MD-#143 690	NATIONAL ADDISON	PROGRAM FOR POND DAM (CT ND DIV APR	INSPECTI	DN OF NO PS OF EN	N-FEDE GINEER	RAL DA	MS IHMI M	1/	
UNCLASSIFIED	NEN ENOLI		•1			F/G 1	3/13	NL	
								M	
								:	
	_								



•

~

. .

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-4

.

•

1

1

Ţ

AD-A143 690

Ē

ļ

Ē

E

5

E

ľ

OTIC

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT

ADDISON POND DAM CT 00245

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASS. 02154

APRIL 1981

84

07

25

171

This dominant has been approved for patting polou we can't sale; its distribution is estimited.

INCLASSIFIED	Entered)	
REPORT DOCUMENTATION		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER		3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
CT 00245		
4. TITLE (and Sublille)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Addison Pond Dam		INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF	NON-FEDERAL	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION		B. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
DEPT. OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEE	RS	April 1981 13. NUMBER OF PAGES
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED 424 TRAPELO ROAD, WALTHAM, MA. 0225	4	· 45
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSI I dilleren		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		UNCLASSIFIED
		154. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered	in Block 20, il dilloreni fre	m Reportj
Cover program reads: Phase I Inspec however, the official title of the Non-Federal Dams; use cover date f	program is: Natio or date of report	onal Program for Inspection of
DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY,	ng igentliy by block muneer)	
Conn. River Basin Glastonbury, Conn.		
10. ABSTRACT (Continue en reverse side il necessary en	d identify by block mumber)	
Addison Pond Dam is a stone masonry embankments extending 70 ft. east of 2 ft. and a maximum height of a Addison Pond Dam is judged to be in work and/or monitoring. The Addison with a 'low' hazard potential.	y structure, 88 f and 30 ft. west. pprox. 18 ft. Bas n poor condition.	t. long with short, low earth The masonry dam has a top width ed on visual inspection, the Several areas require repair
E FORM 1 (TRA		

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 63 IS OBSOLETE

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

	NTIS GRA&I
Contraction of the second seco	By Distribution/ Available Codes Jor
	A-1

Accession For

GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

ADDISON POND DAM CT 00245

NATIONAL DAM INSAGE GRAM PHASE I INSPECTION RE. ORT

IDENTIFICATION NO:	СТ-00245
NAME OF DAM:	Addison Pond Dam
TOWN :	Glastonbury
COUNTY AND STATE:	Hartford County, Connecticut
STREAM:	Salmon Brook
DATE OF INSPECTION:	December 17, 1980

.

Γ.

ľ

. .

F

BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Addison Pond Dam is a stone masonry structure, 88 ft. long with short, low earth embankments extending 70 ft. east and 30 ft. west. The masonry dam has a top width of 2 ft. and a maximum height of approximately 18 ft. There is a 35 ft. x 4 ft. regulating outlet through the west side of the spillway. The operating mechanism for the outlet is currently inoperable.

Based on visual inspection, the Addison Pond Dam is judged to be in poor condition. Several areas require repair work and/or monitoring. Some features found existing that could affect the stability of the dam are considerable leakage through the spillway and the eastern portion of the dam structure, state of general disrepair of the entire project and continuous flow of water from the foundation of the warehouse.

بر اس

It is recommended that the owner arrange for a qualified registered engineer to do the following within one year of the receipt of this report:

Inspect the dam after the pond has been lowered and investigate sources of leakage through the dam, the spillway and at the warehouse foundation.;

Design necessary repairs to the structures including the dam, the spillway, the regulating outlet mechanism.

The recommendations of the professional engineer should be implemented by the owner. Remedial measures contained in Section 7 should be carried out within a period of one year.

Based on the Corps of Engineers' "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams", the Addison Pond Dam is classified as 'small' in size with 'low' hazard potential. A test flood equal to 100 year event was selected in accordance with the Corps of Engineers' Guidelines. The calculated test flood inflow of 4,500 cfs was used in the analysis to assess spillway capacity. The storage capacity of the pond being small, the routing did not alter the flow significantly.

Ξ.

R

F

The spillway capacity is 600 cfs with the water level at the top of the dam. The spillway is capable of passing only 13% of the test flood flow without overtopping the dam. The storage capacity up to the top of the dam is 62 ac. ft. and up to the test flood level is 115 ac. ft.

An operation and maintenance manual to take care of normal routine procedures should also be prepared.

> GOODKIND & O'DEA INC. AND SINGHAL ASSOCIATES (J.V.)

Ramesh Singhal, Ph.D., P.E. (Singhal Associates)

E

, P

ł

Lawrence J. Buckley, P.E. (Goodkind & O'Dea, Inc.)

PREFACE

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.

F

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. In cases where the reservoir was lowered or drained prior to inspection, such action, while improving the stability and safety of the dam, removes the normal load on the structure and may obscure certain conditions which might otherwise be detectable if inspected under the normal operating environment of the structure.

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

1

present condition of the dam will continue to represent the condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there by any chance that unsafe conditions be detected.

Phase I inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the Spillway Test flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. Because of the magnitude and rarity of such a storm event, a finding that a spillway will not pass the test flood should not be interpreted as necessarily posing a highly inadequate condition. The test flood provides a measure of relative spillway capacity and serves as an aide 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.

The Phase I Investigation does <u>not</u> include an assessment of the need for fences, gates, no-trespassing signs, repairs to existing fences and railings and other items which may be needed to minimize trespass and provide greater security for the facility and safety to the pulic. An evaluation of the project for compliance with OSHA rules and regulations is also excluded.

F

11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

İ

1

E

5

Ē

E

-

ł

j

Ι.

ľ

E

ñ

٠

.

Į.

Į

SECTION	PAGE NO.
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	
BRIEF ASSESSMENT	
REVIEW BOARD PAGE	
PREFACE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
OVERVIEW PHOTO	Sheet 1
LOCATION PLAN	Sheet 2

REPORT

1.	PROJ	ECT INFORMATION	
	1.1	General a. Authority b. Purpose of Inspection	1-1
	1.2	Description of Project a. Location b. Description of Dam & Appurtenances c. Size Classification d. Hazard Classification e. Ownership & History	1-2
	1.3	Pertinent Data a. Drainage Area b. Discharge at Damsite c. Elevation d. Reservoir Length e. Storage f. Reservoir Surface g. Dam h. Diversion & Regulating Tunnel i. Spillway j. Regulating Outlet	1-5

SECTION	PAGE NO.
2. ENGINEERING DATA	2-1
3. VISUAL INSPECTION	3-1
4. OPERATIONAL & MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	4-1
5. EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES	5-1
6. EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY	6-1
7. ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS & REMEDIAL MEASURES	7-1

.

.

E

*

F

• \

C

C.

•

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	INSPECTION CHECKLISTS	A-1 to A-4
APPENDIX B:	ENGINEERING DATA Engineering Data Checklist Survey Information Bibliography General Plan Profile of Spillway	B-1 B-2 to B-4 B-5 Sheet B-1 Sheet B-2
APPENDIX C:	DETAIL PHOTOGRAPHS Photo Location Plan Photographs	Sheet C-l C-l to C-4
APPENDIX D:	HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS Drainage Area Map Computations	Sheet D-1 D-1 to D-9
APPENDIX E:	INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS	



NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION Section 1

1.1 General

a. Authority

Public Law 92-367, August 8, 1972, authorized the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, to initiate a National Program of Dam Inspection throughout the United States. The New England Division of the Corps of Engineers has been assigned the responsibility of supervising the inspection of dams within the New England Region. Goodkind & O'Dea, Inc., Hamden, Conn. and Singhal Associates, Orange, Conn. (Joint Venture) have been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the State of Connecticut. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to Goodkind & O'Dea, Inc. and Singhal Associates (J.V.) under a letter of December 9, 1980 from Colonel William E. Hodgson, Jr., Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW 33-81-C-0022 dated December 9, 1980 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

b. Purpose of Inspection

The purposes of the program are to:

 Perform technical inspection and evaluation of nonfederal dams to identify conditions requiring correction in a timely manner by non-federal interest.

Ancourage and prepare the States to quickly initiate effective dam inspection programs for non-federal dams.

3. To update, verify and complete the National Inventory of Dams.

1.2 Description of Project

F

E

a. & b. Location and Description of Dam and Structures

The Addison Pond Dam is situated on the Salmon Brook which flows into the Connecticut River, approximately 3 miles downstream from the dam. The location is approximately 2 miles northeast of the Glastonbury Town Hall and one mile east of the intersection of Route 94 (Hebron Avenue) and Route 2. The geographic location of the site may be found on the Glastonbury Quadrangle Map, having coordinates of latitude N 41^o 43.1' and longitude W 72^o 34.6'.

The Addison Pond is impounded by Addison Pond Dam which is a stone masonry structure 88 ft. long with two minor earth embankments extending east and west approximately 70 ft. and 30 ft. respectively. The top width of the masonry dam is 2 ft. and maximum height 18 ft. with crest elevation 102.0. The downstream slope is vertical and the upstream slope presumably the same.

The spillway, 50 ft. wide and with a crest elevation of 99.75 is the overflow portion of the dam and has vertical upstream and downstream slopes, same as for the dam. The crest is 2 ft. wide. As shown on the plan, there are stone masonry wing walls

on the downstream side confining the raceway channel which runs under the Porch and Patio building for a distance of 100 ft. starting from about 30 ft. from the dam. In addition to the 50' spillway, there is a 13 ft. wide dam section at elevation 100.25 which also acts as a spillway.

c. Size Classification - 'Small'

d. Hazard Classification - 'Low'

F

6

يو²قين

A dam failure analysis indicates that a breach of the Addison Pond Dam would result in an instantaneous downstream flow of approximately 10,000 cfs causing a 9 ft. high wave of water to travel down the Salmon Brook. Continuation of the flood routing through the brook indicates that at the two cross-sections analyzed, the flood-flow depths under the dam failure condition, and the test-flow condition (with no failure), work out as follows:

	Initial Q	Flow depth	n (ft.)
	(cfs)	<u>Sta. 7+0</u>	Sta. 16+50
Test flood condition (no failure assumed)	4,500	6.0	10.0

Dam failure condition 10,000 9.0 11.0

The brook has steep banks on both sides for a distance of 1,600 ft. downstream from the dam. Around the intersection of Mill Street with Salmon Brook, there are 3 houses whose yards are subject to flooding both under the test flood and the dam failure flood. Water is not expected to rise above the first

floor elevations.

E

{`**`**

E

Downstream from Section #2 (sta. 16+50), the routed flows for test flood condition and the dam failure condition are 3,100 cfs and 5,200 cfs, and the wave depths 10 ft. and 11 ft. respectively and closing in with each other. Further downstream there will be no additional flood hazard caused by dam failure.

e. Ownership & History

The owner and operator for the Addison Pond Dam is:

Velvet Textile Corporation Blackstone, Virginia

The dam is currently used for recreational purposes. It was built in the early 1800's by the Addison Woolen Mill for generating water power. The penstock was located on the east side of the dam embankment and supposedly went out of commission in the 1940's. A 3½ ft. x 4 ft. regulating outlet was built in the 1950's through the face of the spillway.

There are no available design or construction plans or records. The only available information about the project was the aerial topographic map furnished by the Town of Glastonbury.

The owner used to drain the pond periodically for cleaning and necessary repairs. This came to a stop four years back when the regulating outlet control mechanism was vandalized and rendered inoperable. Currently there are no known operational and maintenance procedures.

1.3 Pertinent Data

1

ر مال

a. Drainage Area

The drainage area consists of 6.25 sq. miles of flat terrain with average slope approximately 3.25%. Most of the area is lightly populated, with several town roads and State Route 94 (Hebron Avenue) passing through.

b. Discharge at Damsite

There is one 50 ft. long overflow spillway at the damsite at a crest elevation of 99.75, and a 13 ft. long low section of the dam at crest elevation of 100.25 which also acts as a spillway.

1.	Outlet works conduit:	N/A
2.	Maximum known flood at damsite:	Unknown
3.	Ungated spillway capacity at top of dam elevation:	600 cfs 102.0
4.	Ungated spillway capacity at test flood elevation 105.5:	4,500 cfs
5.	Gated spillway capacity at normal pool elevation 99.75:	N/A
6.	Gated spillway capacity at test flood elevation 105.5:	N/A
7.	Total spillway capacity at test flood elevation 105.5:	4,500 cfs
8.	Total project discharge at top of dam elevation 102.0:	600 cfs
9.	Total project discharge at test flood elevation 105.5:	4,500 cfs

c. <u>Elevation</u> (NGVD)

F

F

E

.

ľ

E

Ľ

E

L

L

l

d.

e.

f.

1.	Streambed at toe of dam:	84.7		
2.	Bottom of cutoff:	N/A		
з.	Maximum tailwater:	N/A		
4.	Normal pool:	99.8		
5.	Full flood control pool:	99.75		
	-			
6.	Spillway crest:	99.75		
7.	Design surcharge (original design):	N/A		
8.	Top of dam:	102.0		
9.	Test flood surcharge:	105.5		
Res	ervoir Length in Feet			
1.	Normal pool:	1,400 ft.		
2.	Flood control pool:	1,400 ft.		
з.	Spillway crest pool:	1,400 ft.		
4.	Top of dam:	1,800 ft.		
5.	Test flood pool:	2,300 ft.		
Sto	rage (acre feet)			
1.	Normal pool:	30		
2.	Flood control pool:	30		
3.	Spillway crest pool:	30		
4.	Top of dam:	62		
5.	Test flood pool:	115		
Reservoir Surface-Acres				
1.	Normal pool:	14.5		
2.	Flood control pool:	14.5		

€

€

4

€

•

¢

¢

¢

ŧ

D

	3. Spillway crest:	14.5
	4. Top of dam:	18.5
	5. Test flood pool:	24.0
g.	Dam	
	l. Туре	Main dam made of stone masonry with several stone masonry walls retaining two minor earth embankments on both sides of main dam.
	2. Length:	88 ft. stone masonry dam with 30 ft. and 70 ft. long embank- ments located west and east.
	3. Height:	18 ft.
	4. Top width:	2 ft.
	5. Side slopes:	Vertical
	6. Zoning:	N/A
	7. Impervious core:	N/A
	8. Cutoff:	N/A
	9. Grout curtain:	N/A
	10. Other:	-
h.	Diversion and Regulating Tunnel:	N/A
i.	Spillway	
	l. Type:	Stone masonry
	2. Length of crest:	50 ft. + 13 ft. = 63 ft.
	3. Crest elevation (NGVD):	99.75 and 100.25
	4. Gates:	N/A
	5. Upstream channel:	N/A

ł

Ċ

€

¢

t

-1.

• 1

i.

E

•

Ł

1 .7

6. Downstream channel:

7. General

J. Regulating Outlet

1

E

F

P

E

•

1. Invert:

2. Size:

3. Description:

4. Control mechanism:

89.5 (NGVD)

Salmon Brook

3½ ft. x 4 ft.

Sluice outlet through the spillway

Gate valve with vertical operating handle, currently out of order

A 192

5. Other:

ENGINEERING DATA Section 2

There was no available design, construction, or operational data for Addison Pond Dam. The only available information was the Aerial Topographical Survey Map supplied by the Town of Glastonbury.

k

VISUAL INSPECTION Section 3

On December 17, 1980 engineers from Goodkind & O'Dea, Inc. and Singhal Associates formally inspected Addison Pond Dam. Detailed checklists included in Appendix A, aided in the inspection of the dam, spillway and regulating outlet. Also taken during the visual inspection and given in Appendix C, are several photographs revealing these dam features and the problem areas. The pool level of Addison Pond was approximately 99.8 ft. (NGVD) at the time of the inspection, which was one-tenth of a foot above the spillway crest.

As assessed by the visual inspection, the general condition of the dam is poor, with several areas requiring repair work and/or monitoring.

Dam

Addison Pond Dam is primarily a stone masonry structure situated between the building presently known as Porch and Patio Warehouse (See general dam plan in Appendix B). The stone masonry structure consists of a 50' spillway with the dam extending 36 ft. east. In addition to the main structure, there are several stone masonry walls retaining two minor earth embankments located north of the dam (See Photos 1, 2 and 3).

Founded on rock base, the 23' stone masonry east dam embankment was generally in fair condition with an appreciable amount of mortar missing between the stones of the lower two feet.

As shown in Photo 6, minor seepage was observed at these mortarless joints and at the contact zone with the rock base. The upper dam section appeared to be in better condition with the exception of the irregular horizontal alignment as a result of several missing stones (See Photos 5 & 6).

Also shown in Photo 6 is a 4" steel drain pipe and a 15" x 12" opening coming through the face of the dam. The source of these two openings could not be determined, but no evidence of any unusual seepage was noticed.

Immediately east of the 50 ft. spillway is an additional 13 ft. section of the dam with a concrete coping. Since the top of this dam section is only 6" above the spillway crest, it also serves as a spillway under high water conditions. This stone masonry embankment is leaking badly as shown in Photos 4 & 5. Water is continuously leaking between the concrete coping and stone masonry at the 5' section of the embankment adjacent to the spillway.

Appurtenant Structures

The 50 ft. spillway is a stone masonry structure with a 2 ft. wide concrete coping across the crest (See Photos 2, 3 and 4). Observation revealed leakage all along the spillway between the concrete coping and stone masonry. Due to water flowing over the spillway, a thorough inspection of its face could not be completed.

The 15 ft. and 23 ft. long stone masonry structures upstream and perpendicular to the spillway, serve as training walls (See general dam plan in Appendix B). As shown in Photo 3, task

east wall is lacking several stones and its concrete coping, whereas, the west wall is only missing the concrete coping (See Photo 2). Overall, the general condition of the two training walls was good with no evidence of missing mortar or seepage. The approach channel through the training walls and the channel immediately downstream of the spillway was clean with no accumunation of debris (See Photos 3 and 4).

Located upstream and east of the spillway, the 63 ft. long 2 ft. wide stone masonry retaining wall, with a 4" thick concrete coping, was in good condition.

The 3 1/2 ft. by 4 ft. regulating outlet through the face of the spillway was obscured by the flow over the spillway, preventing a close inspection. Situated on a pile supported wooden platform the control works for the regulating outlet were inoperable (See profile of spillway, Sheet B-2), since the mechanism which raised and lowered the gate for the outlet was disconnected. Due to pond water level and the absence of any design or construction data, the details of the regulating outlet could not be determined.

In addition to the regulating outlet, there is a screen covered intake chamber adjacent to the 15' training wall. This structure at one time provided water for several large boilers located in the warehouse. As viewed from the basement, several pipes ranging from 1" to 12" entered the building coming from the direction of the intake chamber. Water was observed to be leaking

from the stone masonry foundation, through the east face of the building into the downstream channel (See Photo 2). The leakage may have been associated with the intake chamber.

Reservoir

1.

Addison Pond is a small body of water located in a mostly undeveloped area with numerous large trees along its shore (See Photo 7).

Downstream Channel

The downstream channel immediately south of the spillway flows under Porch and Patio warehouse, which is supported by timber girders on concrete pedestals. During the inspection of the downstream channel, one pedestal was observed to be displaced and not carrying the girder.

Evaluation

As judged by the visual inspection the overall condition of the dam and appurtenant structures is poor. Water leakage between the stone masonry and the concrete coping of the east dam embankment and 50' spillway and seepage from the face of these structures is a major concern. The seepage accelerates the deterioration of the mortar between the stones and increases the possibility of dam failure. Also, the observed seepage from the warehouse foundation wall west of spillway could eventually lead to deterioration of the structure and possible failure of the dam.

3-4

OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES Section 4

At this time, there are no operational or maintenance procedures for Addison Pond Dam. The spillway is designed to be uncontrolled and the $3 \frac{1}{2}x 4$ regulating outlet is presently inoperable.

Several years ago, maintenance and repair work of Addison Pond Dam was undertaken periodically by the owner. However, this ended four years ago when the regulating outlet control works were vandalized.

The present operational and maintenance procedures of the dam are poor considering the existing condition of the stone masonry structures and regulating outlet. Formal operational and maintenance procedures with continuing records should be developed by the owner.

4-1

K

EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES Section 5

The Addison Pond has a contributory drainage area of 6.25 sq. miles which is gently sloping at an average slope of 3.25%. Most of it is lightly populated and has several town roads and State Route 94 (Hebron Ave.) passing through.

The overflow spillway is in two sections: one 50 ft. long at crest elevation 99.75, and another 13 ft. long at 100.25 Total Spillway Capacity is 600 cfs up to the top of the dam, which is only 13% of the test flood discharge of 4,500 cfs. The dam will be overtopped by approximately 3.5 ft. under the test flood condition, assuming no failure. The crest elevation of the dam is 102.0.

No design data is available nor any records of past water elevation in Addison Pond.

Test Flood Analysis

E

Based on dam failure analysis, the Addison Pond Dam is classified as being 'low' hazard potential in accordance with Table 2 on page D-9 of the <u>Corps of Engineers' Recommended</u> <u>Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams</u>. The recommended test flood is 50 to 100 year frequency event. Using the Connecticut Flood Flow Formula, the 100 year flood comes out as:

 $Q = 5 \times 0.85 \text{ AS} = 5 \times 0.85 \times 6.25 \times 172 = 4,500 \text{ cfs}$ The test flood was accordingly assumed as 4,500 cfs.

The storage capacity of the pond up to the top of the dam being 62 ac. ft. only, does not result in a substantial decrease due to routing, and the figure of 4,500 cfs was used to calculate the extent of overtopping. The spillway capacity up to the top of the dam is 600 cfs which is only 13% of the test flood flow.

Dam Failure Analysis

E

ĸ

£

A dam failure analysis was made using the guidelines provided by the Corps of Engineers. Failure of the dam was assumed with water level at 102.0, the elevation of the dam crest, and a pre-failure flow of 4,500 cfs. Assuming a dam breach 80 ft. wide and 18 ft. high, the peak release rate into the downstream valley came out as 10,000 cfs.

The height of the flood wave worked out as 9 ft. at the first cross-section (sta. 7+0). At another cross-section further down (sta. 16+50), the flood wave depth came out as 11 ft. approximately. Flood routing computations were done taking into consideration the available valley storage. The resulting flood elevations and the values of routed flood flow are shown in Appendix D, which also gives the routed flows and flood elevations for the test flood, assuming no failure. The two sets of flood depths are tabulated below:

	Initial Q	Flow depth ft.	
	(cfs)	Sta. 7+0	Sta. 16+50
Test flood condition (no dam failure)	4,500	6.0	10.0
Dam failure condition	10,000	9.0	11.0

The Salmon Brook has steep banks on both sides for a distance of 1,600 ft. downstream from the dam. Around the crossing of Mill Street with Salmon Brook there are three houses whose yards are subject to flooding both under the test flood and the dam failure flood. Water is not expected to rise above the first floor elevation.

Downstream from Section #2 (sta. 16+50), the routed flows for test flood condition and the dam failure condition are 3,100 cfs and 5,200 cfs and the wave depths 10 ft. and 11 ft. respectively and coming closer to each other.

The analysis shows that there will be no additional flood hazard caused by dam failure. Also, under the test flood condition there is no likelihood of any houses being flooded. The dam is therefore classified as 'low'hazard potential.

EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY Section 6

The evaluation of the structural stability of the dam and appurtenances was based solely on the visual inspection due to the absence of engineering data. Several areas of concern that could affect the structural stability of the dam were noted.

Mortar was missing and seepage was observed between the stones at certain areas of the east dam embankment. The continued deterioration of mortar resulting from the seepage will weaken the stone masonry embankment, increasing the possibility of dam failure. At the first five foot length of dam adjacent to the 50 ft. spillway towards the east, water was leaking between the concrete coping and stone masonry which tends to accelerate deterioration of the mortar by flowing down the face of the dam embankment.

A similar leakage situation was observed between the concrete coping and stone masonry of the 50 ft. spillway. However, any seepage that may occur through the face of this structure could not be seen due to the water flowing over the spillway.

Seepage was also observed flowing from the stone masonry foundation of the warehouse located downstream and west of the spillway. The water leaking between the stones is gradually eroding the mortar which increases the possibility of failure of the foundation. Since the west side of the spillway is attached directly to this structure, failure of the building could

6-1

possibly result in dam failure. The source of the water may possibly be the intake chamber situated upstream and west of the spillway. Several pipes ranging from 1" to 12" enter the basement coming from the direction of the chamber. It is quite possible that water is leaking from the intake riser into the basement area and subsequently leaking through the foundation wall. This intake chamber should be filled in and sealed off to prevent water from entering the basement.

The 3 1/2' x 4' regulating outlet and its control mechanism which was constructed in the 1950's is presently inoperative. Indirectly, the inoperative state of the outlet decreases the dam stability since the necessary repairs to the dam cannot be accomplished without lowering the pond water level.

Addison Pond Dam is located in Seismic Zone 1 and, in accordance with Corps of Engineers' guidelines, does not warrant further seismic analysis at this time.

6-2

L.,

ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES Section 7

As assessed by the visual inspection of the site, Addison Pond Dam is judged to be in poor condition. Several areas of major concern were noted during the inspection which directly affect the dam stability.

Recommendations

It is recommended that, within one year of receipt of this report, the owner employ a qualified registered engineer to:

Inspect the dam after the pond has been lowered and investigate the source of leakage through the dam, spillway, and warehouse foundation adjacent to the west side of the spillway;

Design necessary repairs to the dam structures, including the dam, spillway and regulating outlet mechanism.

The owner should implement the recommendations of the engineer.

Remedial Measures

The following remedial measures should also be undertaken by the owner within one year of receipt of this report.

- A formal program of operation and maintenance procedures should be instituted and fully documented to provide accurate records for future reference
- Replace the missing stones and concrete coping on the east dam embankment and east training wall.
- Replace the concrete coping on the west training wall.
- 4. Fill in and seal off the intake chamber situated

upstream and west of the spillway. 7-1

APPENDIX A

1

6

Ľ

2

-

•

INSPECTION CHECKLIST

VISUAL INSPECTION CHECK LIST PARTY ORGANIZATION

1

1

L

E

E

F

-

L

t

Ē

1

L

PROJECT Addison Pond Dam	DATE 12/17/80
	TIME Afternoon
	WEATHER Sunny 201
	W.S. ELEVU.SDN.S
PARTY:	
D	Hydraulics
N	
	Geotechnical
3. Wesley J. Wolf (WW)	Hydraulics
4. Gevald Buckley (68)	Soils & Structures
5 <u>`</u>	-
PROJECT FEATURE	INSPECTED BY
1. Dan Embankment	RS, EH, WW, GB
2. Spillway	
3. Regulating Dutlet	
4	
5.	
6	*****
7.	
8	
9.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
10	

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

.

PROJECT A	Idison	Pond	Dam
PROJECT FEAT	URE Dam Miscelli	Emba	ntment. Walls

Ľ

-

E

U

DATE	12/17/20	<u> </u>	
	RS, EH, WW,		
NAME			

AREA ELEVATED	CONDITIONS
DAM EMBANKMENT	
Crest Elevation	99.71 (NGVO)
Current Pool Elevation	99.8± (NGVD)
Maximum Impoundment to Date	Unknou .
Surface Cracks	None Observed
Pavement Conditions	N/A
Movement or settlement of crest	None Observed
Lateral movement	None Observed
Vertical alignment	Slightly Tilted
Horizontal alignment	Fair
Conditions at abutment & at Concrete Structures	Some Walls Need Repain
Indications of Movement of Structural Items on Slopes	N/A
Trespassing on Slopes	No Signs of Damage
Sloughing or Erosion of Slopes or Abutments	None Observed
Rock Slope Protection-Riprap Failures	N/A
Unusual Movement or Cracking at or Near Toes	None Observed
Unusual Embankment or Downstream Seepage	Seepage at Bottom of Wall Eas of Spillway, seepage tinnu Build. Wall West of Spillway
Piping or Boils	Wall West of Spillway None Observed
Foundation Drainage Features	N/A
Toe Drains	N/A
Instrumentation System	N/A
PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT Addison Pond Dam	DATE 12/17/20
	NAME RS, EH, WW, GR
DISCIPLINE	NAME

۰.

1

1

í

١

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
AREA EVALUATED UTLET WORKS - SPILLWAY WEIR, APPROACH AND DISCHARGE CHANNELS Approach Channel General Condition Loose rock overhanging channel Trees Overhanging Channel Floor of Approach Channel Weir and training walls General Condition of Concrete Rust or Staining Spalling Any Visible Reinforcing Any Seepage or Efflorescence Drain Holes Discharge Channel General Condition Loose Rock Overhanging Channel Trees Overhanging Channel Floor of Channel	

A-3

PERIODIC INSPECT	TION CHECK LIST	₽	
PROJECT <u>Addison</u> Pond Dam PROJECT FFATHRE <u>Regulating</u> Out! DISCIPLINE		Ð	•
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS	₽	
OUTLET WORKS - OUTLET STRUCTURE AND OUTLET CHANNEL General Condition of Concrete Rust or Staining Spalling Erosion or Cavitation Visible Reinforcing Any Seepage or Efflorescence Dondition at Joints Drain Holes Channel Loose Rock or Trees Overhanging Channel Condition of Discharge Channel	Only Features Visible are: D Broken Stem on Sluice gate D Discharge Opening in Face of Dam (3 ^{1/2} ×4 ¹). Mostly Obscured by the Flow of Water Over Spillway Same as Channel for Spillway	•	
·	The Regulating Outlet Discharges thru Face of Masonry Concrete Dam	₽	•
	Below The Spillway Crest.	₽	•
A-4		₽	•

F

E

E

r r

1

i

l

Ł

APPENDIX B

2

F

ľ

1.4°4.

ENGINEERING DATA

ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST

.

ITEM	AVAILABILITY	LOCATION
LOCATION MAP	Available	Town of Glastonbury Aerial Survey Map
AS-BUILT DRAWINGS	Not Available	Glastonbury, CT.
HYDROLOGIC & HYDRAULIC DATA	Not Available	₽
SOIL BORINGS	Not Available	
SOIL TESTING	Not Available	₽
GEOLOGY REPORTS	Not Available	D
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	Not Available	
OPERATION RECORDS	Not Available	•
INSPECTION HISTORY	Not Available	•
DESIGN REPORT	Not Available	
DESIGN COMPUTATIONS	Not Available	•
HYDROLOGIC & HYDRAULIC	Not Available	
DAM STABILITY	Not Available	•
SEEPAGE ANALYSIS	Not Available	:

F

ł

1

K

E

F

.=

B-2 2 OF CONCRETE Retaining wall with LETAIDIDG W ALL PARALLEL TO MARKES INTH TOLKADE FENCE Chiseled EAST EDGE OF IN ADDESON RU 1501 PPAD ON NOSTOO NOSITON RD RNER 3 z et e Pad DATNI С Ц 0 アレレーシット BADT WHICH IS CORNER EDGE OF NOUSE #1 BOARD 2020 AROUND C. G 1580 ี ยัง 2 $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ SOUARE 530 Rock SES LES 353 25.6.5 ETK 133.62 132.26 113.93 103.04 103.75 107.60 Kч ELEU 126.72 139.12 2.61 136.62 6.86 118.36 18.69 114.08 11.32 1 106.78 10.33 1 16 12/11/ \$0 Surphy Windy 201 DAM F.S. 4.18 H. T. 136.23 A DOL SON RUN .43 3.03 5.50 7.04 8.5. 9.5 | BENCH 8.M. 43 7-97 7P.3 TP-4 E-1.1 77-5 Tp. -

B-3 AT SHOT ID 8 NOF SHOT A COMBACK ECORNER stor a ON SHPT6 い 43 DE RETAINTING WAL C. NOF CHY トドミット S PILLWA AT SHOT - 1 ER AT HILL GROUND AT 8.M.-) TOP RETALIUTNO WALL AT SPILLWAY SHOT GROUND BELOW SHO TOP RETAINING WALL AJN' 10 4 Q Q UAC LAC NEAR SPILLWAY TOPOF SLOPE B E O OF 4 0F 1 0R NE CORNER OF EDGE OF WAT EDGE WATER SHOT END OF SPI CORDER SHOT TUP OF S LOPE RETAINTNG 9 BOTTOM OF CONCRETE SEE PAGE EAST END · END END OF EAST END Ì 32 3 0.565. 102.60 102.54 100.24 9.9.0 89.5 ELEY 99.8 100.2 99.76 102.5 03.D 54.73 02.04 99.3 102.6 00.00 00.5 94.7 84.9 03.3 TIDECKALTUN D AM 4 8 8 5 4 5 4 8 8 5 7 8 6 8 5 7 6 8 5 7 6 8 30.8 80.01 10 7,55 5.40 18.3 -C A DOT SON 5. H.T 107.79 AROU 12 A. A DOI LO A E.M - J SHOT -20-442004 1 00 \mathbf{c}^{\dagger} 114 5 9 \$ \mathcal{O}

B E 10 11 11 11 11 11 C 10 10 34 7 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 34 7 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 34 7 10 11 11 11 C 10 34 7 10 10 11 11 11 C 10 34 10 10 11 11 11 11 C 10 10 34 10 11 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 11 C 10 10 10 10 10 11 11 C <		B-4	1
b f f f f f f f c f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f f <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			
		Гом С т с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с с	
		2: 1 84.7 84.7 25.101.94 25.101.94 102.07	
			الــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ
a stratting www.			
a dana dana dana dana dana dana dana da		프 1.1	
	Q	-0	- 1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. "Recommended Guildelines for Safety Inspection of Dams", Department of the Army, Office of the Chief Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314, 1979.
- 2. <u>Design of Small Dams</u>, Revised Reprint, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- 3. Soil Survey, Hartford County, Connecticut, United States Department of Agriculture, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 25, D.C. 1962
- 4. Donald M. Gray: Handbook on the Principles of Hydrology, Water Information Center, 1970.
- 5. Hunter Rouse: Engineering Hydraulics, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1950.
- 6. Victor L. Streeter: Fluid Mechanics, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1958.
- S.C.S. National Engineering Handbook, Hydrology Section 4, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972.

APPENDIX C

ł

7

1

le i

6

E

0

DETAIL PHOTOGRAPHS



ſ

Ē

F

Photo 1 - View of dam and spillway looking West.



Photo 2 - View across spillway. Note inoperative outlet works on right. Note seepage through the wall of the building.



Photo 3 - View looking across spillway

E

E

E

[



Photo 4 - View of spillway face.



Photo 5 - Area of worst seepage through the masonry dam.

10 1



Photo 6 - Seepage zone at contact of bedrock and masonry (Left of ladder). Note lack of mortar in joints.



Photo 7 - View of pond from the dam.

Ľ

1 4

Ľ

F

E

ŀ!



Photo 8 - Channel under warehouse downstream of spillway.

APPENDIX D

E

Y

F

ŀ

E

F

E

E

HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS

SINGHAL ASSUCIATES

CONSULT BOR STRUCT

Job	ADDISON	N PONT) DAM
	Number	D-1	
Date	3 29	1981	
By	R.S.		

827 MAPLEDALE ROAD, ORANGE, CT 09477 TEL. (203) 795-8562

TEST FLOOD

DRAINAGE AREA = 6.25 SQ. MILES THE DRAINAGE AREA IS FLAT WITH AVERAGE SLOPE APPROXIMATELY 3.25%

FROM THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHART FOR FLAT &

PMF = 6.25 × 775 = 4800 CFS +

SIZE AND HAZARD CLASSIFICATION

MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF DAM = 18 FT.

MAXIMUM IMPOUNDMENT UPTO TOP OF DAM = GZ AC FT AS THE STORAGE LIES BETWEEN 50 AC FT. AND 1000 AC FT., THE SIZE OF THE DAM = "SMALL".

THE HAZARD POTENTIAL IS 'LOW'. THE DAM BREACH COMPUTATIONS INDICATE THAT THERE IS NO SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL FLOODING DUE TO DAM BREACH AS COMPARED TO CONDITIONS UNDER THE TEST FLOOD FLOW.

AS PER TABLE 3 , PAGES D-12 D-13 OF THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR SAFETY INSPECTION OF DAMS', THE RECOMMENDED TEST FLOOD WILL BE . 50 TO 100 YEAR FREQUENCY FLOOD.

USING CONNECTICUT FLOOD FLOW FORMULA, QMEAN = 0.85 x A x S

= 0.85 x 6.25 x 172 = 900 CFS

Q100 = 5×900 CFS

= 4500 CFS

(CIVIL, HYDI 827 MAPLEDALE	L ASSOCIATES 'ING ENGINEERS RAULICS, SANITARY) ROAD, ORANGE, CT 06477 (203) 795-6562	Job A DDISON POWD Sheet Number D-2 Date 4-10-1981 By R-10-	
THE MIN	SPILLWAY ONE SOFT. WIDE OVERFIN ONE IS FT. WIDE PORTION MIMUM CREST ELEVATION OF SPILLWAY CAPACITIES AT ABULATED BELOW:	THE FOLLOWING: LOW SECTION (CRTST EL. 9 OF DAMA (CRTST EL. 10 THE DAM IS 102.0	0.25)
ELEVATION ·	CAPACITY OF 50 LONG MAIN SPILLWAY (Q= 3×50×H ^{1/2}) CREST FL. 99.75	CAPACITY OF 13 LONG SECONDARY SPILLWAY (4= 3×13+1) CREST FL 100.25	Toty
99.75	0.0	0.0	0.0
100.00	20.0	0.0	20.C
101-00	210.0	25 0	235
102.00 (TOP OF DAM)	510.0	90.0	600.(

OVER THE TWO SPILLWAY SECTIONS AND THE LOW EARTH PORTIONS OF THE DAM (TOTAL OVERFLOW WIDTH = 200 FT) WIL BE AS FOLLOWS:

ELEVATION	MAIN SPILLWAY Q= 3×50×H ^{3/2} CREST EL 2975	SECONDARY SPILLING Q=3x13×H3- CREST EL 100.25	EARTHEN DAM SECTIONS ON EAST & WEST Q= 3×135 × H3/2 CREST EL: 102-5	TOTAL CES.
102.5	685.0	130.0	0.0	815.0
103.0	880.0	180.0	140.0	1200.0
104.0	1315.0	Z85.0	745.0 /	2345 0
105.0	1805.0	405.0	1600 . 0	3810.0
106.0	2345.0	535.0	2650.0	5530.0

UNDER THE TEST FLOOD CONDITION (Q= 4500 CFS.) THE DAM WILL BE OVERTOPPED BY APPROXIMATELY 3.5 H. THE MAXIMUM SPILLWAY CAPACITY OF 600 CFS UPTO THE TOP OF THE DAM IS ONLY 13 % OF THE TEST FLOOD. NUTE: DUE TO THE SMALL STORAGE CAPACITY IN THE PONT THE EFFECT OF ROUTING IS ISIGNIFICANT AND HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.

SINGHAL ASSOCIATES CONSULTING ENGINEERS (CIVIL, HYDRAULICS, SANITARY) 827 MAPLEDALE ROAD, ORANGE, CT 06477 TEL: (203) 795-6562	By R.S.
DAM FAILURE	
AS PER CORPS OF ENGI	NEERS' GUIDELINES
$Q_{P_1} = \frac{8}{27} \cdot W_{b_2} \cdot J_{2g}^3 \cdot y_{b_1}^3$	12
WHERE QPI = DAM BREACH PI	EAK FAILURE OUTFLOW
Y = HEIGHT FROM	= 40% OF DAM LENGTH AT MID- HEIGHT. STREAM-BED TO VEL AT FAILURE
SUBSTITUTING KNOWN V. $(0.4 \times 200 = 80')$ AND IB' RE	ALVES OF WE AND YO SPECTIVELY :
$Q_{p_1} = \frac{8}{27} \times (0.4 \times 200)$	× J32.2 × 18 3/2
= 10,000 CFS	

С 1

1

ĺ

E

ζ

ľ



SINGHAL ASSOCIATES

Ú

Ĩ.

•

Ċ

1

•

E

F

E

E

E

Ł

ELEV

88 0

90.0

95.0

100.0

СС	٦N	ISL	١Ľ	TI	NG	S E	NG	CIA INE	EF	S							S	hee	t Ni	DD1 imber	. 7	5-1	5		D	
CI	VII	н	YD	R	AUI	LIC	5. S	ANI	TAF	RY)							Ē	ate		3 R.S	.2	<u>).</u>	19	81		_
AP	LE	DA	LE	R	IOA	D. ()RA	NG	E. C	:T 0	5477	7					E	^y		<u>K·2</u>						
-		T	EL	: (;	203)) 79:	5-65	62	D	<u>4 M</u>		FA	11	คบ	E	(1	<u>0/5</u>	F		000	RO	0	TIN	<u>اد)</u>		
							<u>×</u> -	S		1	1	1		sτ			6	1	Ì		!	i	 			i
																				2,		!				
	D		L	1	Pw		<u> </u>				R	ĄF	w	1	Б Г			N=	1.4. 	26R13	5/2	1		Q		!
C	FT)				FT	P	\Box	5-F	/			1).		U	T/FT	•)			FT	SEL)	! •——	C	FS		:
7	- 0	}		ŧ	35		+	45			2.	2			1		Ĺ	İ		10		!	10	000		
	٠C			l	00			30			4.	÷	ļ	•	202	3	ļ		<u>. </u>	29			Z	275		;
	• 0	1		1	80		11	30		-	6.	3							6.	62	!	1	7	705)	Ì
14	-0			2	25		21	40			9.	5			1				8.	97			17	20	<u></u>	
				_										<u> </u>			ļ				}	 	Ĺ			1
		 	L	_										<u> </u>							1					
			L				<u> </u>							ļ	L											1
			L							<u> </u>				ļ		_					 					
				j											I						i	<u>i</u>			_	
										L				<u> </u>											-	
																					1					
	_									<u> </u>												 				
																					Ļ					
										1					İ											
										ĺ	•															
													-													
			Ĺ																							
	_			Ī																						ĺ
				Ī																						
	_																									ĺ
T				I																	Ì	•				
T	_																				ļ					
1	_		Γ	Ĩ			1					[ĺ													İ
1				Ì			—					1									1			1		
Ť																			İ							!
+			\vdash	-+			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>		+ 			-						·			

.

.

I.

Ì

SINGHAL ASSOCIATES

ł

Ļ_

F

E

F

F

F

E

E

L

			SIN	IG	HA	L	\S	SO	CL	AT	ES								Tab			~ ~		~.		م د.			
		(co	NS	UL.	TIN	G	EN(GIN	EE	RS								She	et N	lum	ber		D	- 2		<u>7D</u>	<u>l</u>	<u>X 1.1</u>
						RAL												-	Dat	e	Į	3 - 1	29	- 1	<u>-</u> 92	-1			-
	827	7 M	APL	ED/	ALE	RO	۸D	OR	ΔΝ	3F	ста	1647	7						By_			R.	S٠		92				
				1	TEL:	(20	3) 7	95.6	562																				-
J		-		-						_		-					_	_(<u>s</u>	F	Le Le	<u>op</u>	1-	201	דט	1	<u>(C)</u>	,
					\vdash		<u> </u>		<u>¥-</u>	\$	SE	¢т	10	Ň	#	<u> </u> 2	-	5	+7/	<u> </u>	16	+5	þ	1		i 	-		
			+_		+-	$\downarrow_{=}$			+		1	\downarrow			1								<u> </u> 2	<u>6 7</u> 5	2		6	2	
LEV		<u> </u>	D		\square		w		//	1 57 F	1					S			\	/=						1	¢ F	= ٢.	
	<u> </u>	_	(F	Ύ		10-	T)				·)	KF	<u>ť.)</u>		(F	τ/	<u>(†</u>			1	(F	Ţ./	S€(<u>)</u>		<u> </u>	-		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	∔	-	+										1			ĺ.						ĺ					
0.0		<u> </u>	4.	-i			0	1	-	,¢		_	.00			Î			1	1	8	•0	6	1		-	64	40	
5.0	L		9.	-	+		30	-	25		<u> </u>		• 19	÷	(0:00)\$7				6	19	3	I		1	77	7Q	
8.0			IZ.				40		103				66								6.	4	5			6	61	40	
80.0		<u> </u>	14	4-0		50	00	1	189	Ø		3	78								7.	77	-			4	70	20]
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	\perp		ļ.,																I		1	1
		ļ	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	4	ļ				<u> </u>												ĺ	1]
		ļ			1						<u> </u>												1	1	T	1			1
						ĺ.															T	<u> </u>	-	i	1	-			
																	1		1			1	1	Ī	1	Ī	1		1
(Ι											1					İ	†		Ī		1
[Τ			T	\square		1-	1		<u> </u>	1	1		<u> </u>	1	1	†	<u> </u>	+	<u> </u>	
[Τ	Τ	1	1		1	1			1	1	1		1	<u> </u>	-		i		†—	\square	<u>+</u>	<u> </u>	
Γ					Γ	1				1	1	1		<u>† </u>					1					†	†	<u> </u>			{
Γ								İ	1		1	-		-			†		1					1-	┼──		+	+	
Γ						-		1			1	1				1	1		1	 	†		<u> </u>		┼──	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	┿┥	
ſ						1	1		1-			1				<u> </u>	1			<u> </u>				<u>.</u>	 		1	+	
F			1		\square		<u> </u>	1-	1	<u> </u>	1	†			<u> </u>	+								 	<u></u>		-	+	
F					1-			1	1-		1	†—		-	 	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	—			 		╉╍╍┥		-	+	
F					1			1	1		<u> </u>	1											 	1	┢──┤		-	+	
F					†			1	+			+							! i				, 		<u> </u>	i		+	
F									┢		1													 	\vdash			+	, F
								<u> </u>	+										i						┠─┤		<u> </u>		
ŀ					1				+								┟──┤							 i	┟──┤	¦		+	
F									+					- <u></u>		1									╞╶┤		 	<u>!</u>	
⊢	\dashv			-		╎╌┥		<u> </u>	<u> </u>							<u> </u>								!	<u> </u>			+	
┢								<u> </u>														_		1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	; ;		
┢	-							\vdash									┝──┤							¦	\vdash	<u> </u>			
┣	-																							! :					
⊢			-+																	_				 	$\left - \right $;	
-	-							<u> </u>								<u> </u>	└──┤								Ĺ		<u> </u>		
-		4																								1		<u> </u>	

.

SINGHAL SSOCIATES

CONSULT: © ENGINEERS (CIVIL, HYDRAULICS, SANITARY)

Job	ADDISON	POND	DAN
Sheet	Number D-	7	
Date	3.29.	1981	
By	R.s.		

827 MAPLEDALE ROAD, ORANGE, CT 06477 TEL: (203) 795-6562

X- SECTION #1 STA. 7+0
FOR $Q_{P_1} = 10,000$ CFS. $H_1 = 10.1'$ AND $A_1 = 1356$ S.F. REACH LENGTH = 700 FT. STORAGE = 700 × 1356/43560 = 22 ACFT
$Q_{p_2} = Q_{p_1} \left(1 - \frac{22}{62} \right) = 10000 \times 0.67 = 6,700 \text{ cfs.}$ $H_2 = 8.1'$ AND $A_2 = 10000 \text{ s.f.}$ STORAGE = 1000 × 700/43560 = 16.0 AC. FT. AVG. STORAGE = 1/2 (16 + 22) = 19 AC. FT.
$Q_{P3} = Q_{P1} \left(1 - \frac{19}{62} \right) = 10,000 \times 0.72 = 7,200 \text{ CFS}$ $H_3 = 8.6' \text{AND} A_3 = 1070 \text{ S} \text{ F} $ $\text{STORAGE} = 1070 \times 700/43560 = 17.0 \text{ Ac} \text{ FT}$ $\text{AVG. STORAGE} = \frac{12}{2} \left(17 + 19 \right) = 18 \text{ Ac} \text{ FT}.$
$Q_{P4} = Q_{P_1} \left(1 - \frac{1B}{62} \right) = 10,000 \times 0.73 = 7,300 \text{ CF}^{(1)}$ THE ROUTED FLOOD FLOW BELOW X-SECTION #
THE ROUTED FLOOD FLOW ISELOW ADDICTION A WILL BE APPROXIMATELY 7,300 CFS. H = 8.7' POST- FAILURE FLOOD ELEVATION = 86.0 + 8.7 = 94.7
SAY 95.0

SINGHAL ASSOCIATES

CONSULTING ENGINEERS (CIVIL, HYDRAULICS, SANITARY)

POND	D-11
	8
. 1931	

827 MAPLEDALE ROAD, ORANGE, CT 06477 TEL: (203) 795-6562

G

E

DAM FAILUFE	FLOOD	ROUTING
X-SECTION #2	STA . 16	+50

FOR Qpi=7,300 H₁ = 12.2' AND A₁ = 1100 SF REACH LENGTH = 950 FT. STORAGE = 950 × 1100/43560 = 24 AC FT. $P_{2} = Q_{P1} \left(1 - \frac{24}{62}\right) = 7,300 \times 0.61 = 4450 \text{ CFS}.$ $H_{2} = 10.65$ AND A₁ = 680 SF STORAGE = 950×680/43560 = 15 AC FT AVG. STORAGE = $\frac{1}{2} \left(15 + 24\right) = 19.5 \text{ Ac}$ FT. $Q_{P3} = Q_{P1} \left(1 - \frac{19.5}{62}\right) = 7,300 \times 0.69 = 5,040 \text{ CFS}$ $H_{3} = 11.0$ AND A₃ = 774 SF STORAGE = 950×774/43560 = 17 AC FT. AVG. STORAGE = $\frac{1}{2} \left(17 + 19.5\right) = 18$ AC FT. $Q_{P4} = Q_{P1} \left(1 - \frac{18}{62}\right) = 7,300 \times 0.71 = 5200 \text{ CFS}$ AND H₄ = 11.1 THE ROUTED FLOW BELOW X-SECTION # 2

WILL BE 5,200 CFS. APPROXIMATELY. AND POST- FAILURE FLOOD ELEVATION = 66.0+11.1 = 77.1 SAY 77.0

SINGHAL ASSOCIATES	JOB ADDISDINI POIND
CONSULTING ENGINEERS	Sheet Number D-9
(CIVIL, HYDRAULICS, SANITARY)	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
827 MAPLEDALE ROAD, ORANGE. CT 06477 TEL: (203) 795-6562 	
TEST FLOOD = 4500 CFS	
$\Delta T. X - SEC = 1 H = 6.3'$	A = 760 STORACE = 12 AC
ROUTED FLOW = $4800 \left(1 - \frac{12}{62}\right)$	$= 4800 \times 0.8 = 3500$ Cr
FLOOD ELEVATION = 86.0	+6.3 = 92.3
	5 AY 92.0
$\frac{AT}{P_{1} = 3800}, H = 10.2^{\prime}$	A = 580

5

E

Ī

ľ

STORAGE = $580 \times 950/43560 = 13 \text{ AC} \cdot \text{FT}$. $P_{P_2} = 3800 \times (1 - \frac{13}{62}) = 3000 \text{ CFS}$ $H_2 = 9.8' \quad 4 \quad A_2 = 450 \text{ SF}$. STORAGE = $450 \times 950/43560 = 10 \text{ AC} \cdot \text{FT}$ AVG STORAGE = $\frac{1}{2}(10 + 13) = 11.5 \text{ AC} \cdot \text{FT}$ $P_3 = 3800 \times (1 - \frac{11.5}{62}) = 3100$ $H_3 = 9.8'$

TEST_ FLOOD ELEVATION = (6.0+9.8 = 75.8) SAY 76.0



•



4 BR.

)



قيور.



f



ti yy k

.



 \mathcal{D}

