.0 MONITORING SITES AND DATA COLLECTION	24
7.1 SITE SELECTION	24
7.1.1 <i>Site Selection Considerations</i>	24
7.1.2 <i>Site 1: James River at Huron</i>	24
7.1.3 <i>Site 2: Big Sioux River at I-29</i>	26

7.2	INSTALLATION AT MONITORING SITES	27
7.2.1	<i>I-29 Site Installation</i>	27
7.2.2	<i>US14 Site Installation</i>	31
7.3	ICE LOAD DATA	34
7.3.1	<i>Data Collection Procedure</i>	34
7.3.2	<i>Post-Processing</i>	35
7.4	ADDITIONAL ICE STRENGTH MEASUREMENTS.....	43
8.0	RELIABILITY EVALUATION	47
8.1	EXTREME ICE LOAD STATISTICS	47
8.2	COMPARISON TO AASHTO ICE LOAD DESIGN LOADS	48
9.0	FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	51
10.0	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
10.1	CALCULATION OF ICE LOADS	52
10.2	FURTHER MONITORING EFFORTS.....	52
11.0	RESEARCH BENEFITS	54
12.0	REFERENCES.....	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 5-1: REDUCTION FACTOR K_1 FOR SMALL STREAMS.....	13
TABLE 7-1: MEASURED ICE CRUSHING STRENGTH AT THE JAMES RIVER SITE.....	45
TABLE 7-2: MEASURED ICE CRUSHING STRENGTH AT THE BIG SIOUX RIVER SITE	46
TABLE 8-1: TOTAL IMPACT EVENTS GREATER THAN 10 KIPS.....	47
TABLE 8-2: DESIGN ICE LOADS PER AASHTO CODE	48
TABLE 8-3: PROBABILITY OF EXCEEDANCE AND CORRESPONDING RELIABILITY INDEX FOR 75-YEAR DESIGN LIFE	50

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 5-1: ESTIMATED MAXIMUM POTENTIAL ICE THICKNESS FOR WATERWAYS IN SD (NIEHUS, 2002)	11
FIGURE 6-1: CONCEPTUAL MONITORING SYSTEM CONFIGURATION	14
FIGURE 6-2: SYSTEM RENDERING	15
FIGURE 6-3: CUSTOM BUILT LOAD CELL FOR THE MONITORING SYSTEM.....	15
FIGURE 6-4: DIAGRAM OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEM.....	16
FIGURE 6-5: CR3000 DATA LOGGER USED IN THE PROJECT.....	17
FIGURE 6-6: WIRELESS TRANSMISSION MODEM AND SOLAR PANEL REMOTE POWER.....	17
FIGURE 6-7: STRAIN GAGES APPLIED IN THE CENTER OF THE HSS LOAD CELL	18
FIGURE 6-8: LOAD CELL WITH THE STRAIN GAGE PROTECTION (HIGHLIGHTED).....	19
FIGURE 6-9: INSTALLED MONITORING SYSTEM AND PROTECTION	20
FIGURE 6-10: TYPICAL TEST SET UP FOR THE MONITORING SYSTEM.....	21
FIGURE 6-11: STRAIN GAUGES AND CONNECTING WIRES.....	21
FIGURE 6-12: LOADING TEST CONFIGURATIONS	22
FIGURE 6-13: PLOT OF CALCULATED FORCE VS. APPLIED FORCE.....	23
FIGURE 7-1: PLAN AND ELEVATION VIEWS OF US14 BRIDGE OVER JAMES RIVER NEAR HURON, SD.....	25
FIGURE 7-2: AERIAL VIEW OF US14 BRIDGE OVER JAMES RIVER NEAR HURON, SD.....	25
FIGURE 7-3: PICTURE OF US14 BRIDGE OVER JAMES RIVER NEAR HURON, SD	26
FIGURE 7-4: PLAN AND ELEVATION VIEWS OF SOUTHBOUND I-29 BRIDGE OVER THE BIG SIOUX RIVER	26
FIGURE 7-5: AERIAL VIEW OF SOUTHBOUND I-29 BRIDGE OVER THE BIG SIOUX RIVER	27
FIGURE 7-6: BIG SIOUX RIVER INSTALLATION LOCATION	27
FIGURE 7-7: BIG SIOUX RIVER HISTORICAL WATER ELEVATIONS.....	28
FIGURE 7-8: SYSTEM INSTALLATION AT BIG SIOUX RIVER SITE	29

FIGURE 7-9: SDDOT’S SNOOPER TRUCK	30
FIGURE 7-10: INSTALLED WEATHERPROOF BOX FOR THE DATA LOGGER.....	31
FIGURE 7-11: MONITORING SYSTEM PARTS AT JAMES RIVER SITE	32
FIGURE 7-12: JAMES RIVER HISTORICAL WATER ELEVATIONS	32
FIGURE 7-13: INSTALLATION OF THE MONITORING SYSTEM CUFFS AND ANCHORS	33
FIGURE 7-14: INSTALLATION OF TRANSDUCER PIPE AT THE JAMES RIVER SITE	34
FIGURE 7-15: UNPROCESSED DATA AT US14 JAMES RIVER SITE	36
FIGURE 7-16: UNPROCESSED DATA AT I-29 BIG SIOUX RIVER SITE	37
FIGURE 7-17: EXAMPLE OF IMPACT LOAD DATA RIDING ON TEMPERATURE-INDUCED FLUCTUATION	38
FIGURE 7-18: FILTERED ICE IMPACT FORCE DATA	40
FIGURE 7-19: HISTOGRAM OF THE INDIVIDUAL ICE IMPACT LOAD AT JAMES RIVER SITE	41
FIGURE 7-20: HISTOGRAM OF THE INDIVIDUAL ICE IMPACT LOAD AT BIG SIOUX RIVER SITE.....	41
FIGURE 7-21: LOGNORMAL MODEL FITTING FOR IMPACT LOAD DATA GREATER THAN 10 KIPS.....	42
FIGURE 7-22: EQUIPMENT FOR ICE CORING AND MEASUREMENT OF ICE STRENGTH	43
FIGURE 7-23: RESEARCHERS TAKING ICE CORE SAMPLES AT THE JAMES RIVER SITE	43
FIGURE 7-24: COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH TEST SETUP OF AN ICE CORE SAMPLE.....	44
FIGURE 8-1: TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUAL IMPACT CDF TO 75-YEAR MAXIMUM IMPACT CDF.....	48

TABLE OF ACRONYMS

[illegible]

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A research study was conducted by South Dakota State University in cooperation with the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) to assess the applicability of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design specifications for dynamic ice loads on bridge sub-structures in the state of South Dakota.

The research study comprise four major activities, the first being the development of an ice loading monitoring system. The monitoring system designed in this study was unique in that it measured the ice impact force explicitly through a one-foot diameter hollow structural section (HSS) pipe load transducer installed at the upstream direction of the bridge pier. Based on fundamental force equilibrium, the configuration included an HSS pipe spanning two strain-gauge instrumented load cell supports with overhang. The system was designed to be robust enough to remain elastic under 400 kips ice impact load at any location, be able to be attached to bridge piers and partially submerged under water, and operate continuously during harsh winter conditions. The strain gauge load cells were assembled and calibrated in SDSU's Structure's Lab to ensure reliability of the collected data. The monitoring system also had 14-channel data acquisition capacity with a 5-Hz sampling rate, designed to record 12 channels of strain measurement data and two channels of temperature data. The entire system was powered by a solar panel and battery, and could be monitored using a wireless modem.

The second activity involved selection of the study sites and the installation of the monitoring system at each site. Working collaboratively with the project's technical panel and other SDDOT personnel, two small stream sites were selected based on accessibility, installation feasibility, and ice characteristics from former research on ice strength and thickness. The US14 site over the James River site was selected because it was identified in a previous USGS study as the location where the highest ice strength was measured. The I-29 site over the Big Sioux River is close to Brookings SD, which is a very typical small stream situation with potentially high ice impact loads. The research team and project panel also considered some other sites that may have experienced ice dam conditions, but did not select those sites because of the difficulty caused by a large water level variation. As the first study of its kind on a stream in the United States, the two sites selected were reasonable. Although these sites do not represent ice dam conditions (likely the worst case scenario for small-stream lateral ice loads), the scope of the study is appropriate considering the current state of knowledge on small-stream ice loads. The installation of the devices on the selected sites was completed in November 2012, with a large amount of assistance from SDDOT personnel and project panel members.

Collecting data from the ice load monitoring system was the third activity of this study. The automatically collected data included strain gauge and temperature data at a 5-Hz sampling frequency. The data were recorded on data logger memory cards and periodically (approximately monthly) transferred to a lab computer for post processing. The data collection was only active during the winter period, approximately from December to April. When there was no ice in the waterway, data were not collected. Data collection continued for two winter seasons in 2013 and 2014. In addition to ice load data collection, several measurements of ice thickness and ice compressive strength were conducted during the monitoring period.

The fourth study activity was the analysis of the data acquired by the ice load monitoring system. After two years of ice load data collection, the research group identified (after processing the raw data, details presented in this report) about 60,000 ice impact events for the James River site, with a maximum recorded ice load of about 190 kips, and close to 10,000 ice impact events for the Big Sioux River site, with a maximum recorded ice load of about 60 kips. Considering these data are only from two years of collection, the suitable design ice load for a bridge's design life (typically 75 years) needs to be derived based on theory of probability and reliability. In this study, the researchers took the approach of first establishing the probabilistic distribution of single ice impact load values as a lognormal distribution, and then projecting the single impact event cumulative distribution function (CDF) to 75-year maximum impact event CDF by assuming independence of the ice impact events. The average annual impact count was also estimated for both sites based on the measured data. It was found that the statistical median value of the maximum ice impact load in 75 years was 175 kips for the James River site and 82 kips for the Big Sioux River site.

Once the 75-year maximum impact load distributions were obtained for both sites, the AASHTO ice load formula was used to calculate the design ice load for the cross-section size of the monitoring system. The reliability of the calculated design load levels under different ice strength and reduction options was determined. The following two main recommendations were developed based on the objective of maintaining a minimal reliability index of 3.0 considering the load uncertainty alone.

Calculation of Ice Loads

The South Dakota Department of Transportation should use an effective ice strength of 32 ksf, ice thickness as given in SD98-04-F, and no reduction for small streams for structural design.

For flows similar to the James and the Big Sioux rivers, we recommend that SDDOT use an effective ice strength of 32 ksf for small streams as listed in AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications and obtain the ice thickness from the ice thickness map contained in the SDDOT report "Estimation of Ice Thickness and Strength for Determination of Lateral Ice Loads on Bridge Substructures in South Dakota SD98-04-F." We also recommend that SDDOT should not consider the small stream reduction factor given in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications when calculating ice loads for flows similar to those that form on the James and the Big Sioux rivers.

These recommendations are based on the fact that using the ice thickness map data and 32 ksf effective ice strength together with the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications requirements will generate design ice load values that result in a reliability index greater than 3.0 for both sites. Reliability index is a numerical value reflecting the probability of designing ice load value being greater than real ice load during the design life of the structure. It is calculated by input the aforementioned probability into the inverse standard Normal cumulative distribution function (CDF). It should be noted that this recommendation is based on the comparison between the AASHTO load calculation and the extreme ice load statistics derived from two-year monitoring data at the two selected sites. Although the data are limited, the research team feels that the recommendation is on the safe side of AASHTO recommendations and is supported by existing data with reasonable reliability. The exclusion of ice dams and the limitation to small streams is in place because of the nature of the monitoring sites where data were generated.

Further Monitoring Efforts

The South Dakota Department of Transportation should commission work to redesign the ice load monitoring system and collect data for at least 5 years from river sites that may induce more critical ice load conditions.

This recommendation is contingent upon the need to conduct a comprehensive ice load calibration for South Dakota rivers. If there is no immediate need, this recommendation will not be applicable. If there is a need to perform this calibration, we recommend that SDDOT consider the possibility of conducting more data collection on ice impact load for a longer period of time (preferably more than five years) and at sites that cover more critical conditions (such as thick ice sheet floats and ice dams). The potential benefit of conducting this work is to develop an understanding of the realistic ice load demands in these locations and eventually correlate the ice load with weather and geographical data in South Dakota, as well as developing a viable and scalable procedure for river ice load monitoring. Ideally the sites where ice impact damage was observed on bridge structures should be included. Based on experience from this project, the following modifications of the study plan should be implemented:

- 1) The monitoring system should be redesigned with a focus on its sensitivity to long term temperature variations in an as-installed configuration (rather than only relying on the laboratory testing and calibration).
- 2) Conduct the study in two phases. The first phase will only conduct field trial at limited sites, collect data for 1 to 2 years, and adjust the design based on shortcomings of the initial monitoring system observed during the first phase to increase its robustness and accuracy. The second phase will then replicate the validated system at multiple sites and collect data for a longer period (5 to 10 years).
- 3) Supplement the ice load measurement with visual data, preferably using remote cameras to link the measurements with images reflecting river conditions.
- 4) It will be beneficial to seek collaboration with other research entities that have the capacity to conduct scaled modeling or ice floe characterization, such as the US Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Lab. But such collaboration was not pursued during this first phase of the study.

With the experience gathered and lessons learned from this study, it is likely that researchers will be able to improve the current design and obtain better ice load data.

2.0 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

Ice loads on a bridge structure can be one of the major components for Extreme Limit State combinations specified in the AASHTO Code. In seismically inactive regions such as South Dakota, ice loads can be the predominant lateral load in the design of bridge sub-structures. Accurate estimation of the magnitude of ice forces that act on bridge piers in northern climates is critical in the design of new bridges and in the evaluation of existing bridges. While the AASHTO Code provides empirical equations to calculate the design ice loads based on effective ice strength and thickness, these formulas were developed assuming thick ice formation that in many cases is quite different from the relatively smaller chunks of ice floe (i.e. not a large complete ice sheet, size relative to dimension of bridge piers) that form on South Dakota rivers. Even with very accurate ice strength and thickness values, ice loads calculated based on AASHTO formulas may be inaccurate because the boundary conditions and ice breaking conditions may not be ideal as assumed. Using these load levels in design may lead to over-designed bridge sub-structures with excessive construction cost, or under-designed bridge sub-structures that may negatively affect public safety.

As a commonly encountered phenomenon in cold regions, the mechanism of ice formation in natural water bodies and ice loads on bridge sub-structures had been studied for decades. Accurate prediction of extreme lateral ice loads on supporting structural elements at water level is of special interest to researchers due to its implications on structural design. A variety of methods was employed in ice load estimation, including mechanistic modeling of the ice-structure interaction using nonlinear finite element models (e.g., Ahmed 1994, Yuan 2009), scaled testing in a hydraulic laboratory (e.g., Timco 1995, Lever 2001, Jochmann 2003), and field monitoring on full scale structures (e.g., Frederking 1992, Brown 2010). In these studies, several factors were believed to have significant influence on ice loads, including geometry of the sub-structure, ice thickness and strength, and ice failure mode. A notable long term ice load monitoring project was the Confederation Bridge pier ice load monitoring project in Canada, in which ice loads on three of the bridge piers were continuously monitored for more than 11 years after the bridge first opened in 1998. The monitoring system consisted of multiple pressure panels installed to the sub-structure as well as tiltmeters and accelerometers. A significant observation from these field monitoring projects was that the actual ice load was much smaller than what had been used in the design of these structures. However, most of these studies were conducted for ice load in an ocean water environment. There has not been any notable full-scale experimental study on river ice load estimation in the U.S.

During 1998-2002, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), in cooperation with SDDOT, conducted a study to evaluate factors affecting ice forces at selected bridges in South Dakota. The study gathered a significant amount of ice thickness and strength data from six sites representative of South Dakota river conditions. The study also recommended an Accumulative Freezing Degree Day equation for ice thickness estimation in South Dakota. However, the measured ice crushing strength from the study had large variability and could result in an extremely large ice load if used directly in the AASHTO formula. After the study, an equivalent ice strength of 250 lb/in² was used for South Dakota bridge design using the AASHTO formula, with the actual ice load level remaining largely unknown. This knowledge gap provided the impetus for the current study to conduct direct ice load measurements and estimate bridge sub-structure ice load during the time of maximum ice-crushing strength in mid-to late winter and during ice breakup in early spring.

3.0 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study focused on monitoring ice loads directly at bridge sites in South Dakota and comparing measured load statistics with codified design load values. The research sought to provide bridge designers realistic and relevant ice load information for small streams in South Dakota. The research objectives for this study included:

1. *Developing an efficient and accurate ice load monitoring system for bridge sub-structures in cold regions*

The ice load monitoring system developed in this study was able to conduct long-term continuous collection of ice load data. The lateral ice load was measured directly with a relatively simple structural system attached on the bridge sub-structure. The system was designed such that it was not damaged when impacted by the ice and was operational during the span of the research project period.

2. *Accurately determining ice loads exerted on bridge sub-structures through continuous monitoring of ice load at selected sites in South Dakota*

At two selected sites, ice load monitoring systems were installed to record ice load for two winters and springs following the installation. The monitoring system collected strain gauge data continuously. These data were used to calculate the impact ice loads greater than 10 kips.

3. *Evaluating the applicability of AASHTO equations based on observed ice loads on South Dakota bridges and providing a recommendation for the application of the AASHTO ice load section for bridge design in South Dakota small streams.*

At the end of data collection, a comparison between AASHTO-recommended ice load values on the monitoring device cross section and the measured ice load statistical values was conducted. Through reliability-based evaluation, the recommended procedure to apply AASHTO ice load calculation for South Dakota small stream ice conditions was developed.

4.0 TASK DESCRIPTIONS

The scope of this project is defined by the following tasks.

Task 1: Meet with the project's technical panel to review the project scope and work plan.

A kick-off meeting was scheduled shortly after the beginning of the project with the technical panel to discuss the work plan and scope. The principal investigators presented a tentative project timeline and methodology to the panel and facilitated the discussion on critical issues. Feedback from the technical panel was incorporated in the revision of the work plan after the discussion. A revised work plan summary was submitted to the technical panel within one week after the meeting.

Task 2: Review and summarize literature pertinent to ice loading on bridge sub-structures.

Combined with the preliminary literature reviews conducted during the preparation of the project proposal, a thorough literature review of analytical and experimental studies (especially on-site monitoring studies) on bridge ice loads in cold regions was conducted. Existing monitoring systems that may have been of reference value to the design of the ice load monitoring system were identified. The review also included existing literature on evaluation of ice loads in rivers to better estimate the design load for the structural components of the ice load monitoring system. (See Chapter 5)

Task 3: Recommend candidate sites for installation of ice load monitoring instrumentation by evaluating the six sites used in the SD1998-04 research study and other sites identified by the technical panel.

The six sites used in the SD1998-04 research study on ice thickness and strength were evaluated by the researchers for suitability of ice load monitoring. Sites from outside the SD1998-04 report that were of special interest to SDDOT were also included in the evaluation. The evaluation of the potential sites was based on 1) information presented in the SD1998-04 report, 2) presence of bridge structures in the vicinity of the potential sites, 3) as-built plans and drawings for the bridge structures, 4) available hydrology data of the sites that could be obtained from USGS, and 5) visual inspection of the potential sites. Based on the evaluation, two candidate bridges for installation of ice load monitoring instrumentation were recommended by the researchers and approved by the technical panel.

Task 4: Develop and submit for review and approval of the technical panel a design for a durable ice load monitoring system capable of being firmly attached to a bridge sub-structure.

An ice load monitoring system was designed and submitted for review and approval by the technical panel. The system consisted of an instrumented structural assembly and a data acquisition system. The structural assembly was configured so that it could be firmly attached to a bridge sub-structure at one end and be subjected to the ice load generated from the full ice thickness at the other end. The instrumentation was designed to measure strain at two support locations of the structural assembly. The structural assembly and its connection to the existing bridge structure were designed to behave elastically under the anticipated maximum design ice load.

A data logger was used to automatically acquire data related to the ice loads over time. The researchers used a Campbell Scientific CR1000 logger with 16 single-ended data channels. The logger could capture data at maximum rate of 50 Hz. The system was weatherproof and required minimum maintenance. (See Section 6.2)

Task 5: Manufacture and conduct laboratory tests on the approved ice load monitoring system.

Prior to field installation, the approved monitoring system was fabricated, assembled, and tested in the Lohr Structures Lab at SDSU to 1) check the structural integrity of the system and its subassemblies, 2) verify the functionality of the data acquisition system, and 3) validate the correlation between the applied load and the measured strain data. The MTS hydraulic testing system at SDSU was capable of applying up to 350 kips of static loading. The monitoring system was designed so that its response under the maximum load (identified in Task 4) remained elastic. Since the actual maximum load was unknown at the time of the design, a conservative estimate of the load was used in the design to ensure a safety margin against failure (the monitoring system was designed to remain elastic for 200 kips concentrated load). No system deficiencies were identified during the test and the design of the monitoring system was approved by the technical panel (See Section 6.2).

Task 6: Develop and submit for review and approval of the technical panel a revised design for the ice load monitoring system based upon the results of laboratory testing.

The tests in Task 5 revealed that there was no modification needed for the device. Task 6 was skipped as it was not necessary.

Task 7: Install the approved ice load monitoring system at selected sites.

The monitoring system was tested and calibrated at the structures lab before it was shipped to the bridge sites identified in Task 3 and installed with the assistance of SDDOT crews and equipment. Since part of the system needed to be submerged in the water, the installation could be performed only during the months deemed by SDDOT to be safe to conduct this type of installation work, i.e., before ice starts to form at the selected sites. This task required a significant amount of assistance from SDDOT including 1) providing traffic control and necessary hoisting equipment during the installation process, and 2) issuing the necessary permission to install a small weather-proof enclosure on the side of the bridge to house the data acquisition system. Power for the data acquisition system was provided by a battery connected to a solar panel because electricity was not available at the sites.

Task 8: Data collection at the instrumented bridges.

Data from the instrumented sites were collected over two consecutive winter seasons. The collected data were used to perform the analysis in Task 9.

Ice load data were collected either remotely through wireless devices or on-site with the large data storage module. Weather condition data (temperature and wind) were collected from nearby weather stations. Ice thickness and ice compressive strength measurements during mid-winter and spring break-up were measured sparsely (see Chapter 7).

Task 9: Conduct statistical and engineering analysis on ice load data.

The collected ice load data were used to evaluate the statistical characteristics of the ice load occurrence at the instrumented sites. Statistical models were developed for ice-impact load and calibrated with the measured ice load data. Long-term extreme design ice load was projected based on probability theory for structural design applications (see Chapter 8).

Task 10: Evaluate AASHTO ice load applicability to South Dakota river ice conditions

Similar to the process used to calibrate load factors in LRFD, the threshold-level ice load values (corresponding to a certain reliability index, i.e., β) were derived from the measured ice load

statistics. These levels were compared with the ice load values at the bridge sites calculated using the current AASHTO formula. The results were used to assess the applicability of the AASHTO ice load calculations for the design of bridges in South Dakota (see Section 8.2).

Task 11: In conformance with SDDOT's Guidelines for Performing Research for the South Dakota Department of Transportation, prepare a final report and executive summary of the research methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

At the end of the project, a comprehensive final report was prepared by the researchers in conformance with SDDOT guidelines. The final report documented all aspects of the project including literature review, research methods, experimental work, measured data, analytical work findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Recommendations for the adoption of AASHTO ice load levels in South Dakota were included. The final report was submitted to the technical panel for review and comments. The report was revised as needed to address the panel's comments.

Task 12: Make executive presentations to the SDDOT Research Review Board and the SDDOT Bridge Design Office engineers at the conclusion of the project.

An executive presentation was made by the principal investigators to the SDDOT Research Review Board in Pierre, South Dakota, on August 30, 2017. The presentation summarized the research activities that were accomplished in this project and all conclusions and recommendations that resulted from the research.

5.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter describes some significant studies in the past that are related to the subject of this research. First, several other studies that relate to ice load calculation and monitoring are discussed. Then, a study completed by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) on the thickness and strength of ice in South Dakota is introduced (Niehus, 2002). Finally, the AASHTO (2014) equations and current ice load design practices for the state of South Dakota are discussed.

5.1 Field and Experimental Studies

Many studies in the past looked at ice formation and break-up processes in waterways. Other studies focused more on the effects of the ice loads on bridge structures and how to account for them in design. These studies have added to the slim body of knowledge related to the dynamic ice forces on bridge piers and their effects.

Ice formation varies across the globe and ice will have different properties based on the process. In South Dakota, much of the ice is formed from snow accumulation. In the paper titled “River and Lake Processes Relevant to Ice Loads,” Robert Gerard discusses the important influence that snow accumulation has on ice thickness. First the snow insulates the ice cover and reduces the growth rate. But once the snow depth is about half the ice thickness, the weight of the snow will submerge the ice cover. When this happens, water floods through the cracks and saturates the lower layers of snow. This continues until the saturated snow layer freezes, forming snow ice (Gerard, R. 1983). This type of ice formation mechanism will produce ice that has more air content and is more fragmented, which is different from the thick solid ice formations that are assumed by much of the design codes used today. Therefore, the properties of the ice may be different in South Dakota compared to other regions. This is one important factor to consider when designing bridges for the state.

Another important topic for discussion is the ice floe failure types. Five types of failure are commonly seen when a moving ice floe strikes a bridge pier. The type of failure that occurs is influenced by the strength of the ice, the geometry of the pier, and the size of the floe. Montgomery et al. (1984) describe the following five types of ice failure:

- Crushing – The ice fails by local crushing across the width of the pier. Crushed ice is continually cleared from a zone around the pier as the floe moves past.
- Bending – For piers with inclined noses, a vertical reaction component acts on the impinging ice floe. This reaction causes the floe to rise up the pier nose and fail as flexural cracks form.
- Splitting – When a comparatively small floe strikes a pier, stress cracks split the floe into smaller parts.
- Impact – If the floe is small, it is brought to a halt when impinging on the nose of the pier by bending or by splitting.
- Buckling – For very wide piers, where a large floe cannot clear the pier as it fails, compressive forces cause the floe to fail by buckling in front of the pier nose.

Montgomery et al. (1984) also stated that the controlling design dynamic ice forces on typical bridge piers on larger bodies of water will be caused by crushing and bending ice failures. However, impact

failures could be the controlling force for bridges on smaller streams that are not capable of carrying large ice floes.

Due to the high uncertainty in ice formation and characteristics, it is important to develop criteria for the design of bridges under ice loads that are based on actual field measurements (Haynes et al. 1991). These measurements are made at existing bridges in order to refine the design loads for future designs. To date, there have been only a handful of papers written about direct measurements studies (Haynes et al. 1991; Brown et al. 2009). With most of these studies conducted for bridges over straits and ocean water, there is a lack of such studies on inland rivers and streams. There was no such study that had been completed previously in the state of South Dakota.

5.2 USGS – SDDOT Study of Ice Thickness and Ice-Crushing Strength

A study that was completed by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) in cooperation with the SDDOT led directly to this research project. The previous study report was titled “Estimation of Ice Thickness and Strength for Determination of Lateral Ice Loads on Bridge Substructures in South Dakota” and was written by Colin A. Niehus. This study was performed because of the importance of estimating the magnitude of ice forces that act on bridge piers and abutments in northern climates (Niehus, 2002). Niehus states that ice load evaluation is complex because the ice forces acting on bridges tend to be related to many factors including ice thickness, ice-crushing strength, water depth, stream-flow, and wind. Ice thickness and ice-crushing strength are the most important factors that go into the design equations for the estimation of the dynamic ice forces. The estimation of these factors for use in design and evaluation in the state of South Dakota was the primary objective of Niehus’s study.

Niehus and his research team measured ice thickness and ice-crushing strength at six sites across the state of South Dakota from February 1999 to April 2001. They developed a map that gives the estimated maximum potential ice thickness for regions across the state.

The ice-crushing strength measurements were used to estimate an appropriate design value. The measurements showed that it would be practical to assume that sites across the state of South Dakota could potentially develop ice with strength of 1000 psi during the coldest part of the winter if the most extreme conditions were present. Niehus determined that it was more likely that the ice-crushing strength during the spring thaw/breakup would be much lower than 1000 psi. The data they collected closer to spring thaw indicated that 250 psi was an appropriate value to use in estimating ice forces. Therefore, using the maximum ice strength of 1000 psi would grossly over-estimate the ice forces.

In the conclusions and considerations for implementation section of the aforementioned study, the author recommended direct measurement of ice forces acting on bridge structures for South Dakota bridge design practice. This provided the impetus for this study.




Figure 5-1: Estimated Maximum Potential Ice Thickness for Waterways in SD (Niehus, 2002)

5.3 South Dakota Current Practices and AASHTO Equation

The practices followed in the state of South Dakota for bridge design have developed over time based on changing codes and updated knowledge and information. The previously discussed study completed by the USGS in cooperation with the SDDOT caused a change in the values used by SDDOT bridge engineers when designing for ice loads. Before that study was completed, the engineers assumed that the effective ice-crushing strength (as defined by AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications equations) for the state during breakup was 100 psi. This was determined to be too low when compared to the data that was collected in Niehus' study. Therefore, this value was increased to 250 psi for the state (which is equivalent to the 36 ksf value recommended in AASHTO LRFD). The study also resulted in a map of the state of South Dakota with estimated maximum potential ice thickness regions across the state ranging from 2 to 3 feet. The AASHTO (2014) equations used by SDDOT for determining ice loads (AASHTO Section 3.9.2-Dynamic Ice Forces on Piers) require values for the ice-crushing strength and the ice thickness.

Only bridges that have no inclination to their piers will be discussed here. Ice forces on bridges that have inclined piers are determined using other considerations that can be found in Section 3.9.2 of the AASHTO specifications (AASHTO, 2014). For piers that are not inclined, the horizontal ice force, F_c , caused by ice floes that fail by crushing over the full width of the pier is the design ice force. F_c is given by AASHTO Equation 3.9.2.2-1 as follows:

$$F_c = C_a p t w \quad (\text{Eq. 5-1})$$

where:

F_c = design ice crushing force (kips)

C_a is a coefficient accounting for the effect of the pier width/ice thickness ratio where the floe fails by crushing. C_a is given as:

$$C_a = \left(\frac{5t}{w} + 1 \right)^{0.5}$$

p = effective ice crushing strength (ksf)

t = thickness of ice (ft)

w = pier width at level of ice action (ft)

The code gives values for effective ice crushing strength to be used in the absence of more precise information. These values and their respective ice conditions are given below.

- 8.0 ksf (55.6 psi), where breakup occurs at melting temperatures and the ice structure is substantially disintegrated;
- 16.0 ksf (111 psi), where breakup occurs at melting temperatures and the ice structure is somewhat disintegrated;
- 24.0 ksf (166.7 psi), where breakup or major ice movement occurs at melting temperatures, but the ice moves in large pieces and is internally sound; and
- 32.0 ksf (222 psi), where breakup or major ice movement occurs when the ice temperature, averaged over its depth, is measurably below the melting point

These values are all lower than the 250 psi recommendation made by the USGS-SDDOT study discussed previously. AASHTO (2014) allows a designer to reduce the overall design force for small streams (Section 3.9.2.3 of the code). According to AASHTO, for small streams not conducive to the formation of large ice floes, consideration may be given to reducing the forces determined in Section 3.9.2.2, but under no circumstances shall the forces be reduced by more than 50%. The ice load reduction factor, K_1 , is given in Table C3.9.2.3-1 of the AASHTO LRFD (Load and Resistance Factor Design) specifications (AASHTO, 2014) and is reproduced in Table 5-1. K_1 is dependent on the ratio A/r^2 where A is defined as the plane area of the largest ice floe (in units of ft^2) and r is the radius of the pier nose (in units of feet). This reduction is meant for the small stream situation where the ice floes fail by the impact mode instead of crushing. This reduction factor is currently considered for small streams in South Dakota.

Table 5-1: Reduction Factor K_1 for Small Streams

A/r^2	Reduction Factor, K_1
1000	1.0
500	0.9
200	0.7
100	0.6
50	0.5

Using the design parameter of pier width=2.5 feet and ice thickness= 2 feet, the AASHTO ice load equation will result in an ice load that varies from 67 kips to 270 kips (depending on the effective ice crushing strength value used (a range of 8 to 32 psf was given in AASHTO)). This showed a wide range of variability for the calculated ice loads even when the values for the ice thickness and pier width are given. Furthermore, the ice loads could be reduced by up to 50% as discussed previously. This situation makes the design for ice load difficult. In South Dakota DOT bridge design practices before the Niehus study, an assumed ice load level of 10 kips per foot of substructure width in the transverse direction has been used. Using this criteria, a 2.5-foot-wide bridge pier would result in a design ice load equals to 25 kips. Following the measured ice crushing strength measured in the Niehus study (250 psi), the design load in the same example calculated using the AASHTO design code formula with the ice thickness equals to 2.0 feet will be 425 kips. This value could be reduced by up to 50% using engineering judgment. These different options and assumptions in design load calculation can cause a large variability in bridge pier lateral design. This study was conducted in order to provide data to support more reasonable design ice load estimation for South Dakota streams.

6.0 ICE LOAD MONITORING DEVICE

6.1 Design of Ice load Monitoring System

6.1.1 Conceptual Design

Development of the monitoring system required consideration of several key factors including designing the attachment system for the column, determining the shape and load path that would yield the best results while maintaining an economic design, and determining how to protect the sensitive pieces in the system from damage. Multiple design options were conceptualized and assessed. The overall design concept was to measure the dynamic ice loads directly by installing a monitoring system onto the bridge pier at each of the selected sites.

The selected concept can be modeled as a beam that has a simply supported segment between two load cells and a cantilever segment that will receive the ice load as shown in Figure 6-1. The design uses a round HSS section as the load transducer. The force from an impact is transferred from the transducer through load cells and then into the column. Figure 6-1 shows the ice impact force, P , applied to the transducer can be calculated as:

$$P = F_2 - F_1 \quad (\text{Eq. 6-1})$$

Where F_1 and F_2 are the magnitude of the forces at the supports (where load cells were installed) in the direction shown.




Figure 6-1: Conceptual Monitoring System Configuration

6.1.2 Structural Design of the Monitoring System

The design for the data acquisition system consisted of several components assembled together and attached to the bridge pier. This section discusses the mechanical components that were consistent at both sites. Figure 6-2 shows a 3D rendering of the system, together with the basic dimensions of this monitoring system.




Figure 6-2: System Rendering

The main component of this system is the eight-foot hollow structural section (round HSS 12.75"OD x 0.5" wall thickness) that was used as the transducer. This piece receives impacts and then transfers the load into the supports that will be referred to as load cells. Each load cell consists of several smaller pieces welded together to form the composite piece. Figure 6-3 shows the assembled load cell. The transducer pipe was connected to the load cells using clamps that were fabricated using $\frac{1}{4}$ " A36 steel plates bent into shape with $\frac{1}{4}$ " A36 steel stiffeners welded to the outer flanges. The clamps connected to one another and to the load cells using $\frac{7}{8}$ " threaded rods that were tightened on each side using heavy hex head nuts with flat washers and lock washers to create a secure connection.




Figure 6-3: Custom Built Load Cell for the Monitoring System

6.1.3 Data Acquisition System

The data acquisition system consisted of strain gages connected to a data logger, a cellular modem with antenna, a solar panel, and a battery. A diagram of the assembly is shown in Figure 6-4. A photovoltaic controller was used to connect the power (solar panel and battery) to the load (data logger and cell modem).




Figure 6-4: Diagram of Electronic System

The data logger used for this project was a Campbell Scientific CR3000 Micrologger. At each site, the data logger was connected to 12 strain gages and two thermocouples that collected data at a 5 Hertz sampling rate. The data were collected and stored on memory cards that were inserted in the data logger. The memory cards were retrieved frequently and switched. The capacity of the data logger's internal memory allowed the memory cards to be switched without losing data. A photo of the data logger used is shown in Figure 6-5. The strain gages and thermocouples were connected to the data logger using 18 AWG shielded tray cable. These cables had PVC jackets and three conductors. Each cable at the James River site was about 130 feet long, and the cable was about 150 feet long at the I-29 site. A quarter bridge circuit was used to connect each strain gage cable to the data logger. A program created using Campbell Scientific's RTDAQ computer software was used to run the data logger. This program was also used to convert the data into a usable form once collected.




Figure 6-5: CR3000 Data Logger used in the project

A cellular modem was connected to the data logger. The antenna was mounted on the side of the bridge at the I-29 site, while a directional antenna was attached to the solar panel post at the James River site. The modem was used to communicate with the data loggers remotely. The status of the system was checked frequently via this connection. Real-time data could be collected to monitor the activity at the site if desired. The files stored on the memory cards were too large to collect remotely, however. A photograph of the cellular modem is shown in Figure 6-6, together with the solar panel used on this project to charge the battery used to power the system.



Figure 6-6: Wireless Transmission Modem and Solar Panel Remote Power

The data logger, cell modem, battery, and photovoltaic controller were housed in a Campbell Scientific weatherproof box attached to the solar panel pole at the James River site and mounted beneath the bridge on the southern abutment at I-29.

Strain gages were the primary sensor used in this system. The strain was measured for each of the load cells and was later converted to forces that were used to determine the magnitude of the applied load. The gages used were 350-ohm universal general-purpose strain gages with an exposed solder tab area. They had a workable temperature range of -100 degrees to 350 degrees Fahrenheit.

Twelve gages were applied to each load cell. They were located equidistant from one another around the outside of the circular section in the middle as shown in Figure 6-7.



Figure 6-7: Strain Gages Applied in the Center of the HSS Load Cell

Thermocouples were also applied to the load cells. Each load cell had a thermocouple attached to the middle of the HSS section near the strain gages. The thermocouples were connected to the data logger and collected data at the same rate as the strain gages (5 Hertz) to collect temperature information. Two thermocouples (one on each load cell) were necessary due to the possibility that the bottom load cell became submerged while the top load cell remained in the open air, causing a potential temperature differential between the two.

6.1.4 Impact Protection

The monitoring system was partially submerged during the monitoring period and was susceptible to impacts from ice and debris. It was critical to have proper protection for not only the gages themselves but also the cables that led from the gages to the data logger.

Several protection measures were used to prevent damage and maintain integrity of the collection equipment. The first layer of protection was applied to the gages themselves. After short lead wires were soldered to the placed gages, two layers of protection were applied. The bottom layer was a microcrystalline wax that was used as a water-immersion coating to protect the gages from getting wet. The top layer was a two-part polysulfide liquid polymer compound. This layer also resisted moisture but was mainly used for mechanical protection. Once cured, the liquid polymer provided a tough barrier to protect the gages against any debris or ice. Figure 6-8 shows a load cell with the strain gage protection barrier circled. The top layer of liquid polymer is visible.



Figure 6-8: Load Cell with the Strain Gage Protection (Highlighted)

After the system was installed on site, the outer protection components were placed. The short cables that connected to the strain and temperature gages on one end and to the long shielded cabling on the other were run through the inside of plastic tubing that was filled with epoxy. This tubing then connected into a rigid conduit that carried the cabling up to the top of the bridge bent. This system was intended as protection against debris and ice floes for the cabling. Black plastic tubing is shown in Figure 6-8 wrapping around the load cell.

The final measure of protection installed was a Lexan polycarbonate shield. The shield was placed on either side of the system to cover the gap between the transducer and the bridge column. This was the outermost layer of defense and was intended to deflect larger particles of debris or ice that may have otherwise impacted the more vulnerable parts of the system. The shield was clamped to the system by running threaded rod through from one side to the other and tightening. The side of the shield that was touching the transducer was tapered and sealed with epoxy to stop debris from wedging between the shield and the loading system. Figure 6-9 shows a photo of the completed protection system at the Big Sioux River site.



Figure 6-9: Installed Monitoring System and Protection

6.2 Laboratory Testing and Validation of the Monitoring System

6.2.1 Laboratory Testing Setup

Laboratory testing was completed for the monitoring system to be installed at each site prior to installation. This testing consisted of setting up each system horizontally and loading it at three different locations along the length of the transducer pipe. This simulated different ice impact locations that may occur during data collection. The transducer pipe, load cells, and transducer clamps were assembled identically to the on-site arrangement. The load cells were connected to the laboratory strong floor through a base beam. Figure 6-10 shows a typical test setup.

The same cables used for field installation were used during the test in order to eliminate the influence of wiring. Figure 6-11 shows that the cables and strain gages were marked so they could later be installed on site the same way they were installed in the laboratory.




Figure 6-10: Typical Test Set Up for the Monitoring System




Figure 6-11: Strain Gauges and Connecting Wires

As shown in Figure 6-12, three different loading locations were used in the tests. A 146 kip hydraulic actuator was used to load the system. Each test was run by incrementally increasing the load to 50,000 pounds (50 kips) using the actuator. The laboratory data acquisition system was used to record the load and the strain values for each test.




Figure 6-12: Loading Test Configurations

6.2.2 System Accuracy Validation

For each test, the strain and actuator load data were recorded. After testing was complete, the data were analyzed to determine the accuracy of the measurement system by comparing the actual load measured from the actuator load cell to the calculated value based on the strain measurements. First, the strain data from the gages on each load cell were averaged. Then the averaged strain was multiplied by the elastic modulus of the steel (29,000 ksi) to get the average stress. This averaged stress was multiplied by the cross-sectional area of the load cell tube (9.16 in²) to get the averaged force. This was done for each load cell. The forces were then added together to calculate the total applied load, based on simple force equilibrium. In this process, the strain values indicated either compression or tension on the load cell, with their signs included in the calculation. This process was conducted for each load step. A linear relationship was achieved between the applied and calculated forces, as shown in Figure 6-13. The comparison of the two forces showed a good fit and the system was determined to have adequate accuracy.




Figure 6-13: Plot of Calculated Force vs. Applied Force

7.0 MONITORING SITES AND DATA COLLECTION

7.1 Site Selection

7.1.1 Site Selection Considerations

Selection of the sites was critical to achieving the objective of this project. Site selection depended on many factors, including the measured ice strength and thickness from the previous study, water level change during spring thaw, and the feasibility of installation. The starting point for this research was the USGS study which measured ice thicknesses and strengths at several locations across the state from 1999 to 2001. These sites were considered as possible locations for this project because of the data that had been collected. Another resource used to determine the locations for installation was the USGS website that contains historical water data across the state. The sites with relatively large ice thickness and high strength were prioritized for selection. In addition, it was desired to choose sites at which a USGS gage was located nearby for water surface elevation data. This data would benefit the project by allowing researchers to position the data acquisition system at an appropriate elevation to collect the data. The possibility of drastic water level changes and ice jams was an important consideration as well. It would be difficult to design a system that would cover a very wide range of impact points on the bridge substructure. Also, the possibility of ice jams may increase the likelihood of damage to the monitoring system and would require an extensive protection system.

Bridge ownership was considered in the site selection for practical feasibility purposes. A few county bridges came into consideration from the USGS database; however, it was determined that it would be less complicated to use a state-owned bridge for the purpose of approvals. Another issue discussed was the flow path of the river upstream of the bridges. Several sites had flow paths that were complex and would bring in ice chunks from all directions to impact the bridges. This situation would require a more complex system design than what was planned for this project. It may be beneficial to collect data at some of these more complex sites in the future for a thorough consideration of the conditions across the state. For this initial project, however, it was desired to select sites that had straight upstream approaches. This allowed the use of a simple and less expensive design for the monitoring system. Other considerations included the ease of access to the bridge piers for installation and the shape of the column. The final consideration for the site selection process was the distance and travel time for the researchers. A site closer to the researchers would allow for quick response time in the event that the system malfunctions. Based on these considerations, two sites were selected for instrumentation—one on US14 over the James River near Huron, SD, and the other over the Big Sioux River on Interstate 29 south of Brookings, SD. Details of the two sites are presented below.

7.1.2 Site 1: James River at Huron

The first site that was selected was the US14 bridge over the James River just east of Huron, SD. This was one of the sites used in the SDDOT/USGS study discussed previously. Therefore, some historical ice thickness and strength data had been collected for this site. In the USGS study by Niehus, the James River site recorded the thickest and highest strength ice measurements. This site also had water elevation data on the USGS website and a straight upstream approach. The water was relatively deep, so installation required a boat for access to the column. Fortunately there was a wide ditch along the road that allowed easy approach with no fencing or other obstacles. The bridge was built in 1959 and the bents were oriented parallel to the flow of the river, even though this meant that they

were not perpendicular to the bridge deck. This is shown in Figure 7-1 below. The bridge is 326 feet and 6 inches in length and 64 feet and 4 inches in width.




Figure 7-1: Plan and Elevation Views of US14 Bridge over James River near Huron, SD

The columns are 2.5-feet wide and octagonally shaped with shear walls connecting them to one another along each bent. The shape and shear wall design created a challenge in the design of the connection system at this site. Figure 7-7 shows an aerial view of the James River bridge from Google Maps and Figure 7-3 shows a picture taken at the site the winter prior to installation.



Figure 7-2: Aerial View of US14 Bridge over James River near Huron, SD



Figure 7-3: Picture of US14 Bridge over James River near Huron, SD

7.1.3 Site 2: Big Sioux River at I-29

The other site selected was the Interstate 29 southbound bridge over the Big Sioux River located south of Brookings, SD. This site was selected for the simple layout of the bridge, relatively straight approach, availability of water-elevation data, and proximity to South Dakota State University. Access to this site was slightly more challenging since it is less desirable to close down a lane of traffic on the Interstate. Advantageously a side access road and parking lot typically used in conjunction with a game production area provided access to the site.

The plan and elevation views of the bridge in Figure 7-4 below show that the layout of this bridge is relatively simple. The columns are circular, requiring a relatively simple design of the pier connections needed for this site. This southbound bridge is 400 feet long and 34 feet and 4 inches wide. Figure 7-5 shows an aerial view of the bridge site from Google Maps.




Figure 7-4: Plan and Elevation Views of Southbound I-29 Bridge over the Big Sioux River



Figure 7-5: Aerial View of Southbound I-29 Bridge over the Big Sioux River

7.2 Installation at Monitoring Sites

7.2.1 I-29 Site Installation

Instrumentation at the I-29 site was performed on October 10 and 11, 2012. Installation at the site, located south of Brookings on the southbound Interstate 29 bridge over the Big Sioux River, presented a number of challenges. Access to this site was difficult. An access road and parking lot typically used for access to a game production area were used during installation. The parking area was located northwest of the bridge, requiring that all equipment had to be carried across the north fork of the river to gain access to the pier, located in the south fork, on which the instrumentation was installed. Figure 7-6 shows an aerial image of the bridge with the instrumented pier and the access road and parking lot marked.



Figure 7-6: Big Sioux River Installation Location

The first step of installation was to mark the location where the transducer system was to be positioned on the column. This location was determined using the historical water level data obtained from the USGS website. The pipe was positioned so that the lowest water level was not below the transducer pipe and the highest was not above it. However, due to the wide variability of the water levels at the site and the length limitation of the transducer, the 5-yr maximum water table exceeded the top of the transducer. The transducer was protected to be water resistant. Thus if the 5-yr maximum event happens, part of the ice float data will not be collected. Due to the broad flood plain at this location and the low likelihood of this maximum event, the water had never topped the pier during the entire study period. Figure 7-7 shows the historical water levels relative to the proposed installation location.




Figure 7-7: Big Sioux River Historical Water Elevations

Once the location was marked, the installation of the load cells commenced. The relatively low water levels at this site allowed workers to access the bridge column using waders. Two levels of scaffolding were erected on both sides of the column to assist in reaching the necessary heights on the column to install the load cells. A beam was positioned atop the bent cap so that the ends extended out on either side. Pulley systems were attached to this beam for assistance with lifting the components of the system. Figure 7-8 shows the pier with scaffolding and the beam and pulley system during installation.

The load cells were lifted and held in place using the beam and pulley system while the clamps were placed. After both load cells and clamps had been placed, holes were drilled for the anchors. The holes were drilled at locations where there was no column reinforcement (approximate depth of the holes was less than 2 inches). Extra care was taken during the installation to avoid damaging the column structure and the reinforcement bars. Epoxy was injected into the holes using an injection

gun, and then ½" diameter threaded studs were inserted into the epoxied hole. The anchors were placed around the column through the clamps to resist torsional forces applied to the system. After the epoxy had cured, the bottoms of the clamps were sealed and the 0.5-inch gap left by the spacing rods was filled with non-shrink grout. The grout was used as a secondary means of attachment and extra friction for the clamps to connect with the column.

After the load cells and clamps were secured, the transducer pipe was transported from the parking lot to the pier using a small boat. The pipe was then lifted into place using the pulley system. Once positioned, the pipe was secured to the load cells using the outside clamps.



Figure 7-8: System Installation at Big Sioux River Site

Following the installation of the mechanical system, the cables (approximately 130 feet long) were threaded through the girders on the underside of the bridge deck from the southern abutment to the pier. This could not be done from the ground; therefore, a bridge inspection unit (commonly referred to as a snoopers) was provided and operated by the South Dakota Department of Transportation. The snoopers is a truck with a telescoping hydraulic boom and basket that enables up to three people to move around under the deck of a bridge. Figure 7-9 shows a photograph of the snoopers being used during installation.



Figure 7-9: SDDOT's Snooper Truck

The outside lane of southbound traffic was closed during this part of the installation process. The cables were pulled through the rigid conduit that had been installed on the pier by a licensed electrician. The cables were attached to the gage wires and protected in the black tubing as shown previously. This tubing was filled with epoxy to fully protect the connections from water damage. Lexan polycarbonate sheets were then placed on either side of the pipe and secured using the threaded rods. The edge of the sheets that was located on the transducer pipe was sealed using epoxy to protect from debris wedging inside the polycarbonate sheets.

Along the underside of the bridge deck, the cables were attached using rigid conduit straps that had been wrapped with electrical tape and rubber padding. The straps were secured to the bridge deck using concrete screws and were spaced every 6 to 10 feet from the pier to the abutment. Access was provided by the snooper. The data logger was installed in the weatherproof box along with the battery, cell modem, and photovoltaic controller prior to reaching the site. The box was then attached to the south abutment of the bridge underneath the deck as shown in Figure 7-10.



Figure 7-10: Installed Weatherproof Box for the Data Logger

The cables that attached to the strain gages on one end were connected to the data logger on the other end using quarter bridge connection. The solar panel was mounted on a Telspar sign post approximately 30 feet from the end of the bridge in the road ditch. The power cable ran through partially buried conduit from the solar panel to the photovoltaic controller which was located in the weatherproof box under the bridge. Finally, an antenna was attached to the side of the bridge and connected to the cell modem.

7.2.2 US14 Site Installation

Instrumentation at the US14 site was performed on October 2 and 3, 2012. Installation at the site, located east of Huron on the US14 Bridge over the James River, was similar to the I-29 site in many ways but provided its own set of challenges. The average daily traffic at this site was also less at this site, resulting in less congestion. The ditch near the bridge was wide and shallow enough to drive vehicles down for easy access to the bank of the river. The main installation challenge faced at this site was the five-foot depth of the river near the pier. Therefore, all work on the column had to be completed from either the snooper or the boat, shown in Figure 7-11, that was provided by the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks.



Figure 7-11: Monitoring System Parts at James River Site

As at the other site, the first step in the installation process was to locate the ideal positioning of the monitoring system on the column using the information obtained from the USGS website. Figure 7-12 shows the pier relative to the 5-year historical water levels.




Figure 7-12: James River Historical Water Elevations

Once the location was marked, the beam and pulleys were positioned across the top of the bent cap to assist in lifting and holding the pieces in place during the installation. The cuffs were the first pieces moved into position. They were held by the pulley system and marks were made where the anchors would be placed. Once the anchor locations were marked, the cuffs were moved and the holes were drilled with caution to avoid existing steel bars in the sub-structure. The drilling depth was

limited to approximately less than 2 inches). After the holes had been drilled, the cuffs were repositioned and the anchors were installed using epoxy and 5/8" threaded studs. Figure 7-13 shows workers placing the cuffs and anchors on the pier.



Figure 7-13: Installation of the Monitoring System Cuffs and Anchors

The anchors were placed and allowed to cure before the load cells were installed. After curing, the load cells were attached and the transducer pipe was lifted out of the boat and swung into position using the pulley system. The pipe was then secured using the clamps as discussed previously. Figure 7-14 shows the installation of the pipe.



Figure 7-14: Installation of Transducer Pipe at the James River Site

Next, the approximately 150-foot-long cables were run under the bridge deck and pulled through the rigid conduit that had been installed by a licensed electrician on the column. Once the cables had been pulled through the conduit, they were attached to the strain gage wires and protected using epoxy filled black plastic tubing. The polycarbonate shields were then installed similar to the Big Sioux River installation. Using the snoopers, the cables were secured to the underside of the bridge deck with the conduit straps that had been wrapped in rubber and electrical tape. These were anchored using concrete screws. The straps were spaced at 6- to 10-foot intervals from the pier to the end of the bridge. Once the cables had reached the end of the bridge they were run through rigid conduit from under the bridge deck to the weatherproof box containing the data logger, battery, cell modem, and photovoltaic controller. The box was mounted on a Telspar sign post with the solar panel and antenna.

7.3 Ice Load Data

In this section, the data collection and analysis procedures are presented. The first sub-section describes the data collection processes. The post-processing procedure is described in the second sub-section. Finally, the data resulting from two years of monitoring and the statistical analysis of these data are presented in the third sub-section.

7.3.1 Data Collection Procedure

As discussed previously, fourteen channels of data were collected. Twelve channels were strain gages, six on the top load cell and six on the bottom load cell. The other two were thermocouples, one recording the temperature on the top load cell and one on the bottom. The maximum frequency the

data logger could support for fourteen channels of data collection was 5 hertz (5 data points per channel per second).

The use of a trigger to record data only after an event was considered. In the end it was decided to use two 1-GB memory cards and record data at the 5-Hz rate continuously. The data logger itself had a small amount of memory and was capable of storing data during the time it took to switch from one memory card to another. Therefore, two memory cards were used for each data logger. After one memory card had been collecting data for a certain amount of time, the researchers would replace the card that contained the data with a blank card. The data collected during this transition period was saved to the data logger's internal memory and then transferred to the second memory card once the switch was complete. The memory cards had the capacity to record the data over all channels at the rate of 5 Hz for a span of 90 days. During the collection period, the memory cards were swapped about every two weeks to minimize the potential loss of data and to maintain a visual log of the conditions on site. After all of the data had been collected, the strain values were converted to force in each load cell. Using force equilibrium introduced earlier, the total force applied to the system was then calculated.

7.3.2 Post-Processing

The first step of post-processing was condensing the data to a manageable size. The amount of data collected was much more than necessary for the purpose of identifying maximum ice forces. Thus condensed data points were taken at every 5th recording step from the raw data, making the effective data sampling rate 1.0 Hz. The data collected before the ice formed in the waterway and after the complete melt of ice at each site were also discarded based on estimated dates. For both sites, the winter seasons included in the data collection were 12-21-2012 to 4-16-2013 and 12-2-2013 to 4-4-2014. Figure 7-15 and Figure 7-16 illustrate the converted force and temperature (average temperature of two load cells) data collected during the two years.





Figure 7-15: Unprocessed Data at US14 James River Site





Figure 7-16: Unprocessed Data at I-29 Big Sioux River Site

The above figures clearly show a similarity between the overall fluctuation of force measurements and temperature measurements. Either there was a direct relationship between ambient temperature and ice load all the time (which is not logical), or the strain measured by the load cell was affected by temperature. Some spikes of temperature measurement were observed, but were likely caused by error in instrumentation. An examination of the temperature and calculated force from strain data for about 18 days demonstrates a clear pattern of daily fluctuation on both sites (Figure 7-17). The ice load value calculated directly from the raw data was not likely the real ice impact load. Thus the long term trends in the strain gage measurement do not necessarily represent real increase in loads.

The reason for this fluctuation may have been the temperature sensitivity of the strain gauge and the steel material. Although the impact of temperature on the strain measurement can be eliminated using the measured temperature data (through thermocouples attached at each of the load cell), this compensation will not yield accurate results if the structure is not allowed to expand and contract freely under temperature variations. Although the idealized force transfer is a simply supported HSS pipe with overhang, the actual installed structure is an indeterminate system in which temperature-induced strain variation is different from that in determinate structures. Without precise knowledge on the nature of the actual boundary conditions for the installed system, it is difficult to identify and compensate for the temperature-induced strain fluctuation, but any temperature-induced measurement will trend with the temperature fluctuation and can be removed from the data by using a highpass filter, because temperature will not vary rapidly). As shown in Figure 7-17, where both the force measurement and temperature measurement were normalized and plotted to overlap each other, some very short period ice load surges can be observed “riding” on the temperature-induced fluctuation. These high-frequency fluctuations are believed to represent the true impact ice loads experienced by the monitoring devices.




Figure 7-17: Example of Impact Load Data Riding on Temperature-Induced Fluctuation

The built-in Matlab Butterworth filter (a 4th order highpass filter that filtered out frequencies lower than 5.56×10^{-4} Hz (period longer than 30 minutes)) was used to filter out any fluctuation with a period longer than 30 minutes from the data. After the filtering operation, a zero baseline was created with the short-term spikes riding on it. Due to the characteristics of the filtering process, the filtered signal also included some negative peaks. The negative peaks typically appear right after a positive peak due to the shape of the sudden spike in a relatively smooth time history. However, as these peaks still represent a sudden change in the data that may relate to impact loading, the magnitude (absolute value) of these peaks also included in the estimate of the impact loads. Therefore, the estimation of the peak ice load is conservative. Figure 7-18 shows the plot of force vs. time, after the filter was applied, for both sites over the two-year period. It can be seen that most of the impact events happened during the spring thaw period.




Figure 7-18: Filtered Ice Impact Force Data

Once all data had been filtered, a program was developed in Matlab to investigate the positive peaks, which represent the maximum impact ice loads measured during the monitoring period. Only forces greater than 10 kips were considered in the analysis, as the sensitivity of the monitoring device to smaller load levels may be questionable. If we consider the ice impact load as a random variable, the histogram of the impact load can be plotted as in Figure 7-19 and Figure 7-20. A histogram was generated with all of the data from the two-year period at each site.




Figure 7-19: Histogram of the Individual Ice Impact Load at James River Site




Figure 7-20: Histogram of the Individual Ice Impact Load at Big Sioux River Site

Statistical analysis reveals more insights from the data. The first question may be whether there is any difference in data between different sites and different years. It is logical that these data are different,

as the topology and hydraulics at the two selected sites are quite different and the two consecutive winters (2013 and 2014) were not exactly the same. In fact the hypothesis tests (t-test) of the four groups of data confirmed this suspicion. The standard t-test (which is routinely used to judge if the means of two different sample groups are the same) was used here to compare the mean value of these subsets of the data. At the 0.05 significance level, the James River ice load was significantly different from the Big Sioux River ice load when all data from both years are considered. At the James River site alone, the 2013 data at the site was statistically similar to the 2014 data. However, for the Big Sioux River site, the data from the two different years were statistically different. This comparison suggests that the variability of the ice load depended on location and weather. As a first attempt to gather realistic ice load data, the duration and scope of this project was relatively limited for the purpose of capturing the average trends of extreme ice load in South Dakota rivers. Gathering data at more locations over a longer period of time will be beneficial for developing a more comprehensive understanding of river ice loads.

Since it was expected that the ice load statistical distribution at each site would be different (as confirmed by the statistical testing), it was logical to develop an extreme ice load model based on the data from each site. Several extreme distribution models were used to fit the peak ice load data over two years of data collection at individual sites. As shown in Figure 7-21, the lognormal model was a reasonable fit for the tail of the ice load distribution. It was thus adopted in this study to extrapolate the extreme ice load events for the design life of the structure. The fitted parameters for the lognormal distribution representing single impact events are also given in Figure 7-21. These fitted parameters (μ and σ shown in Fig. 7-21) are the result of least-square regression, representing the lognormal distribution parameters that best represents the observed ice impact data. They will be used later in the reliability calculation to estimate maximum ice impact load in a longer design life span.




Figure 7-21: Lognormal Model Fitting for Impact Load Data Greater than 10 kips

7.4 Additional Ice Strength Measurements

At the beginning of the project, it was deemed helpful to collect mechanical properties of ice that formed during the ice load data collection period. In this study, the ice thickness and compressive strength were obtained during the winter periods at both sites. However, it was later discovered that it is inaccurate to use the ice strength measured at a particular time during the winter (when the waterway was completely frozen) as an indicator of the impact ice strength at spring thaw. During the spring thaw, the ice float can be tested for strength. However, due to the increase in ambient temperature and water content in ice cores, the ice core will be very “ductile” and the strength at which the ice will fail in compression cannot be identified.

The research team visited both monitoring sites several times during the monitoring period and conducted multiple tests using the equipment shown in Figure 7-22. Figure 7-23 shows on-site ice sampling at the James River site during the 2013 winter season.



Figure 7-22: Equipment for Ice Coring and Measurement of Ice Strength



Figure 7-23: Researchers Taking Ice Core Samples at the James River Site

The ice compressive strength was measured by conducting compressive strength tests on cylindrical ice samples. The samples were obtained by drilling ice cores of approximately four inches in diameter. The cores were then sawed off at the ends to create even surfaces for uniform loading. Each ice cylinder was tested in compression to failure (cracking and splitting of the cylinder, signified by a sudden drop in the load-ring reading). Figure 7-24 shows a test sample placed in the compression testing apparatus. The maximum load read from the load ring was recorded as the failure load. The compressive strength of the ice specimen was calculated by dividing the failure load by the cross sectional area of the sample. Even for a single core, there were differences between the strength of the ice near the top of the surface and the strength near the bottom of the ice layer.



Figure 7-24: Compressive Strength Test Setup of an Ice Core Sample

The ice strength measurement was not found to correlate with measured ice loads. This is expected because the ice impacting the bridge during spring thaw does not have the same strength as measured during the middle of the winter. The ice samples collected close to spring became very ductile and did not have a clearly identifiable strength. The data obtained from this study are listed in the Table 7-1 and Table 7-2 for reference purposes.

Table 7-1: Measured Ice Crushing Strength at the James River Site

Sample #	Diameter (in)	Length (in)	Failure Load (lb)	Strength (psi)
2/28/2013, James River, thickness 17"				
1	3.88	7.75	4850	406
2	3.88	7.23	3888	319
3	3.92	8.94	6026	489
4	3.76	5.25	4267	391
5	3.86	6.75	4327	366
6	3.98	5.88	5033	413
3/14/2013, James River, thickness 16"				
1	4.00	7.06	3204	255
2	4.00	6.50	2671	213
3	3.87	7.00	3310	281
4	3.87	5.63	4007	340
5	4.00	5.00	2973	237
6	4.00	8.00	3127	249
2/20/2014, James River, thickness 12"				
1	4.00	4.50	4457	355
2	4.00	3.25	6595	525
3	4.00	3.50	2016	160
4	4.00	3.00	1560	124
5	4.00	5.50	5995	477
6	4.00	4.50	5368	427
3/6/2014, James River, thickness 18"				
1	4.00	5.00	3291	262
2	4.00	5.25	3223	257
3	4.00	6.00	2772	221
4	4.00	7.00	4357	347

Table 7-2: Measured Ice Crushing Strength at the Big Sioux River Site

Sample #	Diameter (in)	Length (in)	Force (lb)	Strength (psi)
3/14/2013, Big Sioux, thickness N/A				
1	3.87	7.25	1904	161
2	3.87	6.50	2118	180
3	4.00	5.12	2836	226
2/20/2014, Big Sioux, thickness 9"				
1	4.00	6.00	7743	616
2	4.00	3.75	4833	385
3	4.00	4.00	7153	569
4	4.00	6.25	4580	364
5	4.00	7.50	4307	343
6	4.00	7.25	4670	372
7	4.00	7.50	2474	197
3/6/2014, Big Sioux, thickness 16"				
1	4.00	7.00	3417	272
2	4.00	5.75	3642	290
3	4.00	7.75	2781	221
4	4.00	7.75	3349	267
5	4.00	6.25	3368	268

8.0 RELIABILITY EVALUATION

In this section, the distribution of the extreme ice load value derived in the previous section was used to estimate the maximum ice load statistics for a given design life. The reliability of the AASHTO empirical equation was evaluated by comparing the calculated design load with the measured maximum load. The probability of the actual load exceeding the AASHTO design load under different conditions was evaluated.

8.1 Extreme Ice Load Statistics

In the previous section, the ice impact load was modeled as a random variable following a lognormal distribution. Based on the distribution of single impact events, the distribution of the maximum impact load in any given time span can be derived if we assume individual events are independent. In addition, it was assumed that the average number of impact events at a given site is constant for each year. Based on the impact data gathered at the two sites during this study, it is quite apparent that the number of impacts at a given site can vary from year to year. However, due to the limitation of the available data, the average impact count in the two years of monitoring was used as the average annual impact count. In this study an impact event is defined as any filtered peak exceeding 10 kips. Table 8-1 lists the total number of impact events in the monitoring period at both sites.

Table 8-1: Total Impact Events Greater than 10 kips

	James River	Big Sioux River
2013 Winter	56535	509
2014 Winter	3715	9191

As shown, the number of impacts for each site is quite different, which can be expected because of differences in the geometry of the waterway and flow characteristics. On average, we assumed that the number of annual impact events is 30,000 at the James River site and 4800 at the Big Sioux River site. Thus the total number of impact events during the design life of a bridge (assuming 75 years) will be $75 \times 30,000 = 2,250,000$ for the James River bridge and 360,000 for the Big Sioux River bridge. Based on fundamental probability theory, the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the maximum impact load for these sites can be calculated as:

$$F_{max}(X) = F_{single}(X)^N \quad (\text{Eq. 8-1})$$

where $F_{single}(X)$ is the CDF of an individual event, and $F_{max}(X)$ is the CDF for maximum impact load considering the individual impact event happens N times. The underlying assumption is that all impact events are independent and represent samples from the same distribution. Although quite simplified, these assumptions are logical and present a plausible result given the limited information from only two years of data. The distribution of the maximum ice load in 75 years for each site is plotted in Figure 8-1. Using the CDF function given above for the 75-year extreme event, the probability of exceedance at any given load level X can be calculated as

$$Pr = 1 - F_{max}(X) = 1 - F_{single}(X)^N \quad (\text{Eq. 8-2})$$

The curves below were generated using Equations 8-1 and 8-2, using the fitted lognormal parameters shown earlier in Section 7 for the single impact event (blue curve). The 75-year maximum event curve (red) was generated using Equation 8-2.




Figure 8-1: Transfer of Individual Impact CDF to 75-year Maximum Impact CDF

8.2 Comparison to AASHTO Ice Load Design Loads

As discussed previously, the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) currently uses the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications (AASHTO 2014) calculations when designing new bridges (see Section 5.3). The crushing force case controls for the two sites studied since the piers are vertical and the ice will not fail in bending. To compare the forces measured to the AASHTO code, calculations were completed using the transducer pipe as the column ($w = 12.75$ inches = 1.0625 ft) for both sites. Since a variety of options on effective ice strength are provided by AASHTO depending on the condition of the ice (four levels at 8, 16, 24, and 32 ksf), it is unclear what ice strength level provides a reasonable estimate. Based on the ice-thickness map generated from the previous study, it is reasonable to assume that the ice thickness at the monitoring sites could be taken as 2.5 ft. This yields a w/t ratio smaller than 6. Thus the applicable AASHTO ice load formula is

$$F_c = C_a p t w \quad (\text{Eq. 8-3})$$

$$C_a = \left(\frac{5t}{w} + 1 \right)^{0.5} \quad (\text{Eq. 8-4})$$

In addition, for small streams, the AASHTO code allows a maximum 50% reduction factor (k_1) to be applied to the calculated design load. With the actual A/r^2 value of the two sites unknown, we can assume the maximum reduction in order to explore the bounds for AASHTO design load.

Table 8-2: Design Ice Loads per AASHTO Code

Effective Ice Strength (ksf)	Design Ice Loads (kips)			
	8	16	24	32
James River Site with Reduction Factor	61	122	184	276
James River Site without Reduction Factor	122	245	367	551

Big Sioux River Site with Reduction Factor	37	73	110	147
Big Sioux River Site without Reduction Factor	73	147	220	294

Based on this assumption, the codified ice load for the two monitoring sites on a 1-ft diameter circular column is listed in Table 8-2.

The equation for the reliability index is:

$$P_f = \phi(-\beta) \quad (\text{Eq. 8-5})$$

where:

P_f = probability of failure

$\phi(x)$ = standard normal cumulative distribution function

β = reliability index

Based on the definition, a reliability index of 3.5 is equivalent to a probability of failure of 2.3×10^{-4} (approximately 1 in 4350) during the 75-year design life of a structure. However, this probability of failure is calculated considering both the probabilistic distribution of the demand and the structural capacity, as well as the design approach itself. In the case of this study, the only information we have is on the load side. Thus we can only investigate the probability of the actual maximum ice load in 75 years exceeding the codified ice load calculation results under different conditions. Under the assumption that the structural design approach will ensure there will be additional safety reserve in the structural member capacity estimation, it is safe to assume that if the comparison between the codified load calculation and extreme load statistics can yield a reliability index greater than 3, the code formula is safe to be used. Table 8-3 lists the probability of exceedance and the reliability index of the design load calculation applied to both sites assuming different values of ice strength, considering a 75-year design life.

Table 8-3: Probability of Exceedance and Corresponding Reliability Index for 75-Year Design Life

	Probability of Exceedance, p (Reliability Index, β)*			
	8	16	24	32
Effective Ice Strength (ksf)	8	16	24	32
James River Site with Reduction Factor	1 (NA)	1 (NA)	1 (NA)	0.98 (NA)
James River Site without Reduction Factor	1 (NA)	0.98 (NA)	0.0497 (1.6)	0.0014 (3.0)
Big Sioux River Site with Reduction Factor	1 (NA)	0.91 (NA)	0.086 (2.4)	6.9×10^{-5} (3.8)
Big Sioux River Site without Reduction Factor	0.91 (NA)	6.59×10^{-5} (3.8)	2.57×10^{-8} (5.4)	3.99×10^{-11} (6.5)

From the probability of failure analysis for the James River site presented in Table 8-3, it can be seen that, to be safe, one should use 32 ksf effective ice strength, with the ice thickness obtained from the USGS study ice thickness map, and without taking small stream reduction.

9.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The ice load monitoring device custom-designed for this study was able to achieve accurate load measurements in a laboratory environment. The on-site strain measurements of the device were affected by the long-term temperature variations. However, this effect was removed by using a data filtering technique to identify dynamic impact events. The traditional strain gauge is temperature sensitive and can have poor fidelity over long duration. Given the opportunity in the future, researchers should consider other force measurement devices that are less sensitive to long-term environmental effects.

The on-site data collection and transmission system operated satisfactorily under harsh winter conditions to provide uninterrupted data. The protection measures applied during installation were able to help the system withstand winter and spring loading and debris conditions.

The measured ice strength from the sites over two years varied significantly depending on temperature and ice condition. The maximum strength can reach greater than 600 psi during the middle of the winter. However, the measured ice crushing strength should not be directly used as the effective ice strength in the AASHTO LRFD Code design equations.

The ice impact loads at the sites can be fitted to a lognormal distribution. Based on the assumed annual number of impact events and basic statistics calculations, the 75-year maximum ice load for the James River site was calculated to have a median of 174.5 kips. The 75-year maximum ice load for the Big Sioux River site was calculated to have a median of 81.5 kips. Based on the comparison of the observed ice load statistics with the design calculations, the design using 222 psi (32 ksf) equivalent ice strength without the small stream reduction factor was found to provide a minimum reliability index of 3.0 for both sites.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Calculation of Ice Loads

The South Dakota Department of Transportation should use an effective ice strength of 32 ksf, ice thickness as given in SD98-04-F, and no reduction for small streams for structural design.

For flows similar to the James and the Big Sioux rivers, we recommend that SDDOT use an effective ice strength of 32 ksf for small streams as listed in AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications and obtain the ice thickness from the ice thickness map contained in the SDDOT report “Estimation of Ice Thickness and Strength for Determination of Lateral Ice Loads on Bridge Substructures in South Dakota SD98-04-F.” We also recommend that SDDOT should not consider the small stream reduction factor given in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications when calculating ice loads for flows similar to those that form on the James and the Big Sioux rivers.

These recommendations are based on the fact that using the ice thickness map data and 32 ksf effective ice strength together with the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications requirements will generate design ice load values that result in a reliability index greater than 3.0 for both sites. It should be noted that this recommendation is based on the comparison between the AASHTO load calculation and the extreme ice load statistics derived from two-year monitoring data at the two selected sites. Although the data are limited, the research team feels that the recommendation is on the safe side of AASHTO recommendations and is supported by existing data with reasonable reliability. The exclusion of ice dams and the limitation to small streams is in place because of the nature of the monitoring sites where data were generated.

10.2 Further Monitoring Efforts

The South Dakota Department of Transportation should commission work to redesign the ice load monitoring system and collect data for at least 5 years from river sites that may induce more critical ice load conditions.

This recommendation is contingent upon the need to conduct a comprehensive ice load calibration for South Dakota rivers. If there is no immediate need, this recommendation will not be applicable. If there is a need to perform this calibration, we recommend that SDDOT consider the possibility of conducting more data collection on ice impact load for a longer period of time (preferably more than five years) and at sites that cover more critical conditions (such as thick ice sheet floats and ice dams). The potential benefit of conducting this work is to develop an understanding of the realistic ice load demands in these locations and eventually correlate the ice load with weather and geographical data in South Dakota, as well as developing a viable and scalable procedure for river ice load monitoring. Ideally the sites where ice impact damage was observed on bridge structures should be included. Based on experience from this project, the following modifications of the study plan should be implemented:

- 1) The monitoring system should be redesigned with a focus on its sensitivity to long term temperature variations in an as-installed configuration (rather than only relying on the laboratory testing and calibration).
- 2) Conduct the study in two phases. The first phase will only conduct field trial at limited sites, collect data for 1 to 2 years, and adjust the design of the monitoring system to yield

satisfactory results. The second phase will then replicate the validated system at multiple sites and collect data for a longer period (5 to 10 years).

- 3) Supplement the ice load measurement with visual data, preferably using remote cameras to link the measurements with images reflecting river conditions.
- 4) It will be beneficial to seek collaboration with other research entities that have the capacity to conduct scaled modeling or ice floe characterization, such as the US Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Lab.

With the experience gathered and lessons learned from this study, it is likely that researchers will be able to improve the current design and obtain better ice load data. The likelihood of the success of the subsequent study depends on the plan for improving the monitoring device. Before expanding the monitoring effort to other sites, if the existing sites can be used as test sites for the improved design, the chance of getting improved quality data will be very high.

11.0 RESEARCH BENEFITS

The research presented in this report is the first of its kind in the literature where an ice load monitoring device was developed to measure ice loads on bridge columns in small streams. Based on the measured ice impact loads at two selected sites, this study provided for the first time realistic ice impact data for use by the SDDOT Office of Bridge Design. The study recommended a method of calculating small-stream ice loads (except for ice dam conditions) that will help bring consistency to bridge design practices in South Dakota. A secondary benefit from this study was to explore the feasibility of direct ice load monitoring for bridge sub-structures. Future research will benefit from the results of this study through implementing refinements to the ice load monitoring system and selection of statistically significant duration for ice load monitoring and data collection.

12.0 REFERENCES

- AASHTO, 2014, AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications with 2015 Interim Revisions, Seventh Edition, Washington DC.
- Ahmed, D, 1994, Ice loads on conical piers: A finite element investigation, International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering, 4(1), pg: 53-61
- Brown, T.G et al., 2010, Extreme Ice Load Events on the Confederation Bridge, Cold Regions Science and Technology, 60, pg: 1-14.
- Frederking, RMW, Sayed, M., and Penney, G. 1992, Ice forces on light piers in the St. Lawrence Seaway, International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering, 2(1), pg: 67-72
- Jochmann P., Evers K., and Kuehnlein WL. 2003, Model testing of ice barriers used for reduction of design ice loads, Proceedings of 22nd International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering, Cancun, Mexico.
- Lever J. and Gooch G. 2001, Design of Cazenovia Creek ice control structure, Journal of Cold Regions Engineering, 15(2), pg: 103-124
- Timco GW., Nwogu OG., and Christensen FT., 1995, Compliant model tests with the Great Belt West Bridge piers in ice Part I: Test methods and key results, Cold Region Science and Technology, 23, pg: 149-164.
- Yuan Z., Yu T., and Zhang H., 2009, Research on percussive force of river ice and bridge, Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Modeling and Simulation, Manchester, UK.
- American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC) (2011). Steel Construction Manual, Fourteenth Edition.
- Beltaos, S., Miller, L., Burrell, B. C., and Sullivan D. (2007). "Hydraulic Effects of Ice Breakup on Bridges." National Research Council Research Press Web Site, Can. J. Civ. Eng. 34, 539-548.
- Brown, T. G., Croasdale, K. R., and Wright, B. (1996). "Ice Loads on the Northumberland Strait Bridge Piers – An Approach." International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference, 367-372.
- Brown, T. G., Tibbo, J. S., Tripathi, D., Obert, K., and Shrestha, N. (2009). "Extreme Ice Load Events on the Confederation Bridge." Cold Regions Science and Technology, Cold Regions Science and Technology 60, 1-14.
- Gerard, R. (1983). "River and Lake Ice Processes Relevant to Ice Loads." Design for Ice Forces: A State of the Practice Report, 121-138.
- Haynes, F. D., Sodhi, D. S., Zabilansky, L. J., and Clark, C. H. (1991). "Ice Force Measurements on a Bridge Pier in the St. Regis River, New York." U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Cold Regions Research & Engineering Laboratory, Special Report 91-14, 1-6.
- Montgomery, C. J., Gerard, R., and Lipsett, A. W. (1980). "Dynamic Response of Bridge Piers to Ice Forces." National Research Council of Canada, Can. J. Civ. Eng. 7, 345-356.
- Montgomery, C. J., Gerard, R., Huiskamp, W. J., and Kornelsen, R. W. (1984). "Application of Ice Engineering to Bridge Design Standards." Canadian Society for Civil Engineering, 795-810.

- Neill, C. R. (1976). "Dynamic Ice Forces on Piers and Piles. An Assessment of Design Guidelines in the Light of Recent Research." National Research Council of Canada, Can. J. Civ. Eng. 3, 305-341.
- Niehus, C. A. (2002). "Estimation of Ice Thickness and Strength for Determination of Lateral Ice Loads on Bridge Substructures in South Dakota." South Dakota Department of Transportation Office of Research, SD98-04-F, 1-64.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 2002, Estimation of Ice Thickness and Strength for Determination of Lateral Ice Loads on Bridge Substructures in South Dakota, Technical Report SD98-04-F, September 2002.