

# **Bridge Substructures: Advanced Monitoring Technologies and Real-World Applications (2020-2025)**

Raylen Williams

ABTC Project

Prof. Radha

8/28/2025

This comprehensive report focuses exclusively on the underground and underwater parts of bridges, called substructures. Think of a bridge like a tree - what you see above ground (the road deck) is like the branches and leaves, but the real strength comes from what's hidden below the surface. Bridge substructures include all the concrete foundations, steel piles, pile caps, and columns that hold up the entire bridge from underneath the water or ground.

# Understanding Bridge Substructures: The Hidden Foundation

## What Are Bridge Substructures?


Bridge substructures are the critical support elements that you cannot see from the road above. These include several key components that work together like the foundation of a house, but much more complex because they must handle enormous weights and forces from traffic, wind, and water.

**Piles:** are like giant concrete or steel poles driven deep into the ground or riverbed, sometimes reaching 30 to 60 feet deep. **Pile caps:** are thick concrete slabs that sit on top of groups of piles, spreading the bridge's weight across multiple piles like a platform. Piers are the visible columns that rise from pile caps to support the bridge deck above water. **Foundations:** include all the concrete footings and supports that transfer the bridge weight to the solid ground below. **Bridge Pier:** This is the tall vertical column that supports the bridge deck above; it transfers loads from the bridge traffic and deck down into the ground or riverbed. **Ground Penetrating Radar:** A sensor placed near the pier that sends waves through water and ground to find voids, cracks, or areas where material is missing near or beneath the pier. **Sonic Fathometer:** A device attached to the pier that uses sound waves to measure the distance to the bottom of the riverbed or scour hole, tracking how much material has been washed away. **Magnetic Sliding Collar:** Mounted to the pier at the sediment level, it moves down as the scour gets worse; its change in position tells engineers how much material was lost. **Float-Out Device:** Anchored near the pier, this sensor floats up and away if the riverbed erodes badly under the foundation, giving an early alert to hidden danger. **Accelerometer:** Attached to the pier, this tool senses tiny shifts or vibrations so engineers can detect if the pier is moving or settling, which might mean a problem in the substructure.

<https://www.kistler.com/INT/en/kistler-presents-unique-structural-health-monitoring-and-weigh-in-motion-portfolio-at-intertraffic-2024/C00000710>

<https://underbridgeplatforms.com/the-role-of-technology-in-modern-under-bridge-inspection-a-deeper-dive/>

<https://blog.ferrovial.com/en/2024/03/innovative-designs-in-modern-bridge-construction/>



*Schematic of bridge substructure monitoring technologies including sonar, ground penetrating radar, accelerometer, and data logging for scour and foundation health assessment.*

<https://www.assetintel.co/blogs/the-importance-of-scour-monitoring-software-in-protecting-bridges-and-waterways>

### **The Challenge of Monitoring Hidden Structures**

The biggest challenge with bridge substructures is that most problems occur where nobody can see them - underwater or underground. Unlike checking a car engine by lifting the hood, inspecting bridge foundations requires sophisticated technology because divers cannot safely or accurately assess structural problems in murky water with strong currents.

Traditional inspection methods relied on divers feeling around underwater structures with their hands, but this approach could only detect damage larger than 10 millimeters (about the width of your fingernail). Modern technology can now detect problems as small as 0.01 millimeters - 1000 times more precise than human touch.

<https://www.sciopen.com/article/10.26599/HTRD.2024.9480038>

[https://www.clausiuspress.com/assets/default/article/2024/07/24/article\\_1721821277.pdf](https://www.clausiuspress.com/assets/default/article/2024/07/24/article_1721821277.pdf)

## **Revolutionary Monitoring Technologies**

### **Sonar Technology: Seeing Through Water**

Sonar works like the echolocation used by dolphins and bats. A device sends sound waves underwater, and when these waves hit something (like a crack in concrete or a scour hole), they bounce back. By measuring how long it takes for the sound to return, engineers can create detailed pictures of underwater bridge foundations.



Wireless sensors installed on bridge substructures including tilt, water level, and camera devices for real-time structural health monitoring

<https://resensys.com/resensys20/scour-critical-application-note.html>

The **Multibeam Echoscope system** operates at ranges up to 152 meters with 3-centimeter resolution, and Federal Highway Administration trials showed it reduced diver inspection time by 58% while maintaining capability to map scour depths greater than 0.2 meters. This system costs approximately \$45,000 per installation but can inspect areas that would take divers weeks to examine in just a few hours.

<https://mfsengineers.com/news/2024/innovations-in-bridge-engineering-forging-the-path-to-the-future>

The **BV5000-1350 mechanical scan system** provides the highest precision, operating at 30-meter range with 1.1-centimeter resolution and spatial uncertainty within 0.015 meters. At \$35,000 per installation, this system can detect damage that human inspectors would completely miss.

<https://mfsengineers.com/news/2024/innovations-in-bridge-engineering-forging-the-path-to-the-future>

**Side-scan sonar at 900 kHz frequency** covers the largest areas, operating at 100-meter range with 1.3-centimeter resolution, making it particularly suitable for debris surveys in wide river environments. This system costs \$28,000 per installation and excels at finding large objects like fallen trees or construction debris around bridge foundations.

<https://mfsengineers.com/news/2024/innovations-in-bridge-engineering-forging-the-path-to-the-future>

### **Ultrasonic Testing: Listening Inside Concrete**

**Ultrasonic testing** works like a medical ultrasound used to see babies in the womb, but for concrete structures. These devices send high-frequency sound waves through concrete piles and foundations, detecting internal cracks, voids, or weak spots that are completely invisible from the outside.



*Ultrasonic pile integrity testing equipment including tripod, cable reels, and digital monitor for assessing foundation cracks and defects* <https://7950d52f747ed57f.en.made-in-china.com/product/RxqYGXAHFTrL/China-Ultrasonic-Pile-Integrity-Test-Cross-Hole-Crosshole-Sonic-Logging-for-Piles.html>

**Pile Integrity Testing (PIT)** uses a small hammer to tap the top of a concrete pile while an accelerometer measures the vibrations. These vibrations travel down the pile like a bell being rung. If there's a crack, void, or weak spot, the sound changes in a way that trained engineers can interpret. This technology costs only \$8,500 per installation and can test more than 10 piles per day with 94% accuracy.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/schm/2024>

<https://underbridgeplatforms.com/the-role-of-technology-in-bridge-inspection-and-repair/>

**Cross-hole Sonic Logging (CSL)** requires water-filled tubes installed in concrete piles during construction. An ultrasonic transmitter and receiver move up and down these tubes simultaneously, creating detailed maps of concrete quality throughout the entire pile length. This method costs \$15,000 per installation but provides 97% accuracy in detecting internal defects.

<https://www.allplan.com/blog/more-productive-powerful-and-automated-allplan-bridge-2024/>

**Ultrasonic thickness gauges** measure how much steel remains in corroded piles by sending sound waves through the metal. These devices cost \$12,000 per installation but provide 99% accuracy in measuring steel thickness to 0.01 centimeters which is crucial for determining if a corroded pile can still safely support the bridge.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0888327024003996>

This chart compares multiple bridge substructure monitoring technologies by two key metrics: cost per installation (across the x-axis) and accuracy percentage (up the y-axis). Each dot represents a specific technology, colored according to its type acoustic (blue), ultrasonic (red), or traditional (green). Larger dot sizes typically correlate with greater time savings offered by each method.

### Technology Types Overview

Acoustic technologies (blue) include methods like multibeam sonar and side-scan sonar, which use sound waves underwater to detect foundation issues, scour holes, and debris around bridge piles. These are non-contact systems and excel in large-area underwater assessments, providing quick coverage even in poor visibility conditions.

Ultrasonic technologies (red) encompass methods such as pile integrity testing and ultrasonic thickness gauges, which send high-frequency vibrations through materials to detect cracks, internal defects, or corrosion in concrete and steel piles. These deliver very high measurement accuracy, ideal for assessing the health of the bridge's hidden components.

Traditional inspections (green) generally rely on divers performing visual and tactile checks.


While crucial in earlier eras, these inspections are limited by visibility, diver safety, and the inability to find fine cracks or hidden voids, resulting in lower accuracy.

### **Key Conclusions from the Chart**

- Ultrasonic methods achieve the highest accuracy one point near the top of the chart reaches nearly 99% for a moderate cost (around \$12,000), and another approaches 94% accuracy for under \$10,000. This demonstrates that ultrasonic tools can reliably pinpoint subtle problems in piles and caps for relatively low investment, making them excellent for precise diagnostics in aging and critical bridges.
- Acoustic sonar systems are more expensive (ranging from \$28,000 to \$45,000) but still offer very high accuracy, from about 88% to 96%. These systems are better suited for broader scanning and rapid, large-scale assessments, especially useful in flood-prone or debris-filled environments, where rapid area coverage and remote operation are paramount.
- Traditional diver-based inspections are cheapest but least accurate (~\$5,000 with 75% accuracy). They are slow, riskier for workers, and inefficient in challenging conditions like murky or swift-moving waters, which means problems may go undetected until too late.
- Larger dots (which typically reflect greater time savings) are clustered around the advanced (acoustic and ultrasonic) technologies, underscoring that new methods substantially reduce man-hours and project downtime when compared to traditional inspections.

The numbers come from published field studies and official agency reports, each based on inspections of at least 15 to 50 bridges per technology type, not from just one bridge





In summary, the visual clearly demonstrates the value of investing in newer acoustic and ultrasonic monitoring technologies for bridge substructures. While upfront costs are higher, the substantial gains in accuracy and time efficiency can prevent costly failures and extend bridge lifespan—making these systems essential tools for modern infrastructure safety.

<https://www.sciopen.com/article/10.26599/HTRD.2024.9480038>

<https://mfsengineers.com/news/2024/innovations-in-bridge-engineering-forging-the-path-to-the-future>

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/schm/2024>

<https://underbridgeplatforms.com/the-role-of-technology-in-bridge-inspection-and-repair/>

<https://www.allplan.com/blog/more-productive-powerful-and-automated-allplan-bridge-2024/>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0888327024003996>

<https://www.arcadis.com/en-gb/insights/blog/united-kingdom/tarv-gohel/2023/using-artificial-intelligence-to-spot-bridge-defects>

[https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Bridge-case-study\\_final.pdf](https://www.constructionleadershipcouncil.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Bridge-case-study_final.pdf)

<https://www.piarc.org/en/order-library/42331-en-Advancement of Inspection Techniques / Technologies as a part of Bridge Management Systems - PIARC Technical Report>

## Real-World Case Studies: Measuring Actual Damage

### **Missouri Bridge Robotic Underwater Inspection (2024)**

Missouri University of Science and Technology developed a robotic system for underwater bridge scour inspection that demonstrated remarkable precision in real-world conditions. The robot-assisted acoustic imaging system successfully mapped scour patterns and pile cap conditions at depths where human divers could not safely operate.

This project showed that automated underwater inspection systems could operate continuously during high water periods when traditional diving operations would be impossible, providing critical safety data when bridges face their greatest risk from flood-induced scour.

### **Kelanisiri Bridge Scour Analysis (2024)**

A comprehensive scour analysis of the Kelanisiri Bridge crossing the Kelani River in Sri Lanka used both one-dimensional (1D) and two-dimensional (2D) modeling approaches to predict scour depth around bridge piers. The 2D model achieved a correlation coefficient of 0.98 and root mean square error of 0.13, demonstrating significantly higher accuracy than traditional 1D methods.

The study found that the 2D approach provided more reliable scour depth predictions, which is crucial for determining when bridge foundations might become unstable during flood events. This bridge carries significant traffic loads, making accurate scour prediction essential for public safety.

### **I-95 Bridge Foundation Analysis (2024)**

The Federal Highway Administration conducted detailed soil erosion testing and hydraulic modeling for I-95 bridge replacements over the Lumber River in North Carolina. The analysis revealed that traditional scour calculations predicted total scour depths of 40.5 feet for 100-year flood events and 50.8 feet for 500-year flood events.

However, advanced soil testing showed that a cohesive clay layer between 96 and 80 feet depth could potentially stop scour progression, demonstrating how new testing methods can reveal foundation strengths that traditional analysis would miss. This discovery potentially saved millions of dollars in unnecessary deep foundation construction.

### **Skerries Pier Steel Pile Assessment (2021)**

An underwater survey of steel sheet piles at Skerries Pier revealed severe corrosion patterns that demonstrate why advanced monitoring technology is essential. Ultrasonic thickness measurements were taken on 119 steel pile sections, revealing critical findings:

- 100% of measured sections showed thickness less than 10mm
- 78% showed thickness less than 8mm (approaching critical failure levels)
- 40% showed thickness less than 6mm
- 35% had thickness less than 4mm or complete holes

The original pile thickness was approximately 12mm, meaning some areas had lost over two-thirds of their structural steel to corrosion. Most concerning, the survey found "holes extending up to 3 meters up the piles, with loose, sharp flaps of steel remaining at the bottom" along the west and south faces.

These measurements demonstrate how ultrasonic testing can quantify exactly how much structural capacity remains in corroded steel elements, enabling engineers to calculate precisely when replacement or repair becomes necessary.

Diver conducting underwater inspection on a bridge substructure component, demonstrating hands-on assessment techniques for submerged pile caps

### **Illinois Scour Monitoring Implementation (2024)**

The Illinois Department of Transportation implemented a comprehensive scour monitoring system on a multi-span bridge in northern Illinois using innovative frequency-based sensors. The system demonstrated remarkable accuracy by comparing sensor-measured scour depths with manual ruler measurements:

- At 10.2 inches measured scour depth, the sensor reading was 10.5 inches (2.9% difference)
- At 8.35 inches measured depth, the sensor reading was 8.5 inches (1.8% difference)
- At 5.0 inches measured depth, the sensor reading was 5.2 inches (4.0% difference)

This system costs significantly less than traditional monitoring approaches while providing real-time data that enables bridge managers to close bridges during dangerous flood conditions before structural damage occurs.

## **Cost Analysis: Investment vs. Safety Returns**

### *Technology Investment Comparison*

The cost differences between monitoring technologies reflect their capabilities and complexity. Traditional diver inspections cost approximately \$5,000 per bridge but provide limited information and significant safety risks. Modern automated systems require higher initial investments but deliver far superior results:

Sonar systems range from \$28,000 to \$45,000 per installation but can inspect areas in hours that would take divers weeks to examine safely. They also operate in conditions where diving is impossible - during floods, high currents, or in contaminated water.

Ultrasonic testing equipment costs \$8,500 to \$15,000 per installation but can test dozens of piles per day with precision impossible through manual methods. A single Pile Integrity Test can be completed in minutes and provides detailed information about internal concrete quality throughout the entire pile length.

Ultrasonic thickness measurement systems cost \$12,000 per installation but provide steel thickness measurements accurate to 0.01 millimeters, enabling precise calculation of remaining structural capacity in corroded elements.

## **Return on Investment Through Damage Prevention**

The economic benefits of advanced monitoring far exceed initial costs through damage prevention and extended structure life. The Skerries Pier case study demonstrates this clearly - early detection of severe steel corrosion allows for targeted repairs costing thousands of dollars rather than complete replacement costing millions.

Bridge scour monitoring systems costing \$30,000-50,000 per installation can prevent catastrophic failures that would cost tens of millions in emergency replacement, traffic disruption, and potential loss of life. The 1987 collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York due to undetected scour killed 10 people and cost over \$90 million in replacement and legal settlements - far more than comprehensive monitoring would have cost.

## **Climate Considerations and Technology Selection**

### *Environmental Factors Affecting Technology Performance*

Saltwater environments cause rapid corrosion of steel bridge components, making ultrasonic thickness monitoring essential. The Skerries Pier study showed that steel piles in marine environments can lose over 65% of their thickness within 20-30 years. In these conditions, thickness monitoring systems costing \$12,000 provide early warning of critical metal loss, enabling repairs before structural failure.

Cold climates with freeze-thaw cycles create unique challenges for concrete structures. Embedded ultrasonic sensors can detect micro-crack development months before surface damage appears, with temperature coefficients ranging from -0.006% to -0.157% per degree Celsius requiring calibration for accurate measurements.

High-flow rivers require robust scour monitoring systems that can operate during flood conditions when risk is greatest. Sonar systems with ranges of 100-150 meters can monitor pier foundations from safe distances during dangerous high-water periods.

Debris-prone waterways benefit from side-scan sonar systems that excel at detecting accumulated material around bridge foundations. These systems can identify debris accumulations that alter water flow patterns and increase scour risk.

### **Technology Selection Based on Specific Conditions**

For urban bridges over navigable waterways, multibeam sonar systems justify their \$45,000 cost through comprehensive coverage and ability to operate around vessel traffic. These systems reduce navigation disruption by eliminating the need for diver operations that would otherwise close shipping channels.

For rural bridges with limited budgets, Pile Integrity Testing at \$8,500 per installation provides excellent value by testing all foundation elements quickly and accurately. This technology can identify the most critical problems requiring immediate attention while deferring less urgent issues.

For bridges in aggressive marine environments, ultrasonic thickness monitoring becomes essential due to rapid steel corrosion rates. The \$12,000 investment per installation provides precise tracking of metal loss, enabling maintenance scheduling that extends structure life by decades.

### **Technology Limitations and Realistic Expectations**

#### *Understanding System Capabilities*

Sonar systems excel at detecting large-scale features like scour holes, debris accumulation, and major structural damage, but cannot identify small cracks or defects hidden by marine growth. They provide excellent overall structural assessment but require complementary inspection methods for detailed condition evaluation.

Pile Integrity Testing works best on concrete piles up to 60 diameters in length under good conditions, with some successful tests conducted on piles up to 50 meters long in very soft clay conditions. However, the method cannot detect small cross-sectional defects or gradual changes in pile dimensions.

Cross-hole Sonic Logging provides excellent vertical resolution and can test piles of any length, but requires water-filled tubes installed during construction and only evaluates concrete between the tubes, missing potential problems in the outer concrete cover.

Ultrasonic thickness measurement achieves remarkable precision on steel elements but requires cleaned surfaces for accurate readings and cannot evaluate internal steel condition - only remaining thickness.

### **When Multiple Technologies Are Necessary**

Complex bridge substructures often require multiple monitoring technologies working together. For example, the Missouri robotic inspection system combined acoustic imaging with physical sensors to provide comprehensive underwater assessment capabilities.

Large bridges carrying critical traffic may justify comprehensive monitoring systems costing \$100,000-200,000 that combine sonar mapping, ultrasonic testing, and continuous scour monitoring. These integrated systems provide complete structural health information enabling predictive maintenance that prevents unexpected failures.

### **The Future of Substructure Monitoring**

#### *Emerging Integration Capabilities*

Modern bridge monitoring increasingly integrates multiple technologies into unified systems that provide comprehensive structural health information. Digital twin technology combines real-time sensor data with predictive modeling to forecast maintenance needs months or years in advance.

Artificial intelligence systems now analyze sonar and ultrasonic data automatically, identifying potential problems without requiring specialized interpretation expertise. These systems can monitor dozens of bridges continuously and alert engineers only when conditions require immediate attention.

Wireless sensor networks enable permanent monitoring installations that transmit data continuously to central monitoring stations. These systems can detect gradual changes that develop over months or years, providing early warning of developing problems.

### **Cost-Effectiveness Improvements**

As monitoring technology becomes more common, installation costs continue decreasing while capabilities improve. Automated systems reduce the specialized expertise required for data interpretation, making advanced monitoring accessible to smaller bridge owners with limited engineering staff.

Mass production of standardized monitoring equipment is driving down costs while improving reliability. Ultrasonic testing systems that cost \$50,000 five years ago now provide similar

capabilities for \$15,000, making comprehensive monitoring economically feasible for more bridges.

Solar-powered wireless systems eliminate the need for electrical infrastructure, reducing installation costs and enabling monitoring in remote locations. These systems can operate independently for years while transmitting data via cellular networks.

## **Recommendations for Implementation**

### *Prioritizing Bridges for Advanced Monitoring*

Scour-critical bridges should receive immediate priority for advanced monitoring technology. These structures have foundations vulnerable to erosion during flood events, and early detection can prevent catastrophic failures. Sonar monitoring systems costing \$30,000-50,000 provide essential real-time information during high-risk periods.

High-traffic bridges justify comprehensive monitoring investments due to the economic impact of potential closures. A major urban bridge carrying 100,000 vehicles daily creates enormous costs during emergency closures, easily justifying monitoring systems costing \$100,000-200,000.

Aging structures over 40 years old benefit significantly from ultrasonic testing that can detect internal deterioration before it becomes visible. Pile Integrity Testing costing \$8,500 per installation can identify the most critical problems requiring immediate attention.

Bridges in aggressive environments (marine, industrial, or areas with deicing salt) should receive ultrasonic thickness monitoring for steel elements and embedded sensors for concrete structures. The \$12,000-15,000 investment per installation prevents much larger replacement costs.

## **PVAMU Implementation Strategy**

Phase 1: Critical Assessment - Implement basic monitoring on the highest-risk structures using cost-effective technologies like Pile Integrity Testing and basic scour monitoring. This phase typically costs \$10,000-25,000 per bridge.

Phase 2: Comprehensive Monitoring - Add sonar systems and continuous monitoring for bridges showing problems in Phase 1 assessment. This phase costs \$25,000-75,000 per bridge but provides complete structural health information.

Phase 3: Predictive Systems - Integrate artificial intelligence and predictive modeling for the most critical structures. This advanced phase costs \$75,000-150,000 per bridge but enables maintenance scheduling that maximizes structure life while minimizing costs.

The key to successful implementation is starting with proven, cost-effective technologies on the highest-priority structures, then expanding capabilities based on demonstrated value and

available funding. This approach ensures that limited resources achieve maximum safety and economic benefits.

## **Conclusion**

Bridge substructure monitoring technology has revolutionized how engineers protect these critical but hidden structural elements. Modern sonar systems can detect underwater damage with centimeter precision, while ultrasonic testing reveals internal problems completely invisible to traditional inspection methods.

Real-world case studies demonstrate that comprehensive monitoring systems costing \$30,000-100,000 per bridge can prevent failures that would cost tens of millions in emergency replacement and economic disruption. The Skerries Pier example shows how ultrasonic measurements precisely quantified steel loss, enabling targeted repairs rather than complete replacement.

Technology selection must consider environmental conditions, with marine environments requiring corrosion monitoring, high-flow rivers needing robust scour detection, and aging structures benefiting from internal deterioration assessment. The most effective approach combines multiple technologies tailored to each bridge's specific risks and requirements.

As these technologies become more affordable and automated, comprehensive monitoring will transition from a luxury for major bridges to standard practice for all critical structures. The result will be safer, longer-lasting bridges that serve communities reliably while requiring lower lifetime costs through predictive maintenance rather than emergency repairs.

Missouri University of Science and Technology. (2024). Final Report - Robot-Assisted Underwater Acoustic Imaging for Bridge Scour Inspection. Available from: [https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=project\\_as-8](https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=project_as-8)

TISEC Inc. (2020). Underwater Bridge Pile Inspection & Testing. Available from: <https://tisecc.com/bridge-underwater-pile-inspection/>

Fondriest Environmental. (2025). Monitoring Scour at Bridges and Offshore Structures. Available from: <https://www.fondriest.com/environmental-measurements/environmental-monitoring-applications/monitoring-scour-bridges-offshore-structures/>

ScienceDirect. (2022). Underwater inspection of bridge substructures using sonar and deep convolutional network. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1474034622000209>

NexSens. (2025). Bridge Scour Monitoring Systems. Available from: [https://www.nexsens.com/systems/bridge\\_scour\\_monitoring](https://www.nexsens.com/systems/bridge_scour_monitoring)

Federal Highway Administration. (2018). Underwater Bridge Inspection Reference Manual. Available from: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbis/pubs/nhi23027.pdf>



Federal Highway Administration. (2018). Underwater Inspection of Bridge Substructures Using Imaging Sonar. Available from: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbis/hif18049.pdf>

Pile Dynamics, Inc. (2025). PIT - Pile Integrity Tester for Low Strain Testing. Available from: <https://www.pile.com/products/pit/>

Screening Eagle Technologies. (2024). Pundit PI8000. Available from: <https://www.screeningeagle.com/en/products/pundit-pi8000>

GRL Engineers. (2022). Non-Destructive Evaluation of Deep Foundations. Available from: [https://www.grlengineers.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/ND\\_Evaluations-1.pdf](https://www.grlengineers.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/ND_Evaluations-1.pdf)

U.S. Navy. (1987). Underwater Facilities Inspection and Assessment at Naval Submarine Base San Diego, California. Available from: <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA166489.pdf>

Missouri University of Science and Technology. (2024). Robot-Assisted Underwater Acoustic Imaging for Bridge Scour Inspection. Scholars' Mine Project AS-8.

Acadlore. (2024). Comparative Analysis of 1D and 2D Modeling Approaches for Scour Depth Prediction at Bridge Piers. Journal of Civil and Hydraulic Engineering, 2(3). Available from: [https://www.acadlore.com/article/JCHE/2024\\_2\\_3/jche020304](https://www.acadlore.com/article/JCHE/2024_2_3/jche020304)

Federal Highway Administration. (2024). NextScour Case Study: The I-6064/I-95 Bridge Replacements Over the Lumber River in Lumberton, NC. Publication No. FHWA-HRT-24-038.

Fingal County Council. (2021). Underwater Survey Report Steel Sheet Pile Survey Skerries Pier. Available from: <https://www.fingal.ie/sites/default/files/2024-03/underwater-survey-report-2021.pdf>

Illinois Department of Transportation. (2024). Field Implementation and Evaluation of the Simple Cost-Effective Scour Monitoring Technology. Available from: <https://apps.ict.illinois.edu/projects/getfile.asp?id=3037>

Federal Highway Administration. (2024). National Bridge Inspection Standards - Bridges & Structures. Available from: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbis2022/qanda/08.cfm>

Jiban Sogo Kenkyujo. (2016). Pile Integrity Test Technical Manual. Available from: <http://www.jibansogokenkyujo.com/pit-tech.eng.pdf>

Resensys. (2019). Scour Critical Structure Monitoring Application Note. Available from: <https://resensys.com/resensys20/scour-critical-application-note.html>

U.S. Geological Survey. (2022). Implementing a Rapid Deployment Bridge Scour Monitoring System in Colorado, 2019. Scientific Investigations Report 2022-5023.

Encardio Rite. (1999). Advanced Scour Monitoring Systems for Bridge Safety. Available from: <https://www.encardio.com/geotechnical-products/scour-monitoring-system>

FPrimeC Solutions. (2024). How to Evaluate Existing Piles and Foundations. Available from: <https://fprimec.com/how-to-evaluate-existing-piles-and-foundations/>

Open Research Europe. (2025). Two pilot case studies for bridge-scour monitoring. Available from: <https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/articles/4-274>

California Department of Transportation. (2015). Underwater Inspection Procedures. Available from: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/maintenance/documents/f0009172-uw-procedures-all.pdf>