

1 Postprint of: Kolerski T., Assessment of the ice jam potential on regulated rivers and reservoirs with the use of  
2 numerical model results, COLD REGIONS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, Vol. 191, iss. 11 (2021), 103372,  
3 DOI: [10.1016/j.coldregions.2021.103372](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2021.103372)

4

5 © 2021. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0  
6 license <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

---

7

## 8 Assessment of the ice jam potential on regulated rivers and reservoirs with 9 the use of numerical model results

---

10 Tomasz Kolerski

11 Gdańsk University of Technology, Faculty of Civil and Environmental Engineering,  
12 Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland  
13 tomasz.kolerski@pg.edu.pl

### 14 **Abstract**

15 This study presents an attempt at estimating the jam potential on rivers with significant  
16 anthropogenic intervention in the course or flow characteristics of the river. The DynaRiCE model  
17 was used for forecasting both the place and time of an ice jam occurrence. In this modified method,  
18 two ice parameters are subjected to analysis, namely the relative ice-to-water velocity ( $v_i/v_w$ ), and  
19 the ice thickness to single floe thickness ( $\eta_i/\eta_0$ ). Both variables were analyzed at two locations; first  
20 spot is the Odra River near Słubice-Frankfurt bridge (between 581 and 586 km), and the second is the  
21 Vistula section between the existing Włocławek dam (674.75 river km) and the planned Siarzewo  
22 dam (706.38 river km), covering a 31.6 km reach. Once the model is implemented in the selected  
23 areas, the numerical simulations were processed and the obtained results were analyzed in terms of  
24 ice accumulation and jamming. The results on both rivers shown some potential of ice jamming, due  
25 to the planned engineering works. In the case of the Odra river, it was indicated that ice jam  
26 potential increased during the ice run of high concentration in the average flow conditions. For the  
27 Vistula river two locations for ice jamming were designated and for both of the points an increase of  
28 the ice thickness by about 60 % from the initial, single flow thickness was observed. Also in this case,  
29 the area-averaged ice velocity in an initially specified location drops below 15% of the average water

30 velocity in that area. According to the used methodology, both cases are classified as 'ice jam  
31 probable' type.

32 **Keywords:** ice dynamics; ice jams; river engineering; Odra River; Vistula River

### 33 **1 Introduction**

34 A common issue in engineering practice is to estimate the ice congestion and jamming potential of  
35 rivers due to planned river engineering works or new run-of-river reservoirs and diversion dams. The  
36 task most often comes down to determining to what extent hydrotechnical structures will affect ice  
37 transport, and whether or not they will not stop the ice run during freeze-up and during spring or  
38 mid-winter breakup. In order to consider the fragmented ice cover at locations where border ice has  
39 grown across the river or where man-made structures form a surface barrier, drifting ice can  
40 accumulate and progress upstream (Svensson et al., 1989). This issue is not a trivial task and above  
41 all requires the determination of the impact of hydro-engineering structures on the ice dynamics.  
42 Analyses should additionally take into account other factors affecting ice flow; i.e., wind speed and  
43 direction, hydrological and meteorological factors, as well as flow regulation through diversion  
44 structures (Ashton, 1978; Grześ, 1991; Lal and Shen, 1991; White, 1999).

45 Historical observations provide a vision for researchers to know the severity of the ice-related flood  
46 damaging. Floods are most likely to occur on rivers that have experienced flooding in the past.  
47 Despite this, potential flood hazard may be unknown to some residents and local authorities, due to  
48 the long intervals of flood or the resident's recent arrival in the area (Kovachis et al., 2017). It is  
49 needed to be considered that reoccurring the ice jams may cause the geometric impacts on the river  
50 basins (Boucher et al., 2009). From an ecosystem perspective, a longer-term view may be more  
51 important than annual predictability (Timoney et al., 1997). Having access to data set, it is possible to  
52 illustrate how ice regime characteristics may have varied through time and space within the cold-  
53 region watercourse and examine some of the potential geomorphic responses associated with ice  
54 jam dynamics (Boucher et al., 2012). An important consideration is the inherent uncertainty in these

55 data sets, which must be factored into assessment of ice-jam flood history (Wolfe et al., 2020).  
56 Although, statistical information of ice processes helps to understand general trends in ice cover  
57 formation and ice movement, the complexity of the processes makes it nearly impossible to achieve  
58 a higher accuracy level (Kolerski, 2018). To predict water levels that can potentially occur as a result  
59 of ice jamming, it is necessary to apply one of several numerical models that are available. Regardless  
60 of which model is selected for application, certain hydraulic and morphologic data sets are needed  
61 (Beltaos and Burrell, 2015). However, by utilizing existing theories, a mathematical model of these  
62 processes can be developed. Such model can be used to provide a continuous description of river ice  
63 development based on a limited amount of field data. The model can also assist engineers in  
64 evaluating the possible beneficial and detrimental consequences of ice-control structures and flow  
65 regulation (Lal and Shen, 1991).

66 Following the model selection, the results of the modeling run, as well as scenarios of ice jams of  
67 different length and locations can be concluded (Beltaos, 2018). To quantify which factor influences  
68 the formation of ice jamming the most, a local parameter sensitivity analysis can be carried out to  
69 calculate the sensitivity of different parameters on ice jam flooding (Das and Lindenschmidt, 2020).  
70 In other words, a sensitivity analysis can be performed to evaluate changes in model predictions  
71 resulting from changes in several model input parameters. The parameters like: river flow rate,  
72 locations of ice jam formation, ice supply volume entering from upstream, downstream water level,  
73 and underside roughness (i.e. Manning's coefficient) of the ice cover and jam (Liu and Shen, 2005).

74 In recent years, knowledge about ice processes on rivers has been significantly improved, which is  
75 reflected in the developed mathematical models for simulating flow in rivers in winter conditions.  
76 The initial concept of the static ice jam theory, first developed by (Pariset et al., 1966; Pariset and  
77 Hauser, 1961) is based on a static balance of floating ice. It was further developed by (Uzuner and  
78 Kennedy, 1976, 1974) and used in a number of mathematical models. The basic ice jam stability  
79 concepts are categorized under common modular feature, and have been adopted in a number of

80 one-dimensional mathematical models, including the RIVJAM model developed by (Beltaos, 1983;  
81 Uzunur and Kennedy, 1976, 1974), the ICEJAM model (Flato and Gerard, 1986), RIVER1D (Hicks et al.,  
82 1992) and RIVICE (Lindenschmidt et al., 2012). Moreover, the theory behind the ice module in  
83 commercial softwares, such as the HEC RAS model or the MIKE11-ICE model closely follow static jam  
84 formulations (Brunner, 2002; Thériault et al., 2010). Since an ice jam is fully dynamic and three-  
85 dimensional in nature, modeling its occurrence and range often requires a more sophisticated  
86 approach. Therefore, Shen developed DynaRICE, a two-dimensional, depth-averaged coupled  
87 hydrodynamic and ice dynamic model of ice transport in rivers (Shen, 2010; Shen et al., 2000).

88 In the context of what can be defined in a broad sense as the impact assessment of river ice  
89 phenomena, one-dimensional modeling has been widely used to recreate magnitude of ice related  
90 flooding and maximum water levels reached in the river valley (Beltaos, 2003; Kandamby et al., 2010;  
91 Lindenschmidt et al., 2019; Lindenschmidt and Rokaya, 2019). In such an approach, model efficiency  
92 is significantly improved, however it assumes a regular distribution of ice velocity and thickness in a  
93 cross section. Therefore a two-dimensional model is implemented in the area, where a blockage is  
94 expected to occur (Shen and Liu, 2003; Su et al., 1997; Kolerski and Shen, 2015).

### 95 **1.1 Study site**

96 When selecting the model domain, it is important to refer to historical data and other evidence,  
97 including practical knowledge from the management of water systems and icebreaker crews. On this  
98 basis, river sections with a significant ice jam potential were determined, which were subjected to  
99 detailed numerical analyses. The assessment of the results of the numerical model in the context of  
100 the risk of an ice jam requires the area to be determined in which ice run slows noticeably and  
101 increases in concentration and thickness. Such locations are often places where the water flow  
102 diverges due to the existence of an island (Pawłowski, 2015), rapids or in the case of the channel  
103 being split into a number of distributaries (i.e. the ice jam in the St Clair delta (Kolerski and Shen,  
104 2015)). Furthermore, a reduction in the slope of the river bed or the water level (ice inflow to a

105 reservoir (Rădoane et al., 2010)), a narrowness in the channel as well as the presence of engineering  
106 structures, such as bridge piers will hamper ice transport (Wang et al., 2015).

### 107 **1.1.1 Odra River**

108 A good example in ice accumulation area, is a section of the natural border river - the Odra, which is  
109 characterized in terms of ice jamming potential by the Regional Water Management Board in  
110 Szczecin (RWMB Szczecin). Information on jam-prone sections of the Odra River mainly comes from  
111 observations made during annual icebreaking operations and published reports (RWMA, 2010).



112


113 **Figure 1. The catchment of the Upper and Middle sections of the Odra River**

114 The Odra River, similar to many European rivers, was modified in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century to establish  
115 stable conditions for navigation, and reduce bank erosion. Early river engineering works on the Odra  
116 River were mainly carried out by the construction of closure structures, built across secondary

117 channels to reduce floodplain conveyance and increase the main channel depth. The process was  
118 carried out until the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and caused a significant reduction in large winter  
119 flooding (Mudelsee et al., 2004). However, it did not affect the ice jam potential of the river.  
120 Currently, according to the Regional Water Management Authority in Szczecin (RWMA Szczecin), the  
121 lower section of the Odra River (about 200 km), which is a natural border between Poland and  
122 Germany, has 28 ice jam prone locations extending over more than one fourth of the river.

123 The Polish city of Słubice is located on the banks of the Odra River, which forms the border with  
124 Germany. According to RWMA Szczecin, the river in the vicinity of the city is particularly susceptible  
125 to ice jamming. As shown in (Kolerski, 2018), this is caused by the river narrowness and an additional  
126 reduction in the cross-section triggered by a single bridge pier (Słubice-Frankfurt bridge). In recent  
127 years, the city was at risk of flooding caused by ice jamming, e.g. in February 2010. Within the Odra-  
128 Vistula Flood Management Project (OVFMP), it is planned to rehabilitate all the existing structures on  
129 a 5 km reach of the river. The proposed system of spurs is designed in the form of extensions of the  
130 existing structures which are damaged to a varying degree (Kreft and Parzonka, 2007).

131 Detailed river bathymetry and shoreline data measured in 2017 for the OVFMP, are used for the  
132 study. The data is considered to represent the current state of the river, which is considered to be  
133 substantially rebuilt by the construction or reconstruction of spur dikes within the OVFMP. The  
134 conditions after project implementation are taken into account in the model domain by changing the  
135 shoreline to include all the proposed structures. Within the model domain, a sub-domain was  
136 selected where a quantitative jam analysis was conducted. The area includes a river section of about  
137 450 m long upstream of the Słubice – Frankfurt bridge. The location was selected based on the  
138 general trend in ice transport and the high potential of that area for ice jamming and accumulation.  
139 Quantitative comparisons of both the current and proposed river conditions for all the simulated  
140 cases are presented in Figure 2. The modifications are on the left bank along the whole river section,  
141 where the spur dikes are proposed.



142

143 **Figure 2** Water depth at average flow ( $Q_w = 276 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) for current (a) and proposed (b) conditions; sub-domain for  
 144 numerical jam analysis designated by arrow

### 145 1.1.2 Vistula River

146 If the area of interest has no historical evidence of ice jamming or its hydrodynamic features can

147 change significantly based on an executed river regulation plan, the entire reach should be included

148 in the mathematical modeling to the extent possible. Such is the case with regard to the Vistula

149 River, where a new reservoir is planned to be accomplished by the construction of a new dam in

150 Siarzewo, located at 706.4 river kilometers, which is about 30 km downstream of the existing

151 Włocławek dam.

152 Unlike the Odra, the Vistula River was regulated fragmentarily at the second half of the 19th century.

153 The river was divided between three countries, and only in the lower section (downstream of Silno –


154 see Figure 3), which formerly belonged to Prussia, )river engineering works proceeded to a large

155 extent. Currently, the river is in a state of gradual deterioration due to a lack of attention to

156 engineering works (Szymkiewicz, 2017). In addition, Włocławek diversion dam (the only reservoir  
157 functioning on the Vistula River) contributed to river degradation due to a pulsed water discharge  
158 which intensified the erosion downstream of the channel. From the beginning of the operation in the  
159 1970s until the 1990s, the hydropower plant provided peak power demand, temporarily causing  
160 rapid flow changes. The water discharge in the Vistula varied from about 400 m<sup>3</sup>/s during off-peak  
161 periods to as high as 2000 m<sup>3</sup>/s during peak operation (Babiński, 1982; Gosztowtt, 2018).

162 Włocławek diversion dam is a part of a low-head dam cascade developed in the 1950s (Szydłowski et  
163 al., 2015). The main purpose of the concept was to improve the Polish hydropower development  
164 potential and protection against flooding and water resource management for agricultural fields  
165 threatened by the draught. Recently, due to economic development and resultant increased traffic  
166 requirements from the Baltic Sea port (Gdańsk) to the south of the country, and removing electricity  
167 inadequacy in northern Poland have stimulated welcoming the old concept of the Lower Vistula  
168 Cascade operation (LVC). Siarzewo dam was first proposed at 706.38 river km, and the project is  
169 currently being designed (Kolerski, 2016).





170

171 **Figure 3** The Lower sections of the Vistula River—the black bars indicate locations for the proposed dams within the LVC,  
 172 with river mileage

173 **1.2 Ice condition description**

174 **1.2.1 Odra river**


175 The ice cover on the Odra River is dominantly formed from dynamic ice accumulation. A sketch of the  
 176 lower and middle Odra River is shown in Figure 4. Typically, the process of ice cover development is  
 177 initiated at Dąbie Lake, where static ice cover is formed first. Next, incoming ice floes may stop at the  
 178 leading edge of the ice cover on the lake or flow underneath the cover (Kolarski, 2018; Marszelewski  
 179 and Pawłowski, 2019). The rate of ice cover progression in the upstream direction is affected by the  
 180 water flow and ice conditions, as well as the high water levels on the Southern Baltic Sea through the

181 backwater effect and meteorological conditions. Ice cover formed from the accumulation of dynamic  
182 floes has a big potential for jam formation, as evidenced by yearly ice reports provided by RWMA  
183 Szczecin.

184 Besides natural processes, another important mechanism affecting the ice run is ice sluicing from the  
185 system of low-head reservoirs in the middle section of the Odra River (see Figure 4). It is noteworthy  
186 that a lack of coordinated icebreaking operations on the Odra and on the mentioned reservoirs could  
187 significantly increase the threat of ice jamming on the downstream section of the river. Such a  
188 situation occurred in February 2010, when ice sluicing started without prior consultation with the  
189 management of the Polish-German icebreaking operation. Breaking the ice on reservoirs and sluicing  
190 it through the spillways require an increment in discharge, which forms a surge in the downstream  
191 river section. To avoid uncontrolled breakup at the downstream section of the river, the surges must  
192 be evenly distributed over time. If ice sluicing occurs long before the icebreakers reach the edge of  
193 ice cover which is located at the upstream end of the reservoir along the river channel, the broken  
194 ice from the sluicing operation accumulates at the intact ice cover downstream of the spillway.

195 In the winter season of 2009-2010, 250 km of the Odra was covered by ice, and the leading edge of  
196 the ice cover reached the station of 491.4 km of the river. In the second part of February due to air  
197 temperatures above zero, the strength of the ice cover reduced; however, it still remained intact in a  
198 large portion of the river (645 - 491 river km). Regardless of the situation in the lower section of the  
199 river, an ice-sluicing operation from the reservoirs was started. Realizing the threat, icebreaker crews  
200 worked on the Odra with a great nonstop effort. On 27<sup>th</sup> February, the bridge in Słubice was reached  
201 by the icebreakers and an ice-free channel was formed. During the night of 28<sup>th</sup> February, the  
202 weakened ice cover started to collapse due to the additional ice mass released from the reservoirs,  
203 and a large amount of ice collapsed forming an uncontrolled breakup. Under these life-threatening  
204 conditions, the icebreakers were forced to flee downstream, hiding in the Warta outlet (see photo  
205 taken on 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2010, shown in Figure 5).





206

207 **Figure 4 Schematic view of the Middle and Lower Odra River (Note: figure out of scale)**



208


209 **Figure 5 Polish and German icebreakers escaping to the Warta River on 28th February, 2010 (railroad bridge at 615.1**  
 210 **river km) (RWMA, 2010)**

211 **1.2.2 Vistula river**

212 The study covered the Vistula section between the existing Włocławek dam (674.75 river km) and the  
 213 planned Siarzewo dam (706.38 river km), covering a 31.6 km reach. In this section, ice processes are  
 214 affected by existence of the first locating dam and will be significantly changed due to new Siarzewo  
 215 project. The bathymetry of the model domain was described by 32 cross-sections surveyed by the  
 216 Institute of Meteorology and Water Resources in April 2018, reported by the National Water  
 217 Management Authority 'Wody Polskie' (NWMA). Topographic data were developed on the basis of a  
 218 digital elevation model obtained from the state of geodetic resources  
 219 <https://pzgik.geoportal.gov.pl/imap>; with a resolution of 1cm in vertical and horizontal direction.

220 In addition, the model domain includes the proposed elevation of the entrance area of the spillway  
221 (36.6 m above sea level) and the proposed entrance basin of the hydropower plant (35.5 m above  
222 sea level). Also, the left floodplain of the river bank located immediately upstream of the planned  
223 hydroelectric power plant requires dredging. It was assumed that the area would be dredged to a  
224 level of 36.6 m a.s.l. Bathymetric data together with topographic data used to build the mathematical  
225 model are shown in the Figure 6.

226 The existence of artificial islands has been taken into account in all simulations. A total number of 15  
227 islands are designed, as part of an ecological compensation scheme, along both banks of the reservoir.  
228 The islands were proposed to provide habitat areas for birds (i.e. common tern, little ringed plover,  
229 kingfisher) nesting in the river shoals which will be flooded due to the creation of the reservoir. Thus,  
230 the islands are designed in the form of sandy areas exposed over the normal water level, and mildly  
231 sloping beaches. It was assumed that the shoreline of each island is at the normal pool level of the  
232 proposed reservoir (46.0 m a.s.l), and the central part of each island is flat and exposed by 1 m above  
233 the pool level (47.0 m a.s.l.). The shorelines, are shown in Figure 6b, while the bathymetry of the area,  
234 including the islands, is shown in Figure 6a.




235

236 **Figure 6 Siarzewo reservoir bathymetry included in the mathematical model showing islands and sub domain areas (a);**  
 237 **downstream section of the model domain all the areas of modified bathymetry (b)**

238 In the downstream section of the reservoir, the area adjacent to the Vistula left bank is a low-lying  
 239 floodplain with riparian vegetation and wetlands which support a rich ecosystem. Due to the dam  
 240 construction, the pool level in the reservoir will cause a floodplain area, which will be permanently  
 241 inundated. Thus it is necessary to ensure that potentially deteriorated habitats are recreated by the  
 242 planning of sandy islands to be built in the reservoir. The group of 6 islands is proposed close to the  
 243 dam (about 3.5 km upstream) and, as shown by the numerical results, these islands significantly  
 244 threaten the ice run.




245 In the upper section of the reservoir, about 4.5 km downstream from Włocławek dam, there is a bridge  
 246 which deck is supported by 6 piers with semi-circular ends, 96.32 m apart from each other (Figure 7).  
 247 All piers will be in the wetted area, once the pool level is achieved in the new reservoir. The bridge  
 248 piers located within the route of the ice run will hamper its movement downstream, and could cause  
 249 ice jamming (Szydlowski and Kolerski, 2018). Due to the significant impact of these bridge piers on the  
 250 ice dynamics in the immediate vicinity of Włocławek dam, they were included in the model in the form  
 251 of a closed land boundary, as shown in Figure 8.



252

253 **Figure 7** Frazil and pancake ice runs under the bridge in Włocławek, photo courtesy of prof. Marek Grześ (a); a typical  
 254 section of the bridge at 679+200 river km (b)



255

256 **Figure 8** Upstream section of the model domain showing finite element mesh with bridge pier locations, river mileage  
 257 and upstream boundary conditions for average flow  $Q_{ave} = 924 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$

### 258 1.3 Model description

259 The DynaRICE model allows the forecasting of both the place and time of an ice jam occurrence (Knack  
 260 and Shen, 2018; Kolerski and Shen, 2015). The DynaRICE model is able to provide information on the

261 spatial and temporal distribution of ice in a river with a minimal user intervention limited to the task  
 262 of the inputting data such as bathymetry, meteorological conditions and hydrodynamic data on the  
 263 open boundaries of the domain (Carson et al., 2011). This means that the user does not need to know  
 264 a priori location of the ice jam toe or the time of its formation. This is particularly important in the case  
 265 of simulating processes resulting from planned structures (Knack and Shen, 2017). Then, objectively,  
 266 only on the basis of the balance of forces and other external factors, can information on potential ice  
 267 accumulation and jamming be obtained. In order to reduce computation effort, the modelling domain  
 268 is limited to only areas where ice jams are expected to occur. The domain includes locations important  
 269 from ice jamming processes point of view without expansion of the calculation time to a great extent.  
 270 The model was set up to simulate the ice run in the typical flow expected at the beginning of the winter  
 271 season and breakup conditions. The hydrodynamic module is based on the mass and momentum  
 272 equations including mutual interaction between ice and water flow that are shown in conservation  
 273 form (Shen et al., 1990):

$$\frac{\partial H_w}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial q_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial q_y}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (N\eta'), \quad (1-1)$$

$$\frac{\partial q_x}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x^2}{H_w} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{H_w} \right) = \frac{1}{\rho} (\tau_{sx} - \tau_{dx}) + \frac{1}{\rho_w} \left( \frac{\partial T_{xx}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial T_{yx}}{\partial x} \right) - g H_w \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}, \quad (1-2)$$

$$\frac{\partial q_y}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{H_w} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_y^2}{H_w} \right) = \frac{1}{\rho} (\tau_{sy} - \tau_{dy}) + \frac{1}{\rho_w} \left( \frac{\partial T_{xy}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial T_{yy}}{\partial x} \right) - g H_w \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}. \quad (1-3)$$

274 In which  $q_x$  and  $q_y$  denote water discharge in x and y directions (the flow under the ice cover and  
 275 seepage flow through the ice);  $h$  is water surface elevation [m];  $\eta'$  indicates ice thickness from the  
 276 underside surface to the water level [m];  $\tau_{sx}$  and  $\tau_{sy}$  are shear stresses on the water surface in x and y  
 277 direction [Pa]. It either refers to the shear stress on the underside surface of the ice ( $\tau_{ix,y}$ ) or the  
 278 water surface caused by the wind ( $\tau_{ax,y}$ );  $\tau_{dx}$  and  $\tau_{dy}$  are shear stress on the river bed in x and y  
 279 direction [Pa];  $N$  is ice concentration [-];  $\rho_w$  is water density [ $\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^3$ ];  $H_w$  denotes total water depth  
 280 underneath an equivalent ice-water interface  $H_w/d_w = q/q_s$  [m];  $d_w$  is water depth under the ice;

281  $q_s$  is seepage discharge.  $T_{xy}$  is a turbulence tensor. Bed shear stress is calculated from (Shen et al.,  
282 1990):

$$\tau_{dx} = \frac{n_d^2}{(\alpha_d d_w)^{1/2}} \rho g \frac{q_x (q_x^2 + q_y^2)^{1/2}}{d_w^2}, \quad (1-4)$$

$$\tau_{dy} = \frac{n_d^2}{(\alpha_d d_w)^{1/2}} \rho g \frac{q_y (q_x^2 + q_y^2)^{1/2}}{d_w^2}. \quad (1-5)$$

283 Parameter  $\alpha_d$  is the fraction of the water depth affected by the bed friction,  $\alpha_d = A_d/A$ ;  $n_d$  is the  
284 Manning's roughness coefficient for river bed. On open water surface, the wind shear stress on water  
285 surface is calculated from (Shen, 2016):

$$\tau_{a,x} = C_w \rho_a V_a^2 \cos \xi_a, \quad (1-6)$$

$$\tau_{a,y} = C_w \rho_a V_a^2 \sin \xi_a. \quad (1-7)$$

286 In which  $\xi_a$  is the angle of wind vector (between wind direction and x axis);  $C_w = 0.00155$ , is wind  
287 drag coefficient (Wu, 1973);  $V_a$  is wind velocity;  $\rho_a$  is air density.

288 In the DynaRICE model the dynamic transport of the river ice is mathematically described as the  
289 movement of the number of particles carrying all ice properties and being subjected to the force  
290 balance. The governing equation for ice dynamics can be presented in the following form (Shen et al.  
291 2000):

$$M_L \frac{d\vec{V}_L}{dt} = \vec{R} + \vec{F}_a + \vec{F}_w + \vec{G} \quad (1-8)$$

292 In which  $M_L$  is mass per area of parcel,  $\vec{V}_L$  is ice velocity vector,  $\frac{d\vec{V}_L}{dt}$  is surface ice acceleration,  $\vec{R}$  is an  
293 ice internal resistance force,  $\vec{F}_a$  is a wind drag force,  $\vec{F}_w$  is a water drag force,  $\vec{G}$  is gravitational force.  
294 In two dimensional coordinate system (depth averaged), internal ice resistance can be described in  
295 following way (Shen et al., 2000):

$$\vec{R} = iR_x + jR_y, \quad (1-9)$$



$$R_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\sigma_{xx} N \eta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\sigma_{xy} N \eta), \quad (1-10)$$

$$R_y = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\sigma_{yx} N \eta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\sigma_{yy} N \eta), \quad (1-11)$$

296 In which,  $\sigma_{xx}$  and  $\sigma_{yy}$  are internal ice stresses in normal direction built up in ice rubble,  $\sigma_{xy} = \sigma_{yx}$  are  
 297 internal ice stresses in tangential direction. Internal stresses are calculated from viscoelastic-plastic  
 298 constitutive model with Mohr-Coulomb yielding criterion for the ice as described in (Ji et al., 2005).  
 299 Other terms from equation ( 1-8 ); .i.e. wind and water drag, as well as gravitational force can be  
 300 calculated as follows:

$$\vec{F}_a = \vec{i} \left[ \rho_a C_w \left| \vec{V}_L - \vec{W} \right| (u - W_x) N \right] + \vec{j} \left[ \rho_a C_w \left| \vec{V}_L - \vec{W} \right| (v - W_y) N \right] \quad (1-12)$$

$$\vec{F}_w = \vec{i} \left[ \rho \frac{n_L^2}{(\alpha_d d_w)^{1/2}} \left| \vec{V}_L - \vec{V}_w \right| (u - u_w) N \right] + \vec{j} \left[ \frac{n_L^2}{(\alpha_d d_w)^{1/2}} \left| \vec{V}_L - \vec{V}_w \right| (v - v_w) N \right] \quad (1-13)$$

$$\vec{G} = -\vec{i} M_L g \left( \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} \right) - \vec{j} M_L g \left( \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y} \right) \quad (1-14)$$

301  $\vec{V}_w = u_w \vec{i} + v_w \vec{j}$  is water velocity vector,  $\vec{V}_L = u \vec{i} + v \vec{j}$  is surface ice velocity vector,  $\vec{W} = \vec{W}_x \vec{i} +$   
 302  $\vec{W}_y \vec{j}$  is a wind velocity vector referred to the wind velocity on 10 m height above the water surface,  
 303  $n_L$  is ice roughness,  $d_w$  is a water depth under the ice[m]. The solution of the unsteady  
 304 hydrodynamics is based on the Finite Element method (explicit upwind Galerkin scheme), and for the  
 305 ice dynamics, the Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamic (SPH) method is used (Shen et al., 2000).

### 306 1.3.1 Model parameters description

307 The DynaRICE model has many parameters that must be determined or calibrated by the user. The  
 308 most influential physical and numerical parameters are presented in Table 1. Considering the single  
 309 layer ice and ice accumulation, the default values for the Manning's coefficients were used; however,  
 310 to include local characteristics of the ice, the values varied for both sites. At Vistula River, the ice will  
 311 be delivered from the reservoir located at the upstream open boundary. Thus, the ice entering the  
 312 domain is the fragmented static ice cover from the reservoir, which its underside is smooth ( $n_i =$   
 313  $0.02 \text{ s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1/3}$  was used). At the Odra River, the ice is mainly from the fragmented static ice cover,

314 originated from the system of reservoirs located at a longer distance (approximately 100 km) in  
 315 comparison with Vistula River. Since the distance from the reservoir to the subjected area is long,  
 316 possible frazil deposition could occur at the underside of ice floes. This is why the resistance for the  
 317 single layer was increased from the default value to  $n_i = 0.025 \text{ s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1/3}$ . The Manning's roughness  
 318 coefficients for ice jam was set to be identical for both sites ( $n_i = 0.06 \text{ s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1/3}$ ). The initial ice  
 319 thickness was used as 30 cm for both rivers based on the Institute of Meteorology and Water  
 320 Management – National Research Institute (IMWM–NRI).

321 The group of parameters for Ice concentration were set to default values, which were set as 1.0 for  
 322 static ice, 0.9 for surface frazil and 0.6 for ice rubble and floes accumulation. The value of the  
 323 maximum concentration for ice rubble (0.6) is based on the assumption that ice jam has a porosity of  
 324 0.4 (Prowse, 1990). This value was calibrated by means of the physical model study (Tuthill et al.,  
 325 2008, 2008) and data from the historical ice jams, .i.e., the Thames River (Kolerski et al., 2016) and  
 326 the St John River (Knack and Shen, 2016).

327 The stoppage criteria is a model parameter, which is responsible for artificially stopping the ice. This  
 328 situation happens if the ice moves slowly, possibly attaching to other ice pieces or the border ice. At  
 329 the aim of not considering any artificial stoppage or subjectively controlled ice jamming, this  
 330 parameter was set to zero.

331 **Table 1. Calibrated parameters in the Odra and the Vistula Rivers. Parameters expected values available are referenced**  
 332 **to literatures.**

Parameter	Unit	Value calibrated for the Odra	Value calibrated for the Vistula	Reference literature (if applicable)
Manning's roughness coefficient for single layer ice	$[\text{s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1/3}]$	0.025	0.02	(Ashton, 1986)
Manning's roughness coefficient for ice jam	$[\text{s} \cdot \text{m}^{-1/3}]$	0.06	0.06	(Ashton, 1986)
Initial ice thickens	[m]	0.3	0.3	
Ice internal friction angle	[°]	46	46	(Lal and Shen, 1991)

Wind-ice stress coefficient	[–]	0.0015	0.0015	(Wu, 1973)
Maximum concentration of ice parcels in jam	[–]	0.6	0.6	(Prowse, 1990)
Maximum concentration for skim ice and border ice formation	[–]	1.0	1.0	(Lal and Shen, 1991; Timalsina et al., 2013)
Maximum concentration for frazil ice	[–]	0.9	0.9	(Schneck et al., 2019)
Stoppage criteria for ice	[m · s <sup>-1</sup> ]	0	0	
Total number of nodes in the domain	[–]	11311	22598	
Initial parcel size (for SPH calculation)	[m]	25	30	

333

### 334 1.3.2 Boundary conditions

#### 335 1.3.2.1 Odra river

336 Boundary conditions related to river hydrodynamic were set to represent the flow conditions

337 observed during winter months. The data from Słubice gauging station were analyzed, where the

338 daily water surface elevation is recorded. The water discharge is also provided for the Słubice station.

339 In addition, the station has some ice thickness observations; however, this is mostly qualitative

340 information on the ice type (Wolski et al., 2017; Marszelewski and Pawłowski, 2019). Since detailed

341 ice conditions for the Lower Odra River are not known, the input data for the model were set at the

342 upstream boundary for an initial ice floe thickness of 0.3 m. The calculations do not include any

343 border ice, nor do they consider existing ice cover in the river. Thus, it was assumed that the river is

344 free of ice, and is subjected to possible ice jamming from breakup ice transported from upstream.

345 The data from 11 years of water discharge recorded at Słubice gauging station were analyzed to

346 estimate flow conditions for modeling. Data were provided by the hydrologic surveillance service of


347 the Institute of Meteorology and Water Management – National Research Institute (IMWM–NRI).

348 Also, for the current study, the data were retrieved from < <https://dane.imgw.pl/> >. In Poland, the


349 water year is used for hydrological statistics; thus, the time series starts on 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2006 and

350 ending on 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2017 was used for the study. The more recent data was not available at the

351 time of conducting the study. The raw flow data is presented in Figure 9, and the discharge - time  
 352 duration plot for an average year in Figure 10. The winter season was indicated in Figure 9 by  
 353 marking the time with blue color (1<sup>st</sup> December – 31<sup>st</sup> March) .



354  
 355 **Figure 9** Water discharge at Słubice gauging station; winter seasons were marked with blue, and characteristic flows  
 356 designated by dashed lines (data from <https://dane.imgw.pl/>)



357  
 358 **Figure 10** Water discharge duration for an average year at Słubice gauging station; flows used in the study and their  
 359 durations were marked with black lines (data from <https://dane.imgw.pl/>)

360 The study considered three water discharge conditions: namely, yearly-average flow by  $Q_{ave} = 276$   
 361  $m^3/s$  (based on the 10-year daily average data), low flow by  $Q_{low} = 160 m^3/s$ , and flow referring to the  
 362 breakup condition  $Q = 450 m^3/s$ . Typically for the beginning of the winter season, the flow in the  
 363 Odra River is reduced below the average flow, however rarely dropping to the low flow range. In

364 recent years, the only exception was the 2015/16 season, which was affected by extreme drought in  
365 the summer season (Staśko and Buczyński, 2018). In consequence, during the entire winter season,  
366 low water levels and discharge were observed.

367 The so-called 'typical breakup conditions' for Słubice ( $Q = 450 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) refers to the average flow from  
368 March. It is also the flow recorded on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 during the mid-winter breakup, when the  
369 case of an ice jam in Słubice developed due to the ice sluicing. In many years, in the second half of  
370 the winter, the water discharge rose due to increased air temperature and melting snow, as well as  
371 ice breakup. Recently, an increased discharge is more common for mid-winter, which is caused by  
372 the changing long-term state of the atmosphere in the region. As a result, a mid-winter breakup may  
373 occur leading to a potential ice jamming. Due to the frequency occurrence of the mentioned  
374 circumstances, they were included in the simulations.


#### 375 **1.3.2.2 Vistula river**

376 The upstream open boundary conditions were set at the cross-section of the existing Włocławek  
377 diversion dam, in such a way that the dominant part of the flow was conveyed through the spillway,  
378 and the rest through the power plant. The flow distribution was set according to the operation  
379 procedure during ice sluicing, which is published yearly by RWMA Warszawa (RWMA, 2009). At the  
380 downstream end of the model located at the proposed Siarzewo dam, the constant water surface  
381 elevation was set up according to the proposed normal pool level. In addition, the outflow  
382 boundaries were set at the proposed hydropower plant and the bypass channel. The downstream  
383 open boundaries for water were assumed in the nodes located in each spillway section, at the  
384 turbine outlets and the bypass channel (fish passage inlet). It was considered for setting the ice  
385 boundary condition that ice sluices solely through the spillway.

386 The following calculation conditional variants, from the hydrodynamics point of view, were carried  
387 out for the numerical analysis: average flow  $Q_{\text{ave}} = 924 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  and discharge of 1308, 3008, 4538 and  
388  $6104 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ . As an example, the boundary conditions for water discharge  $Q = 924 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  are shown in



389 figure 8 and 11. At the upstream flow boundary, the proportions were set as 724 m<sup>3</sup>/s in the spillway  
 390 and 200 m<sup>3</sup>/s in the power plant (see Figure 8). At the model downstream, both the water surface  
 391 elevation and discharge conditions were used. Water discharge was set at two locations: the inlets to  
 392 the power plant and the entrance to the bypass channel, while the water surface elevation  
 393 conditions were used at the spillway. The constant water level of H = 46 m a.s.l. was used, which is  
 394 the equivalent of the normal pool level at the proposed reservoir. Water discharge was set up for the  
 395 value of 200 m<sup>3</sup>/s through the hydropower plant (carried out through one of seven turbines, no 4,  
 396 counted from the left bank). In addition, the water flow of 20 m<sup>3</sup>/s was conveyed through the bypass  
 397 channel. The remaining part was distributed over 5 out of 15 spans of the spillway, but no specific  
 398 value for the discharge was used due to the WSE boundary conditions applied at the spillway. Three  
 399 spillway opening setups were tested (as shown in Figure 11), assuming the spans in the immediate  
 400 vicinity of the power plant (span no 1) and the lock (no 15) always being closed.



401  
 402 **Figure 11 Siarzewo spillway opening systems used for calculations at a flow of 924 m<sup>3</sup>/s, open spans from 2 to 6 (a), open**  
 403 **spans from 6 to 10 (b) and open spans from 10 to 14 (c); Note, the river section shown in the figures is downstream of**  
 404 **the proposed dam and is not included in the current simulations**



405 All numerical simulations were carried out with and without taking into account the wind action. For  
 406 those cases applied under the wind effect influence, the wind blows from the west, north, east and  
 407 south with a speed of 3 m/s for average flow conditions, and 4 m/s for all other simulated cases. The  
 408 reduced wind speed for average water flow was based on the fact that the ice was not able to run  
 409 downstream of the reservoir, drifting towards the banks (for the wind velocity of 4 m/s).

410 **Table 2. Scenarios proceeded for the Vistula River study**

Case no	Water discharge	Spillway opening spans from left	Wind	
			Speed	Direction
[-]	m <sup>3</sup> /s	[-]	[m/s]	[-]
1	Q = 924 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0xxxxx000000000*	0	No wind
2			3	W ⇒
3			3	S ↑
4			3	E ⇐
5			3	N ↓
6		000000000xxxxx0	0	No wind
7			3	W ⇒
8			3	S ↑
9			3	E ⇐
10			3	N ↓
11		00000xxxxx00000	0	No wind
12			3	W ⇒
13			3	S ↑
14			3	E ⇐
15			3	N ↓
16	Q = 1308 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0xxxxxxxx000000	0	No wind
17			4	W ⇒
18			4	S ↑
19			4	E ⇐
20			4	N ↓
21		000000xxxxxxxx0	0	No wind
22			4	W ⇒
23			4	S ↑
24			4	E ⇐
25			4	N ↓
26	Q=3008 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0xxxxxxxxxxx0000	0	No wind
27			4	W ⇒
28			4	S ↑
29			4	E ⇐
30			4	N ↓
31		0000xxxxxxxxxxx0	0	No wind
32			4	W ⇒
33			4	S ↑
34			4	E ⇐
35			4	N ↓
36	Q = 4538 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx0	0	No wind
37			4	W ⇒
38			4	S ↑
39			4	E ⇐

40			4	N ↓
41	Q = 6104 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0xxxxxxxxxxxx0	0	No wind
42			4	W ⇒
43			4	S ↑
44			4	E ⇐
45			4	N ↓

411 \*) 0 – closed; x – open

412 In total, 45 number of simulations were made. The initial ice thickness was established at 0.3 m and  
413 the ice was discharged through a spillway with an initial concentration of 0.4 for all analyzed cases.  
414 This means that at the upstream boundary conditions, a 0.3 m thick ice inflow with a surface  
415 concentration of 0.4 was implemented over the entire time of the simulation. It should be noted  
416 that the maximum permissible ice jam concentration in the DynaRICE model is 0.6, and a further  
417 increase in the concentration leads to an increase in jam thickness. Due to the protection of the inlet  
418 to the hydroelectric power plant against incoming ice, in all simulations, it was assumed that the ice  
419 cover remained intact on the right bank of the reservoir for a distance of about 2 km upstream of the  
420 dam, overlapping with the dredged area shown in Figure 6.

#### 421 1.4 Methodology

422 The process of locally reduced conveyance of ice transport resultant from channel narrowness, in the  
423 case of a continuous ice inflow from upstream, often initiates an ice jam. Over time, it will lead to an  
424 increase in the ice thickness and a constriction of the river cross-section, which results in the  
425 impeded water outflow and an increase in water surface elevation in the section upstream of the  
426 jam. This process is well known and described in the literature (Beltaos, 1995; Shen et al., 2008;  
427 Pawłowski, 2019) as a phenomenon responsible for ice jam processes on rivers. For the estimation of  
428 the congestion potential of a selected location on a river, both the following factors, ice velocity and  
429 ice thickness change in time; thereby must be taken into account as indicators. This method for the  
430 estimation of the jam potential was used in the past (i.e. (Knack and Shen, 2017; Shen et al., 2005));  
431 however, for the purpose of this study, a modified procedure was proposed. The current method is  
432 taking into account the change in the ice velocity in relation to the water velocity, and the increase in  
433 the ice thickness in relation to the initial thickness of a single ice floe. This criteria is only applicable



434 for the break-up ice jam conditions without considering the thermal effect on the ice run. Thermal  
 435 processes could change proposed thresholds.

436 Four criteria for assessing ice jamming were adopted: (0) no jam, (1) jam possible, (2) jam probable,  
 437 (3) ice jam. No ice jam implies that ice is proceeding without stop, and neither increased thickness  
 438 nor reduction of the ice velocity is projected. Jam conditions (1) and (2) refer to some reduction in  
 439 the ice velocity, as well as an increase in the surface ice concentration. The possible jam condition (1)  
 440 indicates increased ice concentration due to a reduction in ice velocity, leading to some thickening of  
 441 ice. Using the above criterion, an analysis of the jam potential of the two Polish rivers was carried  
 442 out: the Vistula River, at the upstream of the planned Siarzewo diversion dam, and the Odra River in  
 443 the Słubice region after the modernization of the river training structures. All threshold conditions  
 444 are summarized in Table 3.

445 **Table 3. Conditions used in the study to determine the jam potential for the numerical model results**

Jam potential	$\frac{\text{Ice velocity } (V_i)}{\text{Water velocity } (V_w)}$	$\frac{\text{Ice thickness } (\eta_i)}{\text{Single floe thickness } (\eta_0)}$
<b>(0)</b> No jam	>0.9	<1.1
<b>(1)</b> Jam possible	0.9 – 0.5	1.1 – 2.0
<b>(2)</b> Jam probable	0.5 – 0.15	2.0 – 3.0
<b>(3)</b> Ice jam	< 0.15	> 3.0

446


447 Once the calibrated mathematical model is implemented in the selected areas, the numerical  
 448 simulations can be processed, and the obtained results must be analyzed in terms of ice  
 449 accumulation and jamming.

## 450 **2 Results and discussion**

### 451 **2.1 Odra River**

452 To check the ice conditions in the vicinity of the Słubice-Frankfurt Bridge, a mathematical model was  
453 applied to a 5 km longitudinal section of the Odra River. Probable ice jam conditions represent the  
454 case in which the increased ice thickness is more than 2 times the initial ice thickness. Also, in this  
455 case, the area-averaged ice velocity in an initially specified location drops below 50% of the average  
456 water velocity in that area. Ice jam conditions are defined by a further velocity reduction to 15% of  
457 the water velocity, and the ice thickness increasing to 3 times the initial, single ice floe thickness.

458 The results showed a consistent trend over the time; although, the results from the last hour are  
459 discussed in this study. For the low flow, ice transport through the bridge cross-section is hampered  
460 and the ice accumulation is observed. A comparison of the ice thickness distribution for high ice  
461 inflow ( $Q_i/Q_w = 0.048$ ) is presented in Figure 12 in the form of a contour plot of the 24th hour of  
462 simulation. It shows increased ice thickness upstream of the bridge cross-section. The cause of such a  
463 formation is ice congestion since the ice transport is severely hindered by the reduced cross-section.  
464 In this hydrodynamic condition, the reconstructed river training structures affected the ice transport  
465 insignificantly.




466

467

468

Figure 12 Simulation results of ice thickness at low flow ( $Q_w = 160 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) and high ice inflow ( $Q_i/Q_w = 0.045$ ) for current (a) and proposed (b) conditions; sub-domain for numerical jam analysis designated by black lines




469  
 470 **Figure 13. Simulation results of ice thickness at average flow ( $Q_w = 276 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) and high ice inflow ( $Q_i/Q_w = 0.048$ ) for**  
 471 **current (a) and proposed (b) conditions; sub-domain for numerical jam analysis designated by black lines**

472 The results for average flow showed , the proposed structures reduced the river capacity for ice  
 473 transport. Since the constant ice concentration is applied as the upstream boundary condition,  
 474 different magnitude of water discharge changes the amount of the ice inflow and the resulting ice  
 475 volume in the domain. Three cases of different ice inflow were simulated and all the calculation  
 476 results with the proposed structures led to a larger ice accumulation in comparison to the current  
 477 conditions. The final results of the case with average flow ( $Q_w = 276 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) and high ice discharge  
 478 ( $Q_i/Q_w = 0.048$ ) are shown in Figure 13.

479 All simulation results with high water discharge ( $Q_w = 450 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ) showed that ice is transported  
 480 downstream, without stoppage. Only, is some insignificant shore accumulations perceptible for both  
 481 the current and proposed regulating structures. Thus, the ice thickness distribution over the model  
 482 domain is not presented in this domain. It is mainly caused by the low ice-to-water discharge ratio,



483 and high drag force from the increased water velocity. Consequently, ice is less prone to a stop and  
 484 the release of any form of the accumulation would be facilitated by the high water drag force.



485

486 **Figure 14** Numerical simulation results of ice jamming for the Stubiце according to ice thickness increase (a) and ice velocity  
 487 reduction criterion (b); purple and orange clusters refer to current and proposed conditions, respectively

488 The simulation results are summarized in Figure 14 and Table 4, showing the ice jam potential for the  
 489 aforementioned location. The analysis includes a wide variation of water and ice discharge, covering  
 490 the conditions typical for winter months which are low or average flow. It also includes the condition  
 491 which is common for breakup condition, and represented by flow above average with increased ice  
 492 discharge. The numerical model results show, for most cases the ice run is hampered by new  
 493 structures. The extension of the spurs will act towards a flow constriction and velocity increase in the  
 494 main channel. However, in the vicinity of the bridge, the cross-section will be reduced by the newly  
 495 designed structures. As a consequence, the congestion of the ice is observed due to the convergence  
 496 of the flow. In addition, at the upstream of the river, the regulation increase the ice supply to the ice  
 497 congestion area.

498 The influence of river regulation is particularly visible for the case of low water discharge ( $Q_w = 160$   
 499  $m^3/s$  and low ice inflow of  $Q_i/Q_w = 0.028$ ). In such case, the new structures put a stop to the ice  
 500 run. Simulation results show the reduction of the ice velocity to not more than 30% of the water  
 501 velocity. However, due to the low flow in line with low water velocities, this case did not show a

502 significant increase in the thickness of the ice ( $\eta_i/\eta_0 = 1.39$ ). It can be concluded that, from the two  
 503 mentioned criterion, the velocity ratio is more likely to predict jamming. Since this study mostly  
 504 concerns the low flow condition, in the case of ice blockage, water velocity is not high enough to  
 505 develop thick ice jam toe. As a result, ice stoppage is more commonly evident than the increase of  
 506 the ice thickness.

507 **Table 4. Numerical simulation results for the Odra river, Słubice station**

Model input; upstream boundary			Model results averaged over the sub-domain					Conditions
Water Discharge $Q_w$	Ice discharge $Q_w$	$\frac{Q_i}{Q_w}$	Ice thickness $\eta_i$	Ice velocity $V_i$	Water velocity $V_w$	$\frac{\eta_i}{\eta_0}$	$\frac{V_i}{V_w}$	
[m <sup>3</sup> /s]	[m <sup>3</sup> /s]	[m <sup>3</sup> /s]	[m]	[m/s]	[m/s]	[-]	[-]	C/P*
160	4.5	0.028	0.30	0.57	0.60	0.99	0.95	C
	4.5	0.028	0.42	0.17	0.55	1.39	0.30	P
	7.1	0.044	0.92	0.09	0.69	3.06	0.14	C
	7.2	0.045	0.81	0.10	0.60	2.70	0.17	P
	8.4	0.053	0.99	0.11	0.71	3.31	0.15	C
	8.2	0.052	1.19	0.08	0.68	3.97	0.13	P
276	11.2	0.041	0.35	0.60	0.96	1.17	0.62	C
	11.1	0.040	0.52	0.32	0.89	1.72	0.36	P
	6.7	0.024	0.29	1.08	0.94	0.97	1.15	C
	6.9	0.025	0.31	0.94	0.85	1.02	1.10	P
	13.0	0.047	0.41	0.49	0.96	1.36	0.51	C
	13.1	0.048	0.68	0.30	0.91	2.26	0.33	P
450	15.4	0.034	0.31	1.66	1.39	1.02	1.20	C
	15.5	0.034	0.29	1.47	1.26	0.98	1.17	P
	9.3	0.021	0.30	1.68	1.30	1.00	1.29	C
	9.4	0.021	0.29	1.29	1.24	0.96	1.04	P
	18.4	0.041	0.29	1.46	1.42	0.96	1.03	C
	18.6	0.041	0.33	1.37	1.23	1.09	1.11	P

508 \*C – current conditions; P – proposed conditions

509 The simulation result indicates, although, spur dikes can increase the ice jam potential, they regulate  
 510 the river by producing backwater effect. Because of the reduction in the cross section width, the  
 511 water level increases. Since the increased depth can be considered as an advantage for the ice  
 512 breakers to not be stuck in the shallow areas, mechanical ice breaking (with the advantage of ice  
 513 breakers) is the proper approach in this circumstance. Therefore, both river regulation and increase  
 514 in the water level provided by presented spur dikes will mitigate the ice jam related condition.

## 515 **2.2 Vistula River**

516 According to the obtained numerical model results, two areas of potential ice jamming were selected  
517 in the reservoir: the bridge cross-section and the downstream area where the proposed islands are  
518 designed. Both areas, as indicated in Figure 6, were considered for further analysis within the  
519 proposed methodology. The results are presented in Table 5 (upstream location) and Table 6  
520 (location in the vicinity of the dam) for selected cases.

521 In the first mentioned location, which is a short distance downstream of the existing dam  
522 (679+200 river km, about 4.5 km), the piers of the bridge hinder the ice run. This is particularly likely  
523 in the event of low water flow and high ice concentration. Ice sluicing through the proposed dam  
524 shall not be performed if the water discharge does not reach the average flow conditions; therefore,  
525 low flow scenarios were not performed. Among all the calculated cases, the greatest risk of ice  
526 jamming is observed for simulations with average flow ( $Q_{ave} = 924 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ), and wind blowing from the  
527 opposite direction to the water flow.

528 Under these conditions, the bridge opening (horizontal distance between two piers) is not sufficient  
529 to allow a continuous run of ice of high concentration. This leads to ice congestion and stop near the  
530 bridge piers in the central part of the river, which retards the ice movement, and in some locations,  
531 the formation and progression of the juxtaposed ice cover in an upstream direction. The process  
532 becomes more dynamic once the ice cover progression reaches the vicinity of 677 river km. In that  
533 section, the river originally meandered between alluvial islands on both banks; even though, due to  
534 the formation of the reservoir, the islands were inundated forming shoals hindering the ice run. It led  
535 to additional stops, and accelerated the accumulation of inflowing ice and eventual jam formation.  
536 For average flow conditions, ice was sluiced through 5 out of 15 spillway spans, and three  
537 configurations of spillway opening were tested. However, this has no effect on the ice dynamic in the  
538 upstream section of the reservoir.



539 Some effects were also observed for the discharge  $Q = 1308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ; however, in this case, it was only a  
 540 local retardation of the ice movement and a negligible increase in the ice thickness at the upstream  
 541 face of the bridge piers. While continuing the simulation, the process did not develop nor progress  
 542 towards the upstream with time. For cases with a higher flow discharge, the water drag was  
 543 sufficient to release any ice stop at the bridge cross-section and ice transport proceeded smoothly  
 544 towards the downstream. Thus only cases with average discharge were considered for further testing  
 545 within the proposed procedure. All simulation results are presented in Table 5 and also presented in  
 546 a form of contour plot of the ice thickness in Figure 15.

547 The second location where ice jamming was observed is the area close to the proposed dam (701 - 703  
 548 river km). The calculations carried out for the average flow and a flow of  $1308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  clearly show that,  
 549 the locations of the mentioned artificial islands should be reconsidered, and the change in the layout  
 550 of the southernmost island of the group is absolutely necessary. The southern front of the southern  
 551 island (around 702+650 river km) is a place wherein due to the event of a wind blowing from the north  
 552 and west, ice accumulation and potential ice jamming can occur. A change in the shape of the southern  
 553 shore of the island should be considered to direct ice towards the spillway. For the higher flow velocity  
 554 conditions, the water drag is high enough to push ice towards the spillway without any significant ice  
 555 stop. Also, for the higher discharges, the ice flows in the shallow channel between the islands and the  
 556 bank. The results of numerical modeling also indicated a significant force, exceeding  $2 \text{ kN/m}^2$ , to be  
 557 transferred from the ice to the shore of the artificial islands. This force must be withstood by the  
 558 islands' borders; although, considering the purpose of the islands, neither riprap nor concrete could  
 559 be used to reinforce the shores.


560 **Table 5. Simulation cases and obtained results for the Vistula River study for the water discharge  $Q = 924 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  and single**  
 561 **floe thickness  $\eta_0 = 0.3 \text{ m}$ ; area at the upstream of the reservoir (677 – 678 river km)**

Case no	Water	Ice	Spillway opening spans from left	Wind		Ice thickness ( $\eta_L$ )	Average velocity		$\frac{(V_i)}{(V_w)}$	$\frac{(\eta_i)}{(\eta_0)}$
	Discharge	discharge		speed	direction		Ice ( $V_i$ )	Water ( $V_w$ )		
	[ $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ]	[ $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ]	[-]	[m/s]	[-]	[m]	[m/s]	[m/s]	[-]	[-]
39		12.3	00000xxxxx00000*	3	No wind	0.41	0.072	0.246	0.29	1.36



40	Q = 924 m <sup>3</sup> /s	12.2		3	W ⇒	0.47	0.068	0.236	0.29	1.58
41		12.1		3	S ↑	0.399	0.060	0.244	0.25	1.33
42		12.2		3	E ⇐	0.44	0.078	0.247	0.32	1.48
43		12.2		3	N ↓	0.47	0.069	0.243	0.28	1.57

562 \*) 0 – closed; x – open



563

564 **Figure 15** Ice thickness distribution in the upstream part of the proposed reservoir for the average discharge  $Q_{ave} = 924$   
565  $m^3/s$  and varying wind direction at a speed of 3 m/s

566 Recently, before the new dam construction, some ice stops has been observed upstream of the  
567 bridge, as a result of ice sluicing from Włocławek spillway. The inflow to the new reservoir considers  
568 to be the outflow from the existing reservoir, which forms the upstream open boundary for the  
569 current model. Concerning the procedure of the icebreaking operation on Włocławek reservoir, the  
570 competent Water Authority should allow ice sluicing only if ice jamming on the reservoir is observed,  
571 or if a significant amount of ice is released in the river upstream of the reservoir. If the above-  
572 mentioned conditions occur, it is still not recommended to release ice for a water discharge below  
573  $1308 m^3/s$ . Thus, simulated cases with average water flow should be considered as worst-case  
574 scenarios, occurring only in very unusual conditions.

575 The simulation results indicate the strong effect of the river bathymetry on the ice transport,  
576 compounded by the presence of the bridge piers and wind. At first, the ice cover develops upstream  
577 of the bridge piers. During the time, the progressing ice cover in addition to the restriction at the  
578 cross sections out of the existing islands, lead to an increase in the ice jam formation upstream of the  
579 piers. That is mainly due to the fact that, at the restricted area between the islands, the water  
580 velocity is increased (thereby, drag force of water rises), causing higher velocity for the ice run.  
581 Entering the ice stoppage area, the ice particles become a part of the ice jam due to the ice  
582 resistance force. As shown in Figure 15, all cases with average flow, where the two islands are  
583 located and river meanders, show ice accumulation on both banks . After the reservoir is formed, the  
584 water level will increase to the normal pool level. However, the most parts of the upstream section  
585 of the proposed reservoir will preserve their river-like character, and the main currents will follow  
586 the thalweg. According to the numerical results shown in Table 5, all cases with average flow will  
587 cause a reduction in the ice velocity in comparison to the water velocity by more than 70%, except  
588 for the case with an eastern wind. In this case, the wind accelerates the ice movement; although, due  
589 to the existence of the bridge piers, ice flow converges and ice transport becomes limited, leading to  
590 the ice accumulation in the upstream. Considering ice-to-water velocity conditions, all cases with  
591 average flow represent a strong possibility of ice jam formation.

592 The increase in the ice thickness is variable from case to case, and in all five simulated cases, the  
593 most severe conditions are expected for the case with the western and northern wind. In both  
594 mentioned cases, wind pushes the ice in an opposite direction to the flow or towards the outer bank.  
595 This causes additional resistance to the ice due to the contact between the ice and the banks. In  
596 consequence, the ice increases in thickness by roughly 60 %, being classified as 'ice jam probable'  
597 type in both cases. Other cases similarly indicate increased ice thickness; although this growth  
598 appears to be to a lesser extent, thusly being classified as 'ice jam possible' type.

599 The second area where ice jam potential was tested is within a distance of 4 km in the upstream  
 600 direction from the proposed dam (703 – 704 river km, see Figure 6). In this location, the water  
 601 surface elevation is nearly horizontal due to the backwater effect, and the water velocity is relatively  
 602 low (based on the high water depth). With regard to the force balance on movable ice, the drag force  
 603 from water is not significant, hence the impact of additional obstacles on the ice run in this area may  
 604 cause ice stop. The ice movement is affected by the artificial islands located along the outer bank of  
 605 the reservoir, which causes a narrowness of the cross-section area by about 12%. The upstream  
 606 shore of the southernmost island was designed in a non-streamlined shape, which significantly  
 607 impedes the both ice and water flow.

608 Ice jamming in the downstream section of the reservoir is less located. However, due to the  
 609 proximity of the dam, as well as the wind and flow impact on the ice dynamic, the effect of the  
 610 spillway opening was considered. The ice jam potential upstream of the dam was determined for  
 611 above average water discharge ( $Q = 1308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ ), with variable number of open spillway's spans and  
 612 wind directions. For these hydrodynamic conditions, ice was supplied in the upstream of the model,  
 613 with the surface ice concentration of  $N = 0.4$ . This value of concentration leads to the ice discharge  
 614 varying from  $13.3 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  to nearly  $15 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  which is about 1% of the water discharge. Since the jam has  
 615 no clear location of the toe, the averaged ice thickness was applied over the reach of about 2 km of  
 616 the reservoir, upstream of the artificial islands. The same area was used at the aim of averaging out  
 617 ice and water velocities, and all the results are summarized in the Table 6. The last two columns of  
 618 the table are the relative ice-to-water velocity ratio and the increase in the ice cover thickness.


619 **Table 6. Simulated cases and obtained results for the Vistula River study with the water discharge of  $Q = 1308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  and**  
 620 **the single floe thickness  $\eta_0 = 0.3 \text{ m}$ ; area at the downstream of the reservoir (703 – 704 river km)**

Case no	Water	Ice	Spillway opening spans from left	Wind		Ice thickness ( $\eta_L$ )	Average velocity		$\frac{(V_i)}{(V_w)}$	$\frac{(\eta_i)}{(\eta_0)}$
	Discharge	discharge		speed	direction		Ice ( $V_i$ )	Water ( $V_w$ )		
	[ $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ]	[ $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ]	[-]	[m/s]	[-]	[m]	[m/s]	[m/s]	[-]	[-]
1	$Q = 1308$	13.4	0xxxxxxxx000000*	0	No wind	0.30	0.198	0.198	1.00	1.00
2		13.4		4	W $\Rightarrow$	0.37	0.023	0.169	0.13	1.23

3		13.3		4	S ↑	0.30	0.286	0.189	1.51	1.00
4		14.9		4	E ←	0.31	0.113	0.230	0.49	1.01
5		15.0		4	N ↓	0.35	0.024	0.172	0.14	1.16
6		13.3		0	No wind	0.34	0.040	0.170	0.24	1.12
7		13.5		4	W ⇒	0.424	0.017	0.171	0.10	1.41
8		13.3	000000xxxxxxxx0	4	S ↑	0.30	0.289	0.190	1.52	1.00
9		13.4		4	E ←	0.30	0.277	0.244	1.13	1.00
10		13.3		4	N ↓	0.30	0.152	0.244	0.62	1.00

621 \*) 0 – closed; x – open

622 The simulation results show the significant impact of the wind on ice jam formation. It is a logical  
623 consequence of the backwater effect that causes an increase in depth and a decrease in water  
624 velocity in the direct vicinity of the dam. In such conditions, the wind develops the main drag force  
625 on the surface ice transport. Thus, while the wind is blowing in the same direction as that of the  
626 water flow, it causes the ice to run with a speed exceeding the downstream water velocity. In such a  
627 case, the ice is pushed towards the dam, and no ice stoppage is observed at the southern shore of  
628 the island (see cases 3, 8 and 9 in the Table 6). This is clearly visible for a southern wind, but also for  
629 an eastern one. However, in this case, the order of opening the spans of the spillway will have an  
630 impact on the ice transport. Meanwhile, wind blowing from the opposite direction (west) to the  
631 water flow leads to the ice stoppage and jamming (Figure 16). Due to the fact that the water drag is  
632 not high, the accumulation is not very thick without a clear location of toe; however, the ice run  
633 proceeds with low velocity ( $V_i/V_w < 0.15$ ). Thus, the ice accumulation propagates upstream of the  
634 reservoir; even though, it develops in a juxtaposed ice form due to the low water drag.



635

636 **Figure 16 Ice thickness and ice velocity distribution in the downstream area of the reservoir for the water discharge  $Q =$**   
 637  **$1308 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$  and variable spillway span opening: left (a) and right spans (b)**

638 The abovementioned situation with the eastern wind, as well as the case with the northern wind are  
 639 affected by the spillway operation. Even though, the distance from the spillway to the area of  
 640 interest is about 4 kilometers, the reduction in ice sluicing caused by opening the wrong spillway  
 641 sections enables ice accumulation to happen upstream. Since the water velocity at the reservoir is  
 642 significantly reduced due to the backwater effect, the main mechanism affecting the ice flow at the  
 643 direct vicinity of the spillway will be the wind. For an eastern wind, although intact ice covers the  
 644 area on the left bank, ice drifts away from the opened sections of the spillway towards the west  
 645 bank. Consequently, less ice will pass the dam, and its movement will be hampered in the entire  
 646 reservoir. It was shown in Table 6 that the ice velocity is reduced, but the thickness did not increase  
 647 from the single floe thickness. For this reason, it must be noted that the span opening configuration  
 648 will mainly be determined by the ice dynamic in the reservoir and its inflow towards the spillway,  
 649 together with the wind direction.

650 The ice jam commonly happens during the low flow condition that may not necessarily lead to the  
651 risk of flooding due to the low discharge. However, in the case of not releasing the ice jam in the  
652 warm spell of spring, increased discharge resultant from the snow melting may cause flooding  
653 damages.

### 654 **3 Conclusion**

655 In determining the ice jam potential for rivers that are subjected to the extensive engineering works,  
656 it is important to predict and eliminate possible risk (Shen, 2016). The proposed methodology,  
657 because of the minimum user interference, excludes introspective errors. However, it does not  
658 undermine the already existing practices. As shown by the examples, the obtained results clearly  
659 determine and assess the potential ice jamming that arises from the proposed engineering works.  
660 Considering the Odra River flood management project, the possibility of ice jam formation resulting  
661 from the river engineering works in the Stubice area is increased if an ice run of high concentration  
662 occurs during average flow conditions. While the risk of ice jamming during the low flow conditions is  
663 reduced. It should also be noted that the formation of a main channel with a relatively uniform depth  
664 will greatly enhance the ice-breaking operation. Although jams may form to a greater extent, they  
665 will be easier to release. The application of the mathematical model to the proposed reservoir on the  
666 Vistula River in the scope of the ice dynamics, has been a success, because it helped to deliver on two  
667 very important targets: establishing frames for ice sluicing operations, and redeveloping the artificial  
668 islands. Processing the numerical model results according to the presented methodology contributed  
669 to the designation of areas prone to ice jamming and the level of the related risk assessment.

670 Regarding the proposed water management plan for the ice sluicing target, based on the proposed  
671 results, it is needed to take into account the hydrological and meteorological conditions that are  
672 simulated in the study. Furthermore, since results show a potential ice stoppage based on the shape  
673 of the islands, a practical solution would be to redesigning the islands into more rounded shapes.



674 This newly presented method embrace a wide type of inland water areas including lowland rivers  
675 and reservoirs. This approach does not perquisite the ice stoppage criteria like the location and  
676 velocity threshold. The model is based on the 2 novel methods of comparing the original and final ice  
677 thickness, and the ice velocity to the water velocity. Referring to the limitation of the approach,  
678 major required data would be mentioned; for instance, hydrodynamic, bathymetric, and ice  
679 condition data.

## 680 **Acknowledgments**

681 The bathymetry data used in the Odra River study were provided by Sweco Consulting and were part  
682 of the Odra-Vistula Flood Management Project – 8524 PI, Sub-component 1A: Flood protection of  
683 areas in Zachodniopomorskie Voivodeship. The Vistula River study was supported by the National  
684 Water Management Authority ‘Wody Polskie’ Project no KZGW/KS/306/2019. The author wishes to  
685 show the appreciation to the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of the manuscript and  
686 their many insightful comments and suggestions.

## 687 **Literature**

- 688 Ashton, G.D., 1986. River and lake ice engineering. Water Resources Publication, Littleton Co, USA.  
689 Ashton, G.D., 1978. River ice. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* 10, 369–392.  
690 Babiński, Z., 1982. Influence of the water dam in Włocławek on fluvial processes of the Vistula River.  
691 Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization.  
692 Beltaos, S., 2018. The 2014 ice-jam flood of the Peace-Athabasca Delta: Insights from numerical  
693 modelling. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 155, 367–380.  
694 Beltaos, S., 2003. Numerical modelling of ice-jam flooding on the Peace–Athabasca delta. *Hydrol.*  
695 *Process.* 17, 3685–3702.  
696 Beltaos, S., 1995. River Ice Jams. Water Resources Publication.  
697 Beltaos, S., 1983. River ice jams: theory, case studies, and applications. *J. Hydraul. Eng.* 109, 1338–  
698 1359.  
699 Beltaos, S., Burrell, B.C., 2015. Hydroclimatic aspects of ice jam flooding near Perth-Andover, New  
700 Brunswick. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* 42, 686–695.  
701 Boucher, É., Bégin, Y., Arseneault, D., 2009. Impacts of recurring ice jams on channel geometry and  
702 geomorphology in a small high-boreal watershed. *Geomorphology* 108, 273–281.  
703 Boucher, E., Bégin, Y., Arseneault, D., Ouarda, T.B., 2012. Long-term and large-scale river-ice  
704 processes in cold-region watersheds. *Gravel-Bed Rivers Process. Tools Environ.* 546–554.  
705 Brunner, G.W., 2002. Hec-ras (river analysis system), in: North American Water and Environment  
706 Congress & Destructive Water. ASCE, pp. 3782–3787.



- 707 Carson, R., Beltaos, S., Groeneveld, J., Healy, D., She, Y., Malenchak, J., Morris, M., Saucet, J.-P.,  
708 Kolarski, T., Shen, H.T., 2011. Comparative testing of numerical models of river ice jams. *Can.*  
709 *J. Civ. Eng.* 38, 669–678. <https://doi.org/10.1139/l11-036>
- 710 Das, A., Lindenschmidt, K.-E., 2020. Evaluation of the sensitivity of hydraulic model parameters,  
711 boundary conditions and digital elevation models on ice-jam flood delineation. *Cold Reg. Sci.*  
712 *Technol.* 103218.
- 713 Flato, G., Gerard, R., 1986. Calculation of ice jam thickness profiles, in: *Proc., 4th Workshop on Hydr.*  
714 *of River Ice.* pp. 1–25.
- 715 Gosztowtt, J., 2018. Spatio-temporal changes of Vistula riverbed below the W\loc\lawek hydropower  
716 plant (MSc Thesis). University of Salzburg, Salzburg.
- 717 Grześ, M., 1991. Ice jams and floods on the lower Vistula river: mechanism and processes. Polish  
718 Academy of Sciences Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, Warsaw.
- 719 Hicks, F.E., Steffler, P.M., Gerard, R., 1992. Finite element modeling of surge propagation and an  
720 application to the Hay River, N.W.T. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* 19, 454–462.  
721 <https://doi.org/10.1139/l92-055>
- 722 Ji, S., Shen, H.T., Wang, Z., Shen, H.H., Yue, Q., 2005. A viscoelastic-plastic constitutive model with  
723 Mohr-Coulomb yielding criterion for sea ice dynamics. *ACTA Oceanol. Sin.-Engl. Ed.-* 24, 54.
- 724 Kandamby, A., Jayasundara, N., Shen, H.T., Deyhle, C., 2010. A numerical river ice model for Elbe  
725 River, in: 20th IAHR International Symposium on Ice. Lahti, Finland. Lahti, Finland.
- 726 Knack, I.M., Shen, H.T., 2018. A numerical model for sediment transport and bed change with river  
727 ice. *J. Hydraul. Res.* 56, 844–856.
- 728 Knack, I.M., Shen, H.T., 2017. Numerical modeling of ice transport in channels with river restoration  
729 structures. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* 44, 813–819. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjce-2017-0081>
- 730 Knack, I.M., Shen, H.T., 2016. A numerical model study on Saint John River ice breakup. *Can. J. Civ.*  
731 *Eng.* 45, 817–826.
- 732 Kolarski, T., 2018. Mathematical modeling of ice dynamics as a decision support tool in river  
733 engineering. *Water* 10, 1241.
- 734 Kolarski, T., 2016. Modeling of Ice Passage Through Reservoirs System on the Vistula River, in:  
735 Rowiński, P., Marion, A. (Eds.), *Hydrodynamic and Mass Transport at Freshwater Aquatic*  
736 *Interfaces: 34th International School of Hydraulics, GeoPlanet: Earth and Planetary Sciences.*  
737 Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 35–47. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27750-9_4)  
738 [27750-9\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27750-9_4)
- 739 Kolarski, T., Huang, F., Shen, H.T., 2016. Development of Ice Jam Toe Configurations. Presented at the  
740 23 rd IAHR International Symposium on Ice, Ann Arbor, Michigan USA,.
- 741 Kolarski, T., Shen, H.T., 2015. Possible effects of the 1984 St. Clair River ice jam on bed changes. *Can.*  
742 *J. Civ. Eng.* 42, 696–703.
- 743 Kovachis, N., Burrell, B.C., Huokuna, M., Beltaos, S., Turcotte, B., Jasek, M., 2017. Ice-jam flood  
744 delineation: Challenges and research needs. *Can. Water Resour. Journal/Revue Can. Ressour.*  
745 *Hydr.* 42, 258–268.
- 746 Kreft, A., Parzonka, W., 2007. Issues related to the modernization of river regulation structures on  
747 the border section of the Lower Odra river. *Infrastruct. Ecol. Rural Areas* 123–134.
- 748 Lal, A.W., Shen, H.T., 1991. Mathematical model for river ice processes. *J. Hydraul. Eng.* 117, 851–  
749 867.
- 750 Lindenschmidt, K.-E., Carstensen, D., Fröhlich, W., Hentschel, B., Iwicki, S., Kögel, M., Kubicki, M.,  
751 Kundzewicz, Z.W., Lauschke, C., \Lazarów, A., 2019. Development of an Ice Jam Flood  
752 Forecasting System for the Lower Oder River—Requirements for Real-Time Predictions of  
753 Water, Ice and Sediment Transport. *Water* 11, 95.
- 754 Lindenschmidt, K.E., Rokaya, P., 2019. A Stochastic Hydraulic Modelling Approach to Determining the  
755 Probable Maximum Staging of Ice-Jam Floods. *J. Environ. Inform.* 34.
- 756 Lindenschmidt, K.-E., Sydor, M., Carson, R.W., 2012. Modelling ice cover formation of a lake–river  
757 system with exceptionally high flows (Lake St. Martin and Dauphin River, Manitoba). *Cold*  
758 *Reg. Sci. Technol.* 82, 36–48.



- 759 Liu, L., Shen, H.T., 2005. Numerical modeling of 2003 Grasse River ice jam and scenario analysis.  
760 Presented at the Proc., 13th Workshop of the Hydraulics of Ice Covered Rivers, Hanover, NH,  
761 USA.
- 762 Marszelewski, W., Pawłowski, B., 2019. Long-Term Changes in the Course of Ice Phenomena on the  
763 Oder River along the Polish–German Border. *Water Resour. Manag.* 33, 5107–5120.  
764 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-019-02417-2>
- 765 Mudelsee, M., Börngen, M., Tetzlaff, G., Grünewald, U., 2004. Extreme floods in central Europe over  
766 the past 500 years: Role of cyclone pathway “Zugstrasse Vb.” *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*  
767 109.
- 768 Pariset, E., Hauser, R., 1961. FORMATION AND EVOLUTION OF ICE COVERS ON RIVERS. *Trans. Eng.*  
769 *Inst. Can.* 5, 41–49.
- 770 Pariset, E., Hausser, R., Gagnon, A., 1966. Formation of Ice Covers and Ice Jams in Rivers. *J. Hydraul.*  
771 *Div.* 92, 1–24.
- 772 Pawłowski, B., 2019. Ice Jams: Causes and Effects, in: *Encyclopedia of Water*. American Cancer  
773 Society, pp. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119300762.wsts0035>
- 774 Pawłowski, B., 2015. Determinants of change in the duration of ice phenomena on the Vistula River  
775 in Toruń. *J. Hydrol. Hydromech.* 63. <https://doi.org/10.1515/johh-2015-0017>
- 776 Prowse, T.D., 1990. Heat and mass balance of an ablating ice jam. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* 17, 629–635.
- 777 Rădoane, M., Ciaglic, V., Rădoane, N., 2010. Hydropower impact on the ice jam formation on the  
778 upper Bistrita River, Romania. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 60, 193–204.  
779 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2009.10.006>
- 780 RWMA, 2010. Icebreaking operation 2009/2010 report. Regional Water Management Authority in  
781 Szczecin, Szczecin.
- 782 RWMA, W., 2009. Instruction of icebreaking and ice sluicing thorough Włocławek Dam (No. XI).  
783 Regional Water Management Authority, Warszawa.
- 784 Schneck, C.C., Ghobrial, T.R., Loewen, M.R., 2019. Laboratory study of the properties of frazil ice  
785 particles and flocs in water of different salinities. *Cryosphere* 13.
- 786 Shen, H.T., 2016. River Ice Processes, in: Wang, L.K., Yang, C.T., Wang, M.-H.S. (Eds.), *Advances in*  
787 *Water Resources Management*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 483–530.  
788 [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22924-9\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22924-9_9)
- 789 Shen, H.T., 2010. Mathematical modeling of river ice processes. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 62, 3–13.  
790 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2010.02.007>
- 791 Shen, H.T., Gao, L., Kolarski, T., Liu, L., 2008. Dynamics of Ice Jam Formation and Release. *J. Coast.*  
792 *Res.* 52, 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.2112/1551-5036-52.sp1.25>
- 793 Shen, H.T., Jayasundara, N.C., Tuthill, A.M., Mihm, J.E., 2005. Frequency and Severity of Past Ice Jams  
794 on the Grass River. Presented at the 13 th Workshop on the Hydraulics of Ice Covered Rivers,  
795 Hanover, NH, USA, p. 8.
- 796 Shen, H.T., Liu, L., 2003. Shokotsu River ice jam formation. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 37, 35–49.
- 797 Shen, H.T., Shen, H., Tsai, S.-M., 1990. Dynamic transport of river ice. *J. Hydraul. Res.* 28, 659–671.
- 798 Shen, H.T., Su, J., Liu, L., 2000. SPH Simulation of River Ice Dynamics. *J. Comput. Phys.* 165, 752–770.  
799 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcph.2000.6639>
- 800 Staśko, S., Buczyński, S., 2018. Drought and its effects on spring discharge regimes in Poland and  
801 Germany during the 2015 drought. *Hydrol. Sci. J.* 63, 741–751.  
802 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2018.1446215>
- 803 Su, J., Shen, H.T., Crissman, R.D., 1997. Numerical study on ice transport in vicinity of Niagara River  
804 hydropower intakes. *J. Cold Reg. Eng.* 11, 255–270.
- 805 Svensson, U., Billfalk, L., Hammar, L., 1989. A mathematical model of border-ice formation in rivers.  
806 *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 16, 179–189.
- 807 Szydłowski, M., Gąsiorowski, D., Szymkiewicz, R., Zima, P., Hakiel, J., 2015. Hydropower potential of  
808 the lower Vistula. *Acta Energ.* 1, 18–25.

- 809 Szydłowski, M., Kolerski, T., 2018. Numerical Modeling of Water and Ice Dynamics for Analysis of  
810 Flow Around the Kiezmark Bridge Piers, in: *Free Surface Flows and Transport Processes*.  
811 Springer, pp. 465–476.
- 812 Szymkiewicz, R., 2017. Dolna Wisła-rzeka niewykorzystanych możliwości. Wydawnictwo Politechniki  
813 Gdańskiej.
- 814 Thériault, I., Saucet, J.-P., Taha, W., 2010. Validation of the Mike-Ice model simulating river flows in  
815 presence of ice and forecast of changes to the ice regime of the Romaine river due to  
816 hydroelectric project, in: *Proceedings of the 20th IAHR International Symposium on Ice*,  
817 Lahti, Finland.
- 818 Timalsina, N.P., Charmasson, J., Alfredsen, K.T., 2013. Simulation of the ice regime in a Norwegian  
819 regulated river. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.* 94, 61–73.
- 820 Timoney, K., Peterson, G., Fargey, P., Peterson, M., McCanny, S., Wein, R., 1997. Spring ice-jam  
821 flooding of the Peace-Athabasca Delta: Evidence of a climatic oscillation. *Clim. Change* 35,  
822 463–483.
- 823 Tuthill, A., Ashton, G., Hendershot, P., Quadrini, J., 2008. Grasse River Ice Control Structure, Physical  
824 Model Study. Presented at the 19th IAHR International Symposium on Ice, Vancouver, BC,  
825 Canada, p. 11.
- 826 Uzuner, M.S., Kennedy, J.F., 1976. Theoretical model of river ice jams. *J. Hydraul. Div.* 102.
- 827 Uzuner, M.S., Kennedy, J.F., 1974. Hydraulics and mechanics of river ice jams. IOWA INST OF  
828 HYDRAULIC RESEARCH IOWA CITY.
- 829 Wang, J., Shi, F., Chen, P., Wu, P., Sui, J., 2015. Impact of bridge pier on the stability of ice jam. *J.*  
830 *Hydrodyn.* 27, 865–871. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-6058\(15\)60549-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-6058(15)60549-2)
- 831 White, K.D., 1999. Hydraulic and physical properties affecting ice jams.
- 832 Wolfe, B.B., Hall, R.I., Wiklund, J.A., Kay, M.L., 2020. Past variation in Lower Peace River ice-jam flood  
833 frequency. *Environ. Rev.* 1–9.
- 834 Wolski, K., Tymiński, T., Głuchowska, B., 2017. Analysis of ice phenomena hazard on the middle Odra  
835 river. *Ann. Wars. Univ. Life Sci. – SGGW Land Reclam.* 49. [https://doi.org/10.1515/ssgw-](https://doi.org/10.1515/ssgw-2017-0024)  
836 [2017-0024](https://doi.org/10.1515/ssgw-2017-0024)
- 837 Wu, J., 1973. Prediction of near-surface drift currents from wind velocity. *J. Hydraul. Div.* 99, 1291–  
838 1302.

839