



· • 

### DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

### TRIBUTARY OF MIDDLE CREEK, WAYNE COUNTY

### PENNSYLVANIA .

National Dan Inspection Program. ROBINSON DAM (NDI ID DA PA-00165 DER ID NGA" 64-136), LEISURE-LIFE CORP. OF AMERICA Deloward River Basin, Tributary of middle Creek Wayne County, Pennsylvania.

PHASE J INSPECTION REPORT . NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

76 12



Prepared by:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Baltimore District, Corps of Engineers Baltimore, Maryland 21203



"Criginal contains color plates: All DTIC reproductions will be in black and white"

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. This report is prepared under guidance contained in the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, for Phase I investigations. Copies of these guidelines may be obtained from the Office of Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314. The purpose of a Phase I investigation is to identify expeditiously those dams which may pose hazards to human life or property. The assessment of the general condition of the dam is based upon available data and visual inspections. Detailed investigation and analyses involving topographic mapping, subsurface investigations, testing, and detailed computational evaluations are beyond the scope of a Phase I investigation; however, the investigation is intended to identify any need for such studies.

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the dam is based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection along with data available to the inspection team.

It is important to note that the condition of a dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam will continue to represent the condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through frequent inspections can unsafe conditions be detected and only through continued care and maintenance can these conditions be prevented or corrected.

Phase I inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established guidelines, the spillway design flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. The spillway design flood provides a measure of relative spillway capacity and serves as an aid in determining the need for more detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies, considering the size of the dam, its general condition, and the downstream damage potential.

£

Ac replen For 11-1 - S.I 1 10 14 743 Energy more Ju the contien. Tetrintion/ Aveilet1. for Colos Aveni nor, or Sp din1 3. 11 🛉

### PREFACE

NDI ID No. PA-00165, DER ID No. 64-136

. . . . .

### PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

### NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

### CONTENTS . ~

### Description

Page

Brief Assessment of General Condition and Recommended Action,.....iii

SECTION 1 - Project Information,	1
SECTION 2 - Engineering Data,	5
SECTION 3 - Visual Inspection	6
SECTION 4 - Operational Procedures	8
SECTION 5 - Hydrology and Hydraulics	9
SECTION 6 - Structural Stability	11
SECTION 7 - Assessment, Recommendations, and	
obsition / Associations, and	
rroposed kemedial Measures	13

APPENDICES .

### Appendix

-190

. . .

### Title

A	Checklist - Visual Inspection.
В	Checklist - Engineering Data.
С	Photographs.
D	Hydrology and Hydraulics.
Е	Plates.
F	Geology.

٠

### PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

BRIEF ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL CONDITION
AND
RECOMMENDED ACTION

High

Wayne

Pennsylvania

4 November 1980

Name of Dam:

Robinson Dam NDI ID No. PA-00165 DER ID No. 64-136

Small (19.8 feet high; 190 acre-feet)

Leisure Life Corp. of America

Tributary of Middle Creek

Size:

Hazard Classification:

Owner:

State Located:

County Located:

Stream:

Date of Inspection:

Based on available records, visual inspection, and engineering calculations, Robinson Dam is considered to be in poor condition and is judged to be unsafe, non-emergency.

The collapsed section of the downstream face, the cracking of the corewall and the blocked spillway and outlet works are reasons for immediate concern. Maintenance procedures need to be established and the spillway, outlet works, and embankment need to be rehabilitated.

Based on the size and hazard classification of the dam, the recommended Spillway Design Flood (SDF) varies between 1/2 the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and the PMF. Based on the size of the dam and reservoir, and the downstream conditions, the 1/2 PMF has been selected as the SDF. The hydrologic and hydraulic computations indicate that the combination of reservoir storage and spillway discharge capacity will pass only 11 percent of the PMF without overtopping the embankment. Overtopping the dam could cause failure, which would lead to a significant increase in downstream loss of life and property damage. Therefore, spillway for Robinson Dam is considered to be seriously inadequate.

The following measures should be undertaken immediately by the owner of the dam:

### Robinson Dam

ſ

and selection of the selection of

1. Retain a qualified professional engineer to perform a detailed investigation of the stability of the embankment, including development of remedial measures necessary to place the dam in safe condition. These remedial measures should be implemented immediately.

2. Perform a detailed hydrologic and hydraulic study by a qualified professional engineer to develop plans for increasing the capacity of the existing spillway to an adequate level. This study should also include an evaluation of the adequacy of the existing spillway and outlet channels.

3. The outlet structure should be rehabilitated and provided with a positive upstream closure.

4. All brush and trees should be removed from the embankment slopes. Removal of tree stumps and root systems should be done under the supervision of a qualified professional engineer.

5. All extraneous pipes extending through the embankment should be thoroughly sealed.

6. Riprap should be replaced in areas where needed for wave protection on the upstream embankment.

7. A formal surveillance and downstream emergency warning system should be developed for use during periods of high or prolonged precipitation.

8. An operation and maintenance manual or plan should be prepared for use as a guide in the operation of the dam during normal and emergency conditions.

9. A schedule should be developed for regular inspection and routine maintenance of the dam and appurtenances.

Approved by:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

JAMES W. PECK Colonel, Corps of Engineers District Engineer



ν

•

OVERVIEW + PRESENT CONDITION

ROBINSON DAM

-----

} •

•



### PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

### ROBINSON DAM

### NDI-ID NO. PA-00165 DER-ID NO. 64-136

### SECTION 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 General.

a. Authority.

And the second s

The National Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367, authorized the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, to initiate a program of inspection of dams throughout the United States.

### b. Purpose

The purpose of this inspection is to determine whether Robinson Dam constitutes a hazard to human life and property.

### 1.2 Description of Project.

- a. Description of Dam and Appurtenances.
  - Note: The U.S.G.S. quadrangle sheet (Waymart, Pa.) indicates a reservoir elevation of 1643, which is used in this report as existing spillway crest elevation.

Robinson Dam is an earthfill and dry stone masonry structure with a concrete core wall. The overall length of the dam is approximately 340 feet and the low point of the dam's crest is 19.8 feet above the downstream toe. A 12 foot wide spillway area is located near the left abutment, and a drop inlet structure is located approximately midway across the embankment. Flow into the inlet is controlled by removable wooden stoplogs, currently having an invert elevation approximately two feet below existing top of dam. The outlet for this structure discharges into the natural stream channel at the downstream toe of the embankment.

The original embankment design called for an earth and stone structure 170 feet in length and 15 feet in height, having a concrete corewall extending from four feet below natural ground to top of dam.

There is no record of any modifications being made to the dam.

b. Location: South Canaan Township Wayne County U.S.G.S. Quadrangle - Waymart, Pa. Latitude 41 21.8' Longitude 75<sup>0</sup> 27.2' Ref. Appendix E, Plates I & II. c. <u>Size Classification</u>: Small: Height - 19.8 feet Storage - 190 acre-feet

d. Hazard Classification: High (Ref. Section 3.1.e.)

e. <u>Ownership</u>: Leisure Life Corporation of America C/O Attorney Henry Biglin Hop Bottom, Pennsylvania

f. Purpose: Recreation

And the contract of the

g. Design and Construction History.

The dam was "designed" by Mr. F.G. Meyer for Mr. William H. Robinson. The dam was built by Mr. Robinson and his sons and was completed in 1938. There are no records of any work being performed on the dam since that date. The dam was eventually sold to the Leisure Life Corporation by Mr. Robinson's grandsons, Daniel and Virgil Robinson. Leisure Life Corporation has subsequently defaulted on the mortgage for the property. Mr. Andrew Halestone, lawyer for Daniel and Virgil Robinson, is currently taking action to foreclose and reclaim the property. Mr. Halestone's address is: 200 Bank Towers, Scranton, Pennsylvania 18503.

h. Normal Operating Procedures.

There are no current operating procedures for the dam. Normal pool is maintained by water entering the drop inlet structure and discharging through the outlet conduit. The spillway section is essentially blocked, so that any excess flow must be discharged through or overtop the masonry and earth embankment.

### 1.3 Pertinent Data.

a. Drainage Area (square miles).

From files:	1.50
Computed for this report:	0.50
Use:	0,50

b. Discharge at Damsite (cubic feet per second).

Maximum known flood	Unknown
Outlet works at maximum pool (E1.1644.2)	Conduit size
	unknown
Spillway at maximum pool (E1.1644.2)	45

- c. Elevations (feet above mean sea level).
  - Note: Reservoir elevation of 1643 as shown on U.S.G.S. quad sheet Waymart is used as present spillway crest elevation.

c.	Elevations (feet above mean sea	level) (Cont'd):	
	Top of dam (low point) Top of dam (design) Spillway crest (as surveye Spillway crest (design) Outlet works (top of stopl Downstream culvert invert Streambed at toe of dam	d) ogs)	1644.2 unknown 1643.0 unknown 1642.0 unknown 1624.4
d.	Reservoir Length (miles).		
	Spillway crest (El.1643.0) Maximum pool (El.1644.2)		0.34 0.36
e.	Storage (acre-feet).		
	Spillway crest (E1.1643.0) Maximum pool (E1.1644.2)		150 190
f.	Reservoir Surface (acres)		
	Spillway crest (El.1643.0) Maximum pool (El.1644.2)		30.1 32.0
g.	Dam.		
	Note: Refer to Exhibits in Ap Type: Concrete core wall w/ea masonry downstream. Length: 340 feet (incl. spill Height: 19.8 feet (field meas Top width: 17.0 feet Side slopes: Upstream:	pendix A for plan an rthfill upstream and way) ured; low point to o lV on 4H upper 4'; at maximum section on 4H	nd section. 1 dry stone 1/s toe) 1 lV on 2H below 1 otherwise lV
	Downstream:	where material is	added
	Zoning: Concrete core wall Cutoff: Corewall extends 4 fe Grouting: None reported	et into natural grou	ind.
h.	Outlet Works:		
	Type: 3'x3' drop inlet with s	toplog face; conduit	size and type

• . .

.

• .

unknown. Location: 200' from left abutment on U/S face Closure: Noue reported or observed. i. <u>Spillway</u>:

Type: Uncontrolled, rectangular, stone-lined with broad crest. Length: 12 feet Location: Dam crest; 100 feet from left abutment. Low Flow Notch: None Approach Channel: Reservoir Downstream Channel: Rock-lined

An advised and the second s

### SECTION 2

### ENGINEERING DATA

### 2.1 Design.

Engineering design data for Robinson dam are extremely limited. The available information consists of one rough sketch dated August 1934 showing a profile and section of the proposed dam.

### 2.2 Construction.

The construction data is limited to a progress report by the Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Resources (PennDER) dated 25 May 1938 which mentioned some cracking of the corewall taking place due to ice damage. The PennDER inspector recommended placing riprap to protect against further damage. The report indicated that the dam was being built under the supervision of the original owner, Mr. William Robinson. From the data obtained during the field inspection, it is apparent that either the dam was originally built higher than the PennDER permit called for, or has been raised at some unknown date. The 1965 PennDER inspection stated the dam height as 15 feet, which may not have been verified by field measurement. There is no record in PennDER files of any application for raising the dam, except a note in a progress report during original construction stating that the owner was planning on raising the dam by 3 feet at some future date.

Based on PennDER's 1965 inspection, the owner was requested to clear the spillway opening, which apparently was never done.

### 2.3 Operation.

No formal records of operation or maintenance exist. An inspection report by PennDER in March 1965 stated that there was some leakage at the downstream toe, the spillway was filled in, and the concrete core wall was cracking. The report assessed the dam to be in fair to poor condition.

### 2.4 Evaluation.

### a. Availability.

The only available written information and data on this dam are contained in the files of PennDER. These files contain rough sketches of the proposed structure, which do not correspond in many details to the dam as it currently exists. The files also contain limited inspection and progress reports and related correspondence.

### b. Adequacy.

The available data, including that collected during the recent detailed visual inspection are considered to be adequate to make a reasonable assessment of the dam.

### SECTION 3

### VISUAL OBSERVATIONS

### 3.1 Observations.

### a. General.

The overall appearance of the dam and appurtenances is poor. A portion of the downstream face of the dry stone masonry has collapsed. The spillway is filled with stones to within approximately one foot of the top of the dam. On the day of the inspection, the pool was 2.5 feet below the top of the dam. The owner did not accompany the inspectors to the dam.

The visual inspection checklist and sketches of the general plan, profile and cross-sections of the dam, as surveyed during this inspection, are presented in Appendix A of this report. Photographs taken during the inspection are reproduced in Appendix C.

### b. Dam.

The vertical alignment of the dam crest is irregular with the low point adjacent to the left side of the spillway. The horizontal alignment is straight except for localized collapse of the downstream face and leaning of the corewall. The crest width averages 15 feet downstream of the core wall. A 20 foot x 6 foot wide section of the vertical downstream face of the dry stone masonry dam has collapsed at the dam's maximum section. The rubble is blocking the outlet conduit and a portion of the discharge channel. The date of this collapse is unknown. Clear water is flowing from this area into the streambed at a rate of approximately 8 gallons per minute. The area immediately to the left of this collapsed section shows signs of instability.

Additional material has been placed against the downstream face on a slope of 1V on 1.2H from the spillway to within 10 feet of the maximum section. Construction photographs indicate that entire downstream face was originally constructed vertically. Eight to ten inch diameter trees are growing adjacent to the toe. Smaller trees and brush are growing along the upstream limit of the crest. Eight to ten inch riprap protects the left twothirds of the upstream face. No riprap exists on the right one-third. The upstream face slopes at 1V on 4H for the upper 4 feet and 1V on 2H below at the maximum section; otherwise 1V on 4H.

The top of the core wall is exposed between the left abutment and the spillway and adjacent to the drop inlet. The portion left of the spillway is severely cracked and broken in several locations and is leaning downstream at an angle which varies from 15-45 degrees.

### c. Appurtenant Structures.

The spillway is located on the dam crest approximately 100 feet from the left abutment. The approach is directly from the reservoir and there are no obstructions. However, the spillway is filled with stones to within 1.2 feet of the dam's low point. The upstream ends of the spillway walls are broken and in very poor condition. The downstream limits of the walls are coincident with the downstream face of the dam. Looking toward the spillway from downstream, a broken concrete slab is visible approximately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet below the existing spillway crest. The walls and slab were apparently placed directly on the stone masonry and not carried to natural grade.

The outlet works consist of a drop inlet which is located 200 feet from the left abutment and in line with the core wall. The two sides and downstream face are formed concrete except that large stones are formed into the upper two feet of the sides. The roots from a six inch tree to the right of the inlet are growing through cracks in the upper portion of the inlet wall and down along the inside face. The top of the inlet is a piece of plywood held down by the stones. The upstream face consists of wooden stoplogs in fair condition with no visible leakage. Removal of these stoplogs would cause erosion of the adjacent earthfill since the upstream slope of the dam is continuous across the location of the inlet. There is no evidence of any control. The bottom of the inlet is filled with water to sufficient depth that the outlet conduit cannot be seen. Movement of this water can be detected but the source is unclear. As stated previously, the debris on the downstream slope prevents the examination of the outlet conduit or any outlet structure.

### d. Reservoir Area.

The mostly wooded watershed slopes are moderate to steep and appear stable. Residential development is limited to a few farm houses. No siltation is apparent or reported.

### e. Downstream Channel.

The downstream channel for the spillway is rock-lined with no obstructions. The channel begins perpendicular to the dam axis and is straight for about twenty feet before bending to the right and paralleling the embankment until reaching the original streambed. The streambed has a natural rock bottom with light woods on the mild side slopes.

The first obstruction downstream is a road culvert about 500 feet from the dam. Immediately upstream of this culvert is one house with the first floor approximately nine feet below top of dam. The proximity of this residence to the stream constitutes a high hazard to loss of life should the dam fail. A second house is located 8,700 feet downstream of the dam with the first floor approximately 12 feet above the streambed. Lake Quinn is 2.4 miles downstream of the dam.

### f. Evaluation.

The condition of Robinson Dam and its appurtenances is considered to be poor. The collapse of a portion of the downstream face causes concern for the stability of the adjacent areas. Further investigation of the causes and impact of this collapse is warranted. The outlet works is essentially inoperable with no apparent means of safely drawing down the lake. In addition the spillway is practically nonfunctional in its present condition.

### SECTION 4

### OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

### 4.1 Normal Operating Procedure.

The facility is essentially self-regulating. Inflow would normally pass through the intake structure and outlet conduit. Inflows in excess of the capacity of the outlet works would flow through the spillway and over the dam. No formal operations manual exists.

### 4.2 Maintenance of Dam.

The conditions of the facility as observed by the inspection team is indicative of a general lack of maintenance. A partial collapse of the embankment downstream slope and the obstruction of the outlet conduit are areas that should be repaired. No formal maintenance manual exists. Routine inspection of the dam is currently not performed.

### 4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities.

See Section 4.2 above.

### 4.4 Warning System.

No formal warning system exists.

### 4.5 Evaluation.

Maintenance of the facility is inadequate. Restoration of the outlet works and the embankment in the partially collapsed downstream portion is required. Formal manuals of maintenance and operation are recommended to ensure that all needed maintenance is identified and performed regularly. In addition, a formal warning system for the protection of downstream inhabitants should be developed. Included in the plan should be provisions for aroundthe-clock surveillance of the facility during periods of unusually heavy precipitation.

### SECTION 5

### HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC EVALUATION

### 5.1 Design Data.

No design reports, calculations, or miscellaneous design data are available for the facility.

### 5.2 Experience Data.

Records of reservoir levels and/or spillway discharges are not available. No records of past performance are available.

### 5.3 Visual Observations.

On the date of the inspection, conditions were observed that indicated that the outlet facility would not operate satisfactorily during a flood event. In addition, fill has been placed in the spillway at an undetermined time in the past. The additional fill reduces the capacity of the dam and spillway to pass a flood event.

### 5.4 Method of Analysis.

The facility has been analyzed in accordance with procedures and guidelines established by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, for Phase I hydrologic and hydraulic evaluations. The analysis has been performed using a modified version of the HEC-1 program developed by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, California. Capabilities of the program are briefly outlined in the preface contained in Appendix D.

### 5.5 Summary of Analysis.

a. <u>Spillway Design Flood (SDF)</u>. In accordance with procedures and guidelines contained in the National Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams for phase I investigations, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for Robinson Lake Dam ranges between the 1/2 Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and the full PMF. This classification is based on the relative size of the dam (small), and the potential hazard of dam failure to downstream developments (high). Due to the small storage (less than 200 ac-ft) and height of dam (less than 20 feet) the SDF selected was the 1/2 PMF.

### b. Results of the Analysis.

Robinson Lake Dam was evaluated under near normal operating conditions. Since the outlet conduit has been obstructed, it was ignored in the analysis and the starting water surface elevation was set at elevation 1643.0 (spiilway crest). As previously mentioned, the spiilway has additional rock and fill placed in it leaving only 1.2 feet of freeboard between the existing spillway crest and the low point of top of dam. All pertinent engineering calculations are provided in Appendix D. The overtopping analysis (using HEC1-DB) indicated that the discharge/storage capacity of Robinson Lake Dam can accommodate only about 11 percent of the PMF. Under 1/2 PMF (SDF) conditions the dam is overtopped 9.7 hours to a maximum depth of approximately 1.0 foot. Since the SDF for this dam is the 1/2 PMF, it can be concluded that the dam has a high potential for overtopping, and thus, for breaching under floods of less than SDF magnitude.

To determine if the spillway is seriously inadequate three conditions must be met.

(i) There is a high hazard to loss of life from large flows downstream of the dam.

(ii) The spillway is not capable of passing 1/2 PMF without overtopping the dam and causing failure.

(iii) Dam failure resulting from overtopping would significantly increase the hazard to loss of life downstream of the dam from that which would exist just before overtopping failure.

As Robinson Lake Dam cannot safely accommodate at least 1/2 PMF, a breach analysis is required.

The modified HEC-1 Computer Program was used for the breaching analysis. Since the dam contains a core wall and is rock filled, it is assumed the dam can withstand 1/2 foot of overtopping for short durations. Therefore, the water surface elevation that would cause failure was assumed to be 1644.7.

Four breach models were analyzed under conditions that would approximate 1/2 foot of overtopping. The flood routed was 25% PMF as indicated in Appendix D. Plan 1 was a non-breach run and was inserted into the model to provide a direct means of comparing failure vs. non-failure conditions under the same flood event. Failure times used were 0.33 hour (Plan 2), 1.00 hour (Plan 3) and 2.00 hours (Plan 4). In addition downstream damage centers are given with appropriate channel characteristics and reach lengths. Page D-12 of Appendix D provides peak outflows and changes in stage at the downstream damage centers. Breach geometry is also discussed in Appendix D.

The results of the breach analysis indicated significant increases in stage at downstream damage centers between failure and non-failure conditions.

### 5.6 Spillway Adequacy.

Under existing conditions Robinson Lake Dam can accommodate only about 11 percent of the PMF. Should an event in excess of this occur, the dam would be overtopped and could possibly fail. Since the failure of this dam would lead to increased property damage or loss of life at existing downstream residences, the spillway capacity is considered to be seriously inadequate.

### SECTION 6

### STRUCTURAL STABILITY

### 6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability.

### a. Visual Observations.

### (1) Embankment.

. . . . .

Visual observations of Robinson Dam indicate that the dam is in poor condition. The dry laid stone mass downstream of the corewall is approximately 15 feet wide and has a vertical downstream face. A segment of this stone has collapsed at the maximum section of dam. The collapsed segment is approximately 20 feet long, 6 feet in width perpendicular to the dam axis, and the full height of the dam. The dry laid stone immediately to the left of the collapsed segment shows signs of instability. The concrete corewall is believed to be broken horizontally. It has a downstream tilt which varies from about 15 to 45 degrees. This tilt was probably caused by ice forces. Photographs from 1935 show that this wall was vertical; however, there is no sign of movement in the embankment other than the collapsed segment and the unstable adjacent stone. Water is seeping through the upstream earth embankment into the drop inlet and discharging into the outlet channel at approximately 8 gpm. The water being discharged is clear. Trees are growing on the embankment. The left and middle thirds of the upstream slope are protected by 8 to 10 inch riprap. The right upstream one third has a 5H:1V slope, no rip rap, and no erosion.

### (2) Appurtenant Structures.

The spillway walls and concrete weir are cracked and broken. The spillway has been filled with dry laid stone and covered with fill on the crest. This leaves a shallow depression overgrown with weeds at the spillway. The outlet works consists of a drop inlet and an outlet conduit. The conduit could not be observed because of the collapsed segment of downstream slope. In the drop inlet, the concrete walls are cracked and broken near the top of the inlet. Timber stop logs are used to control the water level. However, fill and riprap have been placed in front of the inlet up to the level of the existing top of stop logs.

### b. Design and Construction Data.

### (1) Embankment.

There are no known design data for this dam. A sketch of a profile and cross section of the proposed dam were submitted to the Water and Power Resources Board (now PennDER) for a construction permit in 1934. Construction data consist of a few photographs when the dam was near completion and several memoranda and a progress report by the Water and Power Resources Board engineers. A review of these data indicates that the dam was to be 170 feet long and 15 feet high. The concrete corewall was to have an 18 inch wide base, be set in a 4 foot deep cutoff trench and have a width of 12 inches at the top of dam. Test pits reveal that the dam foundation is clay. The upstream rolled earth was shown to have a slope of 2H:1V which agrees with the measured slope at the maximum section. The downstream dry laid stone mass was shown to have a planned base width of 15 feet, a top width of 10 feet, and a downstream slope that has a 1H:2V batter. The wall was built with a vertical downstream face, however.

### (2) Appurtenant Structures.

The sketch that accompanied the construction permit application indicated that the spillway would be 12 feet wide and 16 inches deep. There is no data concerning the drop inlet, outlet conduit, or design and construction of the spillway. Measurements at the downstream end of the spillway indicate that the spillway was 28 inches deep before it was filled in to the present depth of 14.4 inches.

### c. Operating Records.

There are no records of operation.

d. Postconstruction Changes.

None reported.

e. Seismic Stability.

Robinson Dam is located in Seismic Zone 1. Normally a statically stable dam in Zone 1 is considered to be seismically stable. This dam however, has already collapsed in one segment and is unstable in the adjacent rock mass. Earthquake activity could easily cause a failure of this unstable segment.

### SECTION 7

### ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7.1 Dam Assessment.

### a. <u>Safety</u>.

The visual inspection and review of available design and construction data indicate that Robinson Dam is in poor condition. The collapsed section of the downstream face, the cracking of the corewall and the blocked spillway and outlet works are reasons for immediate concern. Maintenance procedures need to be established and the spillway, outlet works, and embankment need to be rehabilitated. The dam in its present condition is considered unsafe, non-emergency.

The hydrologic and hydraulic computations indicate that the combination of reservoir storage and spillway discharge capacity will pass only 11 percent of the PMF without overtopping the embankment. Therefore, in accordance with the criteria outlined and evaluated in Section 5.5b, the spillway for Robinson Dam is considered to be seriously inadequate.

### b. Adequacy of Information.

The design and construction information contained in the PennDER files, in conjunction with data collected during the visual inspection, are considered to be adequate for making a reasonable assessment of this dam.

### c. Urgency.

A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OF THE

The recommendations presented below should be implemented immediately.

### d. Necessity for Additional Studies.

The results of this inspection indicate a need for additional studies to ascertain methods of providing adequate spillway capacity and to further evaluate the structural stability of the dam, including development of necessary remedial plans. These studies should be performed by a professional engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams.

### 7.2 Recommendations.

1. The owner should immediately retain a qualified professional engineer to perform a detailed investigation of the stability of the embankment, including development of remedial measures necessary to place the dam in safe condition. These remedial measures should be implemented immediately.

2. A detailed hydrologic and hydraulic study should be performed by a qualified professional engineer to develop plans for increasing the capacity

of the existing spillway to an adequate level. This study should also include an evaluation of the adequacy of the existing spillway and outlet channels.

4. The outlet structure should be rehabilitated and provided with a positive upstream closure.

5. All brush and trees should be removed from the embankment slopes. Removal of tree stumps and root systems should be done under the supervision of a qualified professional engineer.

6. All extraneous pipes extending through the embankment should be thoroughly sealed.

7. Riprap should be replaced in areas where needed for wave protection on the upstream embankment.

8. A formal surveillance and downstream emergency warning system should be developed for use during periods of high or prolonged precipitation.

9. An operation and maintenance manual or plan should be prepared for use as a guide in the operation on the dam during normal and emergency conditions.

10. A schedule should be developed for regular inspection and routine maintenance of the dam and appurtenances.

APPENDIX A

CHECKLIST - VISUAL INSPECTION

Check List Visual Inspection Phase 1

m County Wayne

Name Dam Robinson Dam

Date(s) Inspection 4 Nov 80 Weather Cloudy w/shwrs.

vrs. Temperature 500

State Pennsylvania

Pool Elevation at Time of Inspection 1641.5 M.S.L. Tailwater at Time of Inpsection 1624.4 M.S.L.

Inspection Personnel:

J. Evans (Corps of Engr) B. Cortright (Corps of Engr.)

J. Bianco (Corps of Engr.)

E. Hecker (Corps of Engr.)

B. Cortright

Recorder

EMBANKMENT, CORE WALL AND STONE MASONRY

6.

•

...

•\_\_\_.

.

٠

.

UISHAI EVAMINATION OF	ORSERVATIONS
Any Noticeable Seepage	Eight gpm of clear water flowing from toe at old streambed. Exact location of source obscured by stone from local collapse of d/s face.
Junction of Embankment with: Abutments Spillway Other Features	Good. No signs of erosion or settlement.
Foundation	Not observed.
Surface Cracks – Concrete	Surface cracks and spalling of exposed portions of core wall.
Structural Cracking	Exposed portions of core wall to the left of spillway are cracked vertically in several locations. Walls also lean max. $45^{\circ} \pm d/s$ . Unable to determine if wall has broken off below grade or was constructed this way.
Crest Alignment: Vertical	Vertical - Irregular, varies 0.5' to 1.0' between maximum and minimum elevations with greatest variation near the abutments.
Horizontal	Horizontal - Straight; localized collapse of d/s face; corewall is leaning.
Surface Cracks Embankment	None observed.

EMBANKMENT, CORE WALL AND STONE MASONRY

OBSERVATIONS

Cracking at or Beyond Unusual Movement or the Toe

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF

Sloughing or Erosion: Embankment Slopes Abutment Slopes

Riprap Fallures

Staff Gage and Recorder

Drains

Miscellaneous

Instrumentation

None apparent.

Area immediately left of failure shows signs 6 foot wide x 20 foot long section of d/s face collapsed. Collapsed area is centered over original of instability. streambed.

Very sparse riprap on right one-third of u/s face but no erosion or signs of failure.

None

None

along entire length of dam. Four to six inch dia. trees Several 8"-10" dia trees growing immediately d/s of toe on u/s face immediately right of spillway and left and right of drop inlet.

None

 -1**-**----

OUTLET WORKS

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS
Outlet Conduit	Not observed. u/s end submerged in base of drop inlet and d/s end buried by collapse of dry masonry on d/s face. Eight inch iron pipe encased in concrete projecting from collapsed area approx. two feet below crest. Condition fair. Purpose unknown. Two iron pipes of 6 inch dia. visible on d/s face 5 feet left of inlet and 10 feet below crest. Condition fair. Purpose unknown.
Intake Structure	Plywood top. (not secured). U/S side is stoplogs in fair condition. Concrete in fair condition. Tree roots coming through cracks near top of left wall and running down inside face. No trash rack.
Outlet Structure	None observed. Collapsed portion of d/s face precluded any inspection if a structure does exist.
Outlet Channel	Original streambed. Collapsed portion of embankment blocks channel immediately d/s of outlet. Remainder of channel has rock bottom and is clear.
Emergency Gate	None observed.

•

• .

.

٠

.

# UNGATED SPILLWAY

4

....**.** 

### OBSERVATIONS

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF

Concrete Weir

Filled with stones to within one foot of crest.

Reservoir - no obstructions.

Channel begins adjacent to spillway toe. Rock lined w/3' bottom - No obstructions.

Discharge Channel

Approach Channel

None.

Bridge and Piers

i t

wit K

DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF

Conditions:

Slopes 1. Channel 2. Sides

Approximate number of Homes

OBSERVATIONS

Rock bottom with trees along banks. Clear until culvert 500' d/s, then flows into small impoundment.

Flat
 Mild; wooded

One house 500' downstream with first floor approximately nine feet below the top of dam. Roadway 4,800 feet downstream with 6'x7' elliptical culvert. One house 8,700' downstream with first floor approximately 12 feet above streambed. Lake Quinn 2.4 miles downstream.

**RESERVOIR AND WATERSHE** 

## OBSERVATIONS

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF

Slopes

Right side - Steep and wooded. No apparent slide activity. Left side - Generally mild and wooded.

Sedimentation

None reported or observed.

. 1





براي المحادثة والمستحد المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة والمحادثة والمحادثة والمحادثة والمحادثة والمحادثة والمحادثة و

APPENDIX B

•\_\_\_\_

.**.**.

CHECKLIST - ENGINEERING DATA

Permit application report prepared by PennDER in August 1934 provides summary of design features. NAME OF DAM Robinson Dam NDI ID# PA 00165 U.S.G.S. Waymart Quadrangle - 7.5 minute Original construction completed in 1938. DER ID# 64-136 No record of subsequent modifications. Rough Sketch Only; Not As-Built. See Plate 2, Appendix E. DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION See Appendix F. ENGINFERING DATA CHECK LIST PHASE 1 REMARKS None None None Discharge Ratings Rainfall/Reservoir Records Typical Sections of Dam Constraints Regional Vicinity Map Construction History Details As-Built Drawings Geology Reports **Outlets - Plan** Design Reports ITEM

B – 1

TEM	REMARKS
esign Computations ydrology & Hydraulics am Stability eepage Studies	None
laterials Investigations loring Records aboratory ield	Memo in PennDER files indicated that test pits were dug during construction and showed foundation soil to be clay.
ost-Construction Surveys of Dam	None
Sorrow Sources	None
donitoring Systems	None
lodifications	Unknown
ligh Pool Records	None
Post-Construction Engineering Studies and Reports	None
Prior Accidents or Failure of Dam Description Reports	None reported

•\_\_\_\_

٠

.

**B** – 2
TEM	REMARKS
la întenance Iperation lecords	None
spillway Plan Sections Details	Rough Sketch Only No Details
)perating Equipment Plans & Details	None
Specifications	None
fiscellaneous	None
Previous Inspections	1965 (PennDER) Noted spillway blockage Generally poor condition

1

 • .

APPENDIX C

•

<del>4</del>

PHOTOGRAPHS



Robinson Dam ~ NDI 00165

л.,



1. Crest, upstream face and abutments.



2. Upstream face and left abutment.

Robinson Dam - NDI 00165

• • • •

.,

ويتوافقا فاستخدار والمستحد فليستحد

Construction of the second second



· •

.

3. Downstream face near left abutment.



4. Downstream face between spillway and maximum section.

Robinson Dam - NDI 00165



.

5. Colapsed section of downstream face.



6. Left side of collapsed section and downstream face.

Robinson Dam - NDI 00165

• • • • •

**ب** 

í,



.

• .

7. Collapsed section of downstream face. Purpose of concrete encased pipe is unknown.



3. Downstream channel.

-- .

.....



1

9. Drop inlet on upstream face.



10. Downstream end of spillway. Note ends of concrete walls and broken bottom slab approximately 2 1/2 feet below crest.

APPENDIX D

• . .

٠

.

3

۰۱**۵** ۲۰۰۰ ۲۰

4

.

.

HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS

#### PREFACE

The modified HEC-1 program is capable of performing two basic types of hydrologic analyses: 1) the evaluation of the overtopping potential of the dam; and 2) the estimation of the downstream hydrologic-hydraulic consequences resulting from assumed structural failures of the dam. Briefly, the computational procedures typically used in the dam overtopping analysis are as follows:

a. Development of an inflow hydrograph(s) to the reservoir.

b. Routing of the inflow hydrograph(s) through the reservoir to determine if the event(s) analyzed would overtop the dam.

c. Routing of the outflow hydrograph(s) from the reservoir to desired downstream locations. The results provide the peak discharge(s), time(s) of the peak discharge(s), and the maximum stage(s) of each routed hydrograph at the downstream end of each reach.

The evaluation of the hydrologic-hydraulic consequence resulting from an assumed structural failure (breach) of the dam is typically performed as shown below.

a. Development of an inflow hydrograph(s) to the reservoir.

b. Routing of the inflow hydrograph(s) through the reservoir.

c. Development of a failure hydrograph(s) based on specified breach criteria and normal reservoir outflow.

d. Routing of the failure hydrograph(s) to desired downstream locations. The results provide estimates of the peak discharge(s), time(s) to peak and maximum water surface elevations of failure hydrographs for each location.

### HYDROLOGY & HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS DATA BASE

NAME OF DAM:

ROBINSON POND WAN

.....

PROBABLE MAXIMUM PRECIPITATION (PMP) =

 $PMP) = 21.5 \qquad Inches/24 Hours (1)$ 

STATION	1	2	3
STATION DESCRIPTION	RUBINSON POND		
DRAINAGE AREA (SQUARE MILES)	O.50		
CUMULATIVE DRAINAGE AREA (SQUARE MILES)	0,50		
ADJUSTMENT OF PMF FOR (1) DRAINAGE ARKA LOCATION (%)	Z012E 1		
6 Hours 12 Hours 24 Hours 48 Hours 72 Hours	  23  33  42 		
SNYDER HYDROGRAPH PARAMETERS Zone (2) $C_p$ (3) $C^p$ (3) $L^t$ (MILES) (4) $L_{ca}$ (MILES (4) $tp = C_t$ (L $\cdot L_{ca}$ ) 0.3 (HOURS)	1. 0.45 1.23 1.04 0.52 1.02		
SPILLWAY DATA CREST LENGTH (FEET) FREEBOARD (FEET)	/ 2 1.2		

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

(1) HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL REPORT - 33, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955.

(2) Hydrologic zone defined by Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, For Determination of Snyder Coefficients ( $C_p$  and  $C_r$ ).

(3) Snyder Coefficients

A ....

· .

(4) L = Length of longest watercourse from dam to basin divide.
 L = Length of longest watercourse from dam to point opposite basin centroid.

BALT-MORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS	PAGE
SUBJECT AFETY INSPECTION	
COMPUTATIONS NEW PONE	SHEET OF2 SHEET
COMPUTED BY CHECKED BY	DATE

ALL CLASTFICATION SIZE OF DAM - Small HAZARD - High REQUIREL SAF - 1/2 PMF to FULL PM=

2411 STATISTICS

And the second sec

HEIGHT OF DAM - 19.5 Feet STORAGE AT NORMAL POOL- 153 acrefeet STORAGE AT TOIL OF HAM (TOL) - 190 acrefeet DRAINAGE AREA - 0.50 mi.<sup>2</sup>

ELEVATIONS: \*

TOP OF LAM (FIELD - 1644.3 TOP OF DAM (DESIGN) - UNKNOWN NORMAL POOL - 1643.0 EMERGENCY SPILLWAY CREST - 1643.0 LP.OF TALLET UPSTREAM - TOP OFSTOP LOES - 1642.0 NOUNCTREAM OUTLET - UNORSERVED - 4 STREAM BED AT CENTERLINE OF LAM - 1625.0

ELEVATIONS AFE REFERENCEL TO USES. LUN THEET- N'AYMART, A. GIVING LAKE ELE T 1643 ACOMENTO BE AT CITLOURY LEST.

D-4

SHIS PAGE IS BEST BUALITY PRACTACING

MADB

BALTIMORE DISTRICT, COR	PS OF ENGINEERS	PAGE
SUBJECT AM	SAFETY INSPECTION	
COMPUTATIONS	ROBINSON POND	SHEET 2 OF 12 SHEETS
COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE 12-9-80

•

HYAROGRAPH ARAMETERS RIVER BASIN - DELAWARE ZONE - 1 SYNGER COEFFICIENTS : Cp - 0.45 Ct - 1.23

- \* LENGTH OF THE LONGEST WATERCOURSE : L= 1.04 miles
- \*- LENGTH OF THE LONGEST WATERCOURSE TO THE CENTROD OF THE BASIN: L= 0.52 miles

ED = SNYAERS BASIN LAGTIME TO PEAK IN HOURS

$$t_{p} = C_{t}(L + c_{t})^{0.3}$$
  
= 1.23(1.04(0.52))  
= 1.02 hours

RESERVOR CAPACITY - SURFACE AREA AT NORMAL POOL = 30.1 acres SPILLWAY CREST AT EL. 1643.0 - SURFACE AREA AT ELEVATION 1660 = 65.0 acres ASSUME CONICAL METHON APPLIES TO FIND LOW POINT IN POOL, BROW NORMAL POOL.

VOLUME OF NORMAL ROL = 153 N; FT.

\*- LELLA ARE MENSURED FARAMETERS, DIFF USGS QUAR SMEET WAYMART, PA.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Hittpel Differ consists of theorem is the set of the set$$

•

•

٩

•

BALT MURE DISTRICT DURPS OF ENGINEERS PAGE SUBJECT STATUS TO CALL ADAN UNPUTED BY 1777 JACK SHELKED BY DATE

# MAY ALCULATIONS :

- STA ARA LURATIA ZING 1 MANATER #34

JURATION HR	EXCENT OF - AVILY RAINTAL
ж. Ж.	$M_{1}$
12	. CE
24	135
48	142

- NOTE: HON MAINT FROM THE W. MICHANALL COMPLETED FOR THE HELLINE ANDRAM FOR A DRANAGE THEA LES THEAL IS MOLES WOUNKE THE HET STAFATT CARTOR ODES. HE ASTROTATION FOR THE ALIAN STATES IN THE SECTOR LIKELIHOUS OF A SEVERE STOPP SEATER A. - - > A MALL PACING
- CDF: BASED ON THE SMALL HEIGHT AND JOKAGE FORME DAM. THE SDF SELECTED SOUSIDERING THE HABARD CATAGORY WAS THE YZPMF THIS S IN ALLIKYAN WITH THE GUIDENCE TROUDED.

: USE SOF = 1/2 PMF

TAIS PAGE IS BEST AUALIAN

A THISTALL TAILER FROM HYAROMET NO.33 - BRIANAL , HAAT I MIT EAST OF 10543 MERINAN - FRICAFL- TO LEWMOND EACK.

D-7

FORM



LAN PAINT	LUKIE:
	Distantion
ت بیمد	C
5425	L
1644 2	45
	IÉÇ
<b>المع الث</b> الية المع الم	
K -	471
it of	2400

ALLAN NO HOC

D - D

BALTIMORE DISTRICT	CORPS OF ENGINEERS	PAGE
COMPUTATIONS	ROBINSON ADNIL	_ SHEET OF SHEETS
COMPUTED BY	1913 CHECKED BY	DATE 12-10-80

EMBANKMENT RATING CURVE:

-

408 FORM -232, 28 MAR 74

TH AWALKSIS ASSUMES THAT THE EMBANKMENT ESCHAVES AS A BROAD CRESTED WEIR IF OVERTOFFING OCCURS. THE DISCHARGE CAN BE ESTIMATED BY:

Q=CLHw 22

WHERE: Q= DISCHARGE OVER EMBANKMENT, IN CFS L,= LENGTA OF EMBANKMENT, AVERAGE, INFA Hw= WEIGHTED HEAD IN FEET, AVERAGE ROW AREA WEIGHTED ABOVE LOW POINT OF DAM C = COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE

LENGTH OF	EMBANKMENT	INUN DATED
<b>√</b> ≤.	RESERVOIR E4	EVATION:

RESERVOIR ELEUTION (MSL)	EMCANINMENT LENGTH	(PT)
1644.2	0 ft.	
1644.5	180 A.	
1645.0	260 A.	
1646.0 *	ENTIRE LENSTH OF	5226:
1650.0 🕊	32 <del>8(1</del>	
1655.0*	328ft	
1660.0 **	32814	

\* AT THESE ELEVATIONS ASSUME L = LENGTH OF EMBAURY::  $Q = CLH^{3/2}$  gives consensitive result

BALTIMORE DISTR	ICT, CORPS OF E	NGINEERS	PAGE
SUBJECT.	Mr.1 SAFE	TY TAME CATONS	
CO	ROBINSO	N PONL	
COMPUTED BY	MAB	CHECKED BY	DATE12-10-60

EMBANKME	NT KA	HING A	BLE:	~		_	÷
RESERVOIR ELFNATION	(++)	L2 (ff)	TULRHEDTIK HEAD iti	FRICKEREAFAL FLOW AREA AL	FLOW ARIA	Wei U Hed 7 _ (A	12 (CFE
1644.2	0	-	-	—		<b>~</b> .	!
1644.5	160	0	0.3	27	27	0.15	30
1645.D	260	180	0.5	110	187	0.53	290
1646.0	328	260	1.0	294	431	1.30	1390
1650.0	328	328	4.0	1312	1743	5.30	11400
1655.0	328	328	5.0	1640	3383	10.30	356x
1660.0	328	328	5.0	1640	5023	15.30	5512

C=2.85

• • ...•

۶,

and the second second

MADB FORM 232, 28 MAR 74

TOTAL FACILITY RATING CURVE			Grown = QSPILL + Q EARS		
Sperner CREAT	RESERVOIR ELEVATION IT	95ALLWAY 	General (CPS)	Cors)	
Low 7.0.D	1643.5 1644.2 1644.5	45 60	<u> </u>	<del>45</del> 90	
	1645.0	100	290		
	1646.0	180	1390	1570	
	1650.0	630	11400	12030	
	1655.0	1420	35600	37000	
	1660.0	-706	55900	58300	

ABOUE VALUES TO BE TATUT ON YA \$ 15 CARD.

D-10

BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS PAGE \_\_\_\_\_ SUBJECT LATT ATETY ANALIS COMPUTATIONS \_\_\_\_\_ FINCON FOND \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_ SHEETS COMPUTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ CHECKED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE



NOTE: SINCE THE LAND IS A HIGH HAZARD, AND IT IS FELT THAT THE 50% PMF WOULD CAUSE FAILURE A BREACH ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED. THE BREACH ANALYSIE WOULD EXAMINE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FAILURE AND NON-FAILURE CONDITIONS FOR ~ 25% PMF.



TYPICAL BREACH SECTION



NAOR FORM (232,28 MAR 74

D-11

BALTIMORE DISTRICT	CORPS OF ENGINEERS	PAGE
COMPUTATIONS	MOENIAL POND	
COMPUTED BY	CHECKED BY	DATE CA-EU

## HECHOB INPUT PARAMETERS FOR BREACH ANALYSIS

SINCE LAM HAS CORE WOLL AND STONE EMPANKMENT. ASSUME BREACH OCCURS WHEN WATER SURFACE ELEVATION REACHES 1644.7 OR 1/2 FOOT AGUSTETS.

PLAN	BREACH COTTOM WIDTH (FT)	FULL BREACH , DEPTH (FI)	SIDE SLOPES	TOTAL BREK. THE THE
	50	14.2	OSH:1V	0.33
ſ,	50	14.2	0.5H : IV	1.00
4	50	14.2	0.5H : IV	2 00

NOTE :

TO REACH A WATER SURFACE ELEWATION & FOOT HEQUE TOD ROUTE 15% PMF FOR BREACH AWALYSIS

HECIDE OUTPUT

RESULTS OF LAM BREACH ANALYSIS

AC NOTEL ABOVE-THAN I IS FOR NON FAILURE CONSITIONS

DLAN	MAXIMUM DUTPLOW	JOUNDER	EAM LAMACE	CENTER #2		
VUMBER	THRU BREACH	STAGE (MS-)	FLOW	ITAGE (MSL)	FLOW (CFC)	
	260	16-23.6	260	1403.7	260	
â	75 <b>8</b> 0	16334	7160	1408.1	4060	
3	3400	1630.0	2890	1407.2	2535	
4	2070	16286	1876	1406.4	1620	

DOWNSTREAM AMAGE CENTER #1 - FIRST FLOOR OF HOME ~ EL 1323 LOWALSTREAM DAMAGE CENTER #2 - FIRST FLOOR OF HOME ~ EL 1444

1-12

LO DI GE LE EEST MUALIER FEAGLAUILLE La LUI à L'MAISIAN TO BOC

B FORM 1232, 28 MAR

DIETZGEN CORPORATION Made in U.S.A.

.

NO. 340 - 10' A DIETZGEN GRAPH PAPER 10 X 10 PER HALF INCH

NOTE : FIELD INDER ARTIN -1 -1 - 4 1 1 VERTICH1 = 4 230' DOWNSTRENT OF JUN 15W 30004 331 - 00140313 636 630 628 1634 622 633 626 SANS. 129 R T 11 . -: ::: ::: LONING DOWNSIREM . • : 235' 1000 16 AM 05 DAM EN 4 ÿ 3 12.5 203 \_\_\_\_ : . ł ÷

. est . 0/12

....

· t

1

2

D-13

JOBNIKON PAUD DUMANTEAN OF ENERAUSINE 1" vect = 4" 1°\* HOOH of FILLE NEWE - 10' GELONU to' bound them of the ł ł ÷ 0.01 Sc Ne :: Hot H BRENKIN HOW TOP I Way FAWARE HAV ł X-SECTION 25' UPSTREAM OF SMALL -2 WAF LOOKING DOWNDSTREMY ġ, Doursepent be DAM 1 9 N S 7 500 9 4 1-00 2-1-00 2-1-00 1423 636 63 1624 K.20 1623 634 3 TSW 30084 1333 00140373

DIETZGEN CORPORATION MADE IN U. 8. A.

٩.

ND. 340 .10' , DIETZGEN GRAPH PAPER 10 X 10 PER HALF INCH

D-14

sheet 11/12

Ż

語のし

DIETZGEN CORPORATION MADE IN U.B.A.

ND. 340 . 10' . DIETZGEN GRAPH PAPER 10 X 10 PER HALF INCH ί,

· ...-



• \_ .

			****								
DAM SAFETY VERSION	9UKAI	JULY	1978								
LAST MODIFICATIO	N 0	1 APR	80								
**************************************	<del>μει</del> Δ1	<del>11111</del> 1 0	<del>111</del> Orthonn	nam net	2 NO 90-	44-126					
2	A2	DAĤ	SAFTEY	INSPECTI(	IN PROGRA	M 12	-9-80				
3	A3	(V)	ERTOPPIN	G ANALYS	IS ###	PRELIM	INARY	***			
4	Ð	144	0	20	0	0	Q	Ŏ	Ŏ	Õ	Ŏ
5	- B1	5	Q	. o	0	Q	0	Û	Q	Q	0
07	 	0 10	0.20	0.20	A 5A	1 00					
2 2	101	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.00	1.00	٥	1	0	0	0
9	ĥ	RUŇ	off from	DRAINAG	e area àb	ove robi	nson dår	•	v	v	·
10	- Ĥ	1	1	0.50	0	0.50	0	0	0	1	0
11	P	Ó	21.5	111	123	133	142			•	•
12	Ţ			0	0	0	0	1.0	0.05	0	0
13	W.	-1.02	-0.45	2							
15	ŝ	-1.3	1	່ ຄໍ	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
16	- Ř1	ROÛ	ITING 291	F's thrù	ROBINSON	i dam and	SPILL	iy -	-	•	•
17	Ŷ	Õ	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
18	- Y1	1	0	0	0	0		-1643	-1	0	0
19	- Y4	1643.0	1643.5	1644.2	1644.5	1645.0	1646.0	1650.0	1655.0		
20	- YO #C	0	12.0	45.0	90.0	390.0	12/0.0	12030.0	37000.0		
22	- <b>1</b> -7	1627.7	1643.0	1644.2	1650.0	1655.0	1660.0				
23	- 55	1643.0	)				••••				
24	\$D	1644.2									
25	K.	_1		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
26	_ K1		INSTREAM	X-SECTION	JN 230 FE	ELERUM	LIAR				
27	- <b>T</b> .	0			1	^	٥	-1			
20	- 73 - 72	40.0	0.05	0 07	1422	14.28	220	0.0000	٥	٥	٥
30	77	100	1638	142	1630	162	1625	175	1622	190	162Ž
31	¥7	197	1625	207	1630	225	1638	•		-	
32	K	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
33	<u>- K</u> 1	R	OUTE THE	UTHE	ist downs	STREAM DA	wage cer	ITER			
34	- ¥.	0			1	٥	٥	_1			
50 24	- VL	0 07	0.05	0.07	1420	1428	470	0.0090	٥	0	٥
30	77	100	1639	40	1627.8	180	1627	192	1620	202	1620
38	- Ÿ7	ŹĬŎ	1627	277	1633.6	323	1638	• • •			
39	K	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
40	_ K1		route fi	on thru	2ND DOWN	ISTREAM	Damage (	ENTER			
41 4-)	¥.	9			ľ	٨	۸	-1			
42	AV	0 0		5 0.07	1400	1414	8200	0.027	٥	٥	٥
Ä	- y7	100	) 1414	120	1406	170	1403	175	1400	178	1400
45	Ý7	18	1405	246	1406	270	1414	•••	• · · •	- •	
46	K	99	)								
1			PREVI	iew (nf. se	plience of	STREAM	NETWORK	CALCULA	TIONS		

· · .

A state of the second sec

11234

RUNOFF HYDROGRAPH AT	
ROLITE HYDROGRAPH TO	
ROLITE HYDROGRAPH TO	
ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO	
ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO	
END OF NETHORK	

FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1) DAM SAFETY VERSION JULY 1978 LAST MODIFICATION 01 APR 80

.

RUN DATE# 31/03/04. TIME# 04.26.49.

> RORINSON DAN DER NO. 90-64-136 DAN SAFTEY INSPECTION PROGRAM 12-9-80 OVERTOPPING ANALYSIS ### PRELIMINARY \*\*\* JOB SPECIFICATION

NO	NHR	NMIN	IDAY	THR	IMIN	METRO	IPI_T	IPRT	NSTAN
144	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			LIOPER	NHT	LROPT	TRACE			
			5	0	0	0			

#### MULTI-PLAN ANALYSES TO BE PERFORMED NPLAN= 1 NRTIQ= 5 LRTIO= 1 .30 .50 1.00 .10 .20

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

SUB-AREA RUNOFF COMPUTATION

RINDEE FROM DRAINAGE AREA ABOVE ROBINSON DAM

RTIOS=

•

	I	st <b>ag</b> 1	ICOMP 0	IECON 0	ITAPE 0	JPLT 0	JPRT 0	INAME 1	ISTAGE 0	OTUAL 0
ihydg 1	IUHG 1	TAREA	SNAF	Hydrogi P Trsdi ) .5(	Raph Data TRSPC	RATI0 0.000	ISNOI (	i isa	NE LOCI	AL O

PRECIP DATA SPFE PMS R6 R12 R24 R48 R72 0.00 21.50 111.00 123.00 133.00 142.00 0.00 TRSPC COMPUTED BY THE PROGRAM IS .800 R96 0.00

LOSS DATA LROPT STRVR DLTVR RTIOL ERAIN STRKS RTIOK STRTL CNSTL ALSHX 0 0.00 0.00 1.00 0.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.00 RTIMP 0.00

UNIT HYDROGRAPH DATA TP= 1.02 CP= ,45 NTA= 0

RECESSION DATA STRTQ= -1.50 ORCSN= -.05 RTIOR= 2.00 APPROXIMATE CLARK COEFFICIENTS FROM GIVEN SNYDER CP AND TP ARE TC= 3.33 AND R= 4.76 INTERVALS

۱	UNIT HYDROGRAPH	27 END-0	F-PERIOD	ORDINATES,	lag=	1,03 HOURS,	CP= .45	VOL= 1.00	
21.	76.	128.	137.	115.	93.	75.	61.	49.	40
32.	26.	21.	17.	14.	11.	9.	7.	6.	5
4,	3.	3.	2.	2.	1.	1.			

ROBINSON DAM

OVERTOPPING AN MUSS

	*******		******		H	*******		******		н	*******
					HYDROG	raph rou	TING				
	RO	UTING ZPH	F'S THR	U ROBIN	ISON DAM A	ND SPILLI	AY				
			ISTAQ 1	ICOM	P IECON I O BOIL	ITAPE 0 TING DAT	JPLT 0	JPRT 0	INAME 1	ISTAGE 0	IAUTO 0
		9L055 0.0	CL055 0.000	AV( 0.00	G IRES	ISAME 1	" 10PT 0	IPMP 0		LSTR 0	
			NSTPS 1	NSTDI	LAG 0 0	AMSKK 0.000	x 0.000	TSK 0.000	stora -1643.	ISPRAT -1	
STAGE	1643.00	1643.50	16	44.20	1644.5	0 16	45.00	1646.0	0 16	50.00	1655.00
FLOW	0.00	12.00		45.00	90.0	0 3	90.00	1570.0	0 120	030.00	37000.00
CAPACI	TY= 0	. 15	0.	190.	410.	660	. 🤄	960.			
ELEVATIO	<b>)N=</b> 1628.	. 164	3.	1644.	1650.	1655	. 16	60.			
		CR 1643	EL SP	WID 0.0	COON E	XPW EL	EVL (	0.0 CA	REA 1	EXPL 0.0	
					TOPEL 1644.2	DAM COOD 0.0	DATA EXPD 0.0	DAMUID O.			

-

.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

٠

.

An an and the second

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### PEAK FLON AND STORAGE (END OF PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS FLOWS IN CUBIC FEFT PER SECOND (CUBIC METERS PER SECOND) AREA IN SQUARE MILES (SQUARE KILOMETERS)

						RATIOS APPLIED TO FLOWS			
OPERATION	STATION	AREA	plan	RATIO 1 .10	RATIO 2 .20	RATIO 3 .30	RATIO 4 .50	RATIO 5 1.00	
hydrograph at	1 (	.50 1.29)	1	138. 3.91)(	276. 7.81)(	414. 11.72)(	690. 19.54)(	1380. 39.07)(	
Routed to	1	.50 1.29)	1	42. 1.20)(	188. 5.32)(	332. 9.41)(	638. 18.06)(	1303. 36,98)(	
Rolited to	2,	.50 1.29)	1 (	<b>42.</b> 1.20)(	188. 5.34)(	333. 9.43)(	638. 18.08)(	1302. 36.86)(	
routed to	3,	.50 1.29)	1	42. 1.20)(	188. 5.32)(	333. 9.44)(	639. 18.09)(	1300. 36.82)(	
ROUTED TO	4	.50 1.29)	1,	42. 1.19)(	185. 5.23) (	326. 9,231 (	617. 17.48)(	1266. 35.86)(	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

## SUNNARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

•

•

	elevation Storage Outflow	INITIAL VALUE 1643.00 150. 0.		SPILLWAY CR 1643.00 150. 0.	iest top 1	TOP OF DAM 1644,20 190. 45.	
RATIO	MAXIMUM	Maxinum	Naximun	Maximum	DURATION	time of	tine of
OF	RESERVOIR	Depth	Storage	Outflow	OVER TOP	Max Outflow	Failure
PHF	W.S.ELEV	Over Dam	AC-FT	CFS	HOURS	Hours	Hours
.10	1644.14	0.00	188.	42.	0.00	44.00	0.00
.20	1644.66	.46	208.	188.	7.67	42.33	0.00
.30	1644.90	.70	217.	332.	8.67	41.67	0.00
.50	1645.21	1.01	228.	638.	9.67	41.00	0.00
1.00	1645.77	1.57	250.	1303.	11.33	41.00	0.00

PL/	WI 1 9	STATION	2
RATIO	MAXIMUN	MAXINUM	tihe
	FLON, CFS	STAGE, FT	Hours
.10	42.	1622.9	44.00
.20	188.	1624.1	42.33
.30	333.	1624.9	41.67
.50	638.	1625.9	41.00
1.00	1302.	1627.5	41.00
PL	AN 1	STATION	3
RATIO	MAXIMUM	HAXIMUN	TINE
	Flow, CFS	STAGE,FT	HOURS
.10	42.	1621.2	44.00
.20	188.	1622.9	42.33
.30	333.	1624.0	41.67
.50	639.	1625.6	41.00
1.00	1300.	1627.7	41.00
PL.	AN 1	STATION	4
RATIO	MAXIMUM Flow, CFS	MAXIMUN STAGE+FT	TIME
.10	42.	1401.6	44.33
.20	185.	1403.2	42.67
.30	326.	1404.0	42.00
.50	617.	1405.0	41.67
1.00	1266.	1406.1	41.33

*****************	*********
FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PAC	KAGE (HEC-1)
DAM SAFETY VERSION	JULY 1978
LAST MODIFICATION	01 APR 80
**********************	**********

MAG WORLIGON

OUERTOPPING ANALYSIS

D-19

1

PLAN 1 .....

•**•**•

1

•

INTERNET HYDROGRAPH PA			r-1)								
DAM SAFETY VERSION		ĴΨΥ	1978								
LAST HODIFICATION	0	1 APR	80								
***************	***		HEFER MODINGON I		-	(					
1	H1 Δ2	no.	CONTROL I	INCRECTION	Υ MUL 90- ΊΝΙ ΡΙΡΩΩΩΌΔ	09-130 N 12	-9-90				
3	22	RE	FACH ANAL	VSIS		THIN ARY	+++				
Å	R	144		20	0	0		0	0	0	0
5	81		i õ	ĨŎ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ
6	Ĵ	Ā	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	JI	0, 25									
8	Ķ.			0	0	~ 0		1	0	0	0
10	<u>K1</u>	KUN	UPP PRUM	UKAINAG	e Akea Ab		NSUN LIAN	۱ ۵	^		•
10	D	r 0	215	111	122	122	142	V	U	1	U
12	T	č	1 1.3		140	135	142	1.0	0.05	٥	٥
13	ų.	1.02	0.45	v	v	v	v	1.0	V.VJ	v	v
14	Ϋ́	-1.5	-0.05	2							
15	K	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
16	KI.	ROL	ITING XPH	f's thru	ROBINSON	dam and	SPILLWA	IY _			-
1/	¥.	ç	, Š	, N	ļ	ļ	Ŏ	142	Q.	Ŏ	Ŏ
10		1412 0	1425	1444 2	1444 5	1445 0	1446 0	1/50 0		v	U
20	VE	10431(	104313	1044.2	104413	104210	1040.0	1000.0	1000.0		
20	01 0	č	12.0	40,0	90.0 Ato	590.0	13/0.0	12030.0	3/000.0		
22	÷٩	1627.7	1643.0	1644.2	1650.0	1655.0	1660.0				
23	\$\$	1643.0	)								
24	\$ <u>₽</u>	1644.2	2								
25	<b>S</b> B	50	) 0.5	1630	0.33	1643	1700				
20	90 40	30	) 0.0 ) 0.5	1630	1 00	1643	1044,/				
29	4D	50	0.5	1430	2 00	1640	1644.7				
29	K	ĩ	2	1000		10-0	1044.7	1	0	Û	0
30	ΪŔ1	DÔ	MISTREAN	X-SECTI	DN 30 ŘE	et froň	Dam	•	v	•	v
31	Y	0	) 0	0	1	1					
32	Y1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0			
33	<u>¥6</u>	0.07	0.05	0.07	1622	1640	230	0.009	0	0	0
34	<u></u>	100	) 1638	142	1630	162	1625	1/5	1622	190	1622
-3-3 26	1	17/	1072	207	1030	225	1040	1	٥	^	^
37	ĥ	ĥ	พี่มา สาเกต	ITHE	IST DOLLAS	TREAM DA	MARE (TEN		v	U	v
38	Ŷ	Ö		0	101 1-54410	1					
39	٧1	1	Ô.	Ó	Ō	Ō	0	0			
40	٧6	0.07	0.05	0.07	1620	1638	270	0.0090	0	0	0
41	<u>77</u>	100	1638	140	1627.8	180	1627	192	1620	202	1620
42	<i></i>	210	162/	2//	1633.6	3Z3	1638		•	•	•
43	K	1		บ		CTDE AM	DAMACE C		0	U	0
45	Ŷ	٨		077711 BR		SHREHIT t	DHALLOC L	CHICK			
46	Ŷ1	Ĭ	ŏ	ŏ	ò	Ô	0	0			
47	¥6	0.07	0.05	0.07	1400	1414	820Ŏ	0.027	0	0	0
48	٧Ż	100	1414	120	1406	170	1403	175	1400	178	1400
49	<u>۲</u> 7	185	1405	246	1406	270	1414				
. 50	ĸ	99				-					
1			PREVIE	:₩UF SE	alme (F	STREAM	NETHURK	CALCULA	LUNS		

1

ł

Ţ

RUNOFF HYDROGRAPH AT ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO	1 1 2
ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO	3
ROUTE HYDROGRAPH TO	4
END OF NETWORK	

2-20

1 FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1) DAM SAFETY VERSION JULY 1978 LAST MODIFICATION 03 APR 80

MAG UCENISO 7

BREACH AWALYSIS

PAGE 1/6

 DAM BREACH DATA

 BRWID
 Z
 ELBM
 TFAIL
 MSEL
 FAILEL

 50.
 .50
 1630.00
 .33
 1643.00
 1700.00

STATION 1. PLAN : RATIO 1

 DAM BREACH DATA

 BRWID
 Z
 ELBM TFAIL
 WSEL FAILEL

 50.
 .50
 1630.00
 .33
 1643.00
 1644.70

STATION 1, PLAN 2, RATIO 1

DAM BREACK DATA BRWID Z ELBM TFAIL MSEL FAILEL 50. .50 1630.00 1.00 1643.00 1644.70

STATION 1, PLAN 3, RATIO 1

DAM BREACH DATA BRNID Z ELBM TFAIL WSEL FAILEL 50. .50 1630.00 2.00 1643.00 1644.70

STATION 1, PLAN 4, RATIO 1

..........

.........

*******	******	****		********			****	TT	********
			HYDROG	Raph Roln	TING				
DOWNSTREAM	n X-secti	ION 30	FEET FRO	h dah					
	ISTAQ 2	ICOMP 1	IECON O	ITAPE 0	JPLT 0	JPRT 0	INAME 1	ISTAGE 0	iauto 0
			ALL PLA	NS HAVE S	a <b>n</b> e				
9L0SS 0.0	CLOSS 0.000	AVG 0.00	IRES	ISAME	IOPT	IPHP		LSTR	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

0.0	0.000	0.00	1	1	0	0		0
	NSTPS 1	NSTDL	LAG	AMSKK 0.000	X 0.000	TSK 0.000	STORA	ISPRAT 0

#### NORMAL DEPTH CHANNEL ROLITING

the second se

.......

GN(1) GN(2) GN(3) ELNVT ELMAX RLNTH SEL .0700 .0500 .0700 1622.0 1640.0 230. .00900

A state of the sta

CROSS SECTION COORDINATES-STA.ELEV, STA.ELEV-ETC 100.00 1638.00 142.00 1630.00 162.00 1625.00 175.00 1622.00 190.00 1622.00 197.00 1625.00 207.00 1630.00 225.00 1640.00

STORAGE	0.00 2.26	.09 2.66	.21 3.08	.37 3 <b>.54</b>	.55 4.04	.76 4.57	1.01 5.13	1.28 5.72	1.57	1.90 6.95
OUTFLOW	0.00 4048,92	41.76 4953.91	144.95 5965.64	311.70 7088.39	585.78 8326.36	946.96 9683.71	1391.00 11164.53	1920.72 12787.70	2539.10 14659.21	3246.37 16657.95
STAGE	1622.00	1622.95 1632.42	1623.89 1633.37	1624.84 1634.32	1625.79 1635.26	1626.74 1636.21	1627.68 1637.16	1628.63 1638.11	1629.58 1639.05	1630.53 1640.00

RUBINSON DAM BREACH ANALISIS

# D-21

	********	+	******	••••	***			*******	H44	*******	
					HYDROGRI	aph rout	ING				
		ROLITE THE	N' THE	1ST DOM	NSTREAM D	anare re	NTER				
			197 <b>AD</b> 3	100 <b>HP</b> 1	IECON O	TTAPE C	_ <b>PL</b> *0	JIPRT O	INAME 197AG	e ialite	
		alass	0.055	AVG 0.00	ALL PLAN ROLIT IRES	s have s Ing data Isame 1	AME IOPT	IPHP 0	LST	R	
		¥• ¥	NSTPS	NSTOL	LAG	AMSKY 0.000	0.000 X	TSK 0.000	STORA ISPRA	T O	
irmai tif	PTH CHANNEL R	NITING									
	DN(1) DN(2) ,0700 ,0500	QN(3) .0700	ELNVT 1620.0	ELMAX 1638.0	RLNTH 270	SEL 00900					
	CROSS SECTION 100.00 1638	COORDINATI	ESSTA, 0 1627.8	ELEV.STA 0 180.0	A.ELEVET 00 1627.00	C	) 1620.0	0 202.00	1620.00		
STORAGE	210.00 1627	.00 277.0 .0	0 1633.6 7	0 323.0 .15	0 1638.00 .25	i i	.36	. 49	.64	. 30	1.04
	2.07	2.7	0	3.42	4.21		5.08	6.03	7.06	8.17	9.36
OUTFLO	0.00 2389.97	26.3 3207.6	7 7 <b>4</b> 1	87,08 89,78	1/9.4/ 5344.29	66	19,83	8203.65	9926.18	11857.69	14007.32
STAGE	1620.00 1629.47	1620.9 1630.4	5 16 2 16	21.89 31.37	1622.84 1632.32	162 163	23.79 33.26	1624.74 1634.21	1625.68 1635.16	1626.63 1636.11	1627.58 1637.05
FLO	0.00 2389.97	26.3 3207.6	7 7 41 ******	87.08 89.78	179.47 5344.29	9 30 9 667 ••••••	04,94 79,83	465.64 8203.65	663.98 9926.18	902.42 11857.69	1232.01 14007.32
					HYDROGR	APH ROUT	TING				
		route fi	.on thru	2ND D0	MINSTREAM	Damage	CENTER				
			istan 4	ICOMP 1	IECON 0	ITAPE 0	JPLT 0	JIPRT 0	INAME ISTAC	E IALITO 0 0	
					ALL PLAN	s have s	AME				
		0.0SS	CLOSS 0.000	AVG 0.00	IRES 1	ING DATA ISAME 1	IOPT 0	IPMP 0	LS1	TR O	
			NSTPS 1	NSTDL Ö	LAG	AMSKK 0.000	0.000	TSK 0.000	STORA ISPRA	1T 0	
NOMAL DE	ipth <u>Channe</u> t R	DIFFING									
	GN(1) GN(2) .0700 .0500	9N(3) .0700	ELNVT 1400.0	ELMAX 1414.0	RLNTH 8200	SEL 02700					Robi
											BREAC
	CROSS SECTION 100.00 1414 185.00 1405	COORDINATI .00 120.0 .00 246.0	ES-STA. 0 1406.0 0 1406.0	ELEV, STA 0 170.0 0 270.0	A-ELEVET 00 1403.00 00 1414.00	C 175.00	0 1400.0	0 178.00	1400.00		7.4 <b>C</b>
STORAGE	0.00 65.52	.5	7 3 1	1.46	2.64 123.62	2 14	<b>4.</b> 17 <b>44.</b> 10	6.66 165.16	10.99 186.77	17.31 208.94	29.68 231.68
OF ITEL ON	1 0.00 2801.35	ن د ه د	1 1 53	35.97 55.41	81.21 6913.70	1	18.82 51.27	257.39 10564.29	424.36 12650.10	676.95 14906.96	1096.65 17333.74
STAGE	1400.00 1407.37	1400.7 1408.1	4 14	01.47	1402.21 1409.58	14	02.95 10.32	1403.68 1411.05	1404.42 1411.79	1405.16 1412.53	1405.89 1413.26

257.39

148.82

81.21

9.81

0.00

35.97

424.36

676.95

1096-65

~

1

NORMAL

NORMAL

FLON

BINSON DAM EACH ANALYSIS

3/6

47.28 254.98

1828.20 19929.80

1406.63 1414.00

1828.20

 $1.51 \\ 10.63$ 

1730.43 16384.06

1628.53 1638.00

1730,43 16384.06

PEAK FLOW AND STORAGE (END OF PERIOD) SUMMARY FOR MULTIPLE PLAN-RATIO ECONOMIC COMPUTATIONS
FLOWS IN CUBIC FEET PER SECOND (CUBIC NETERS PER SECOND)
AREA IN SQUARE MILES (SQUARE KILOMETERS)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

RATIOS APPLIED TO FLOWS

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

OPERATION	STATION	AREA	PLAN RATIO 1 .25
hydrocraph at	1	,50 1,29)	1 345. ( 9,77)( 2 345. ( 9,77)( 3 345. ( 9,77)( 4 345. ( 9,77)(
routen to	1	.50 1.29)	1 262. ( 7.42) ( 2 7399. ( 209.52) ( 3 2932. ( 83.02) ( 4 1871. ( 52.97) (
Routed to	2	.50 1.29)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
roitted to	3 (	.50 1.29)	1 264. (7.46)( 2 6808. (192.79)( 3 2884. (81.66)( 4 1880. (53.24)(
routed to	<b>A</b> {	.50 1.29)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

. .

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1

ŀ

ROBINSON DAM BREACH ANALYSIS PORK 4/6

D-23

## SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

.

.

• • •

.

1

PLAN	1	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL 1643 1	VALUE .00 50. 0.	SPILLWAY CRE 1643.00 150. 0.	ist top 10	OF DAM 544,20 190. 45.	
	RATIO OF PHF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S.ELEV	Haximum Depth Over Dam	Maximum Storage AC-FT	Maximum Outflow CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	time of Max outflow Hours	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
	.25	1644.79	.59	212.	262.	8.00	42.00	0.00
Plan	2	elevation Storage Outflow	INITIAL 1643 1	VALUE .00 50. 0.	SPILLHAY CRE 1643.00 150. 0.	est top 10	OF DAM 544,20 190. 45.	
	RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUN RESERVOIR W.S.ELEV	Maximum Depth Over Dam	Naximum Storage AC-FT	Nax Inun Outflow CFS	Duration Over top Hours	time of Max outflow Hours	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
	.25	1644.75	.55	211.	7579.	1.56	41.66	41.33
plan	3	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL 1643 1	VALUE .00 50. 0.	SPILLWAY CRE 1643.00 150. 0.	est top 10	0F DAM 644.20 190. 45.	
	RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S.ELEV	haximum Depth Over Dam	haximum Storage AC-FT	Haxihum Outflow CFS	Duration Over top Hours	time of Max Outflon Hours	time of Failure Hours
	.25	1644.76	.56	211.	3395.	1.84	42.06	41,33
PLAN	4	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLON	INITIAL 1643 1	VALUE .00 50. 0.	SPILLWAY CRE 1643.00 150. 0.	est top 1	0F DAM 644.20 190. 45.	
	RATIO OF Phe	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S.ELEV	Maximum Depth Over Dam	Naxinun Storage AC-F	Naximum Outflow CFS	Duration over top Hours	time of Max outflow Hours	time of Failure Hours
	.25	1644.76	.56	211.	2070.	2.21	42.54	41.33

ROBINSON DAM

BREACH ANALYSIS

price 5/6

3-24

TION	2	PLAN	3 9	TATION	3
MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TINE HOURS	RATIO	Maximum Flow, CFS	HAXIHUM STAGE, FT	TIME
1624.6	42.00	.25	2884.	1630.0	42,33
TION	2	PLAN	4 9	STATION	3
HAXIHUH STAGE, FT	TIME	RATIO	Haxihum Flow, CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME HOURS
1634.4	41.67	.25	1880.	1628.7	42.67
ATION	2	PLAN	1	STATION	4
MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME	RATIO	MAXINUM FLOW, CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	time Hours
1630.0	42.00	.25	258.	1403.7	42.33
ATION	2	PLA	1 2	STATION	4
MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME	RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW-CFS	MAXINUM STAGE FT	time Hours
1628.6	42.67	.25	4062.	1408.1	42.00
ATION	3	PLA	N 3	STATION	4
HAXININ STAGE, FT	TINE HOURS	RATIO	MAXIMUN FLOW, CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME
1623.5	42.00	.25	2535.	1407.2	42.33
ATION	3	PLA	N 4	STATION	4
HAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME	RATIO	NAXINUM FLOW-CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	tine Hours
1633.3	41.67	.25	1618.	1406.4	43.00

STATION 3	=	15+ DOWNSTREAM DAMAGE CENT

DAMAGE AT~ELEV 1633

STATION 4 = 2ND DOWNSTREAM DAMAGE (ENTE

DAMAGE AT-ELEV. 1412

NOTE: PLAN I IS NON FAILURE

THER PLANS ARE FAILURE

PLANS

PAR UDEANSCOR BREACH ANALYSIS PAGE 6/6

2-25

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

E OOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEF-1) DAM SAFETY VERSION JULY 1978 LAST MODIFICATION OI APP 80

,25

HAXINUM MAX FLOW, CFS STAG 1877. .25 16

STATION PLAN 4

STATION

STATION

STATION

PLAN 1

PLAN 2

PLAN 3

RATIO

Ì

.25

RATIO

.25

RATIO

.25

MAXIMUM

263.

HAYTHIN

7162.

FLOW, CFS

HAXTHUN FLOH, CFS

2885.

FLOW, CFS

RATIO

PLAN 1 STATION

MAXIMUM

: AT10

MAX FLOW-CFS

264. 16

.25

STATION PLAN 2

MAXIMUM FLOW, CFS MAX RATIO

6808.

APPENDIX E

.

٠

PLATES




------

APPENDIX F GEOLOGY

ר א וויי

•

А

•

## APPENDIX F - GEOLOGY

## ROBINSON POND DAM General Geology

Bedrock at Robinson Pond (southwest quadrant, Waymart, Pa. 7 1/2-minute quadrangle) is the Duncannon Member of the Catskill Formation. It is interbedded red and gray sandstone, red siltstone and red mudstone. The sandstone is fine and very-fine grained, silty, poorly sorted, micaceous, and locally conglomeratic. The rock is well bedded, medium-thick to massive with both planar and cross bedding. Joints are well developed in a blocky and tabular pattern, generally closely spaced (2 inches to 2 feet) except widely spaced in mudstone. Joints are open, narrow and steeply inclined to bedding. Rock exposures are slightly weathered to a shallow depth; weathered surfaces are hackly except smooth on mudstone. Fragments are blocky, 2 inches to 2 feet.

A moderately thick soil cover may be present with material derived from weathering of the ridge to the west. Test pits that were dug prior to construction of the dam indicated that the foundation is clay.

Contraction of the second second

## Legend (Bedrock)

Dcd <u>CATSKILL FORMATION</u>, <u>DUNCANNON MEMBER</u> - Grayish-red sandstone, siltstone, and claystone in fining - upward cycles; conglomerate occurs at the base of some cycles.

Dcpp <u>CATSKILL FORMATION</u>, PACKERTON Mbr. through POPLAR GAP Mbr. Fine to medium-grained gray sandstones, well-indurated to quartzitic; sandstones grade upward into grayish-red siltstones and shales.



