



Ì.

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A



REPORT DOCUMENTATIO	N PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
NH 00149		
TITLE (and Sublitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERS
Upper Kimball Lake Dam		INSPECTION REPORT
ATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION O	F NON-FEDERAL	5. PERFORMING ORG, REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
J.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS HEW ENGLAND DIVISION		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRE	55	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAS AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND (DDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
DEPT. OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGIN	EERS	March 1980
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED 124 TRAPFIO ROAD WAITHAM MA 02	254	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I diffe	rent from Centrolling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		1
		UNCLASSIFIED
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST	RIBUTION UNLIMITED	UNCLASSIFIED 184. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect enter	RIBUTION UNLIMITED	UNCLASSIFIED 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE m Report)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect enter SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	RIBUTION UNLIMITED	UNCLASSIFIED 18a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE an Report)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect onion Cover program reads: Phase I Inspinowever, the official title of the Non-Federal Dams; use cover date	RIBUTION UNLIMITED	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE a Report) ional Dam Inspection Program onal Program for Inspection
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect enter Cover program reads: Phase I Inspinowever, the official title of the Non-Federal Dams; use cover date KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY,	RIBUTION UNLIMITED we in Block 20, 11 different from ection Report, Nation for date of report and identify by block number;	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE a Report) ional Dam Inspection Program onal Program for Inspection 
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect entred Over program reads: Phase I Insp however, the official title of the Non-Federal Dams; use cover date KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse olds if necessory DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Saco River Basin Chatham, New Hampshire Kimball Brook tributary to Old	RIBUTION UNLIMITED wed in Block 20, 11 different fre ection Report, Nation for date of report and identify by block number; Course Saco River	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE Report) Ional Dam Inspection Program Ional Program for Inspection 
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIST DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observect enter Cover program reads: Phase I Inspinowever, the official title of the Non-Federal Dams; use cover date KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Saco River Basin Chatham, New Hampshire Kimball Brook tributary to Old ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary	RIBUTION UNLIMITED red in Block 20, 11 different from ection Report, Nation for date of report and identify by block number; Course Saco RIver and identify by block number;	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE a Report) ional Dam Inspection Program onal Program for Inspection 

.

. .\* . .\* .

•

•

•

•

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

. . .

, Alta

, · ·

•••

٠.-

REPRODUCED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

# **DISCLAIMER NOTICE**

THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

1



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY NEW ENGLAND DIVISION. CORPS OF ENGINEERS 424 TRAPELO ROAD WALTHAM. MASSACHUSETTS 02154

REPLN TO ATTENTION OF: NEDED MAY 3 0 1980

Honorable Hugh J. Gallen Governor of the State of New Hampshire State House Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Dear Governor Gallen.

Inclosed is a copy of the Upper Kimball Lake Dam Phase I Inspection Report, which was prepared under the National Program for Inspection of Non-Federal Dams. This report is presented for your use and is based upon a visual inspection, a review of the past performance and a brief hydrological study of the dam. A brief assessment is included at the beginning of the report. I have approved the report and support the findings and recommendations described in Section 7 and ask that you keep me informed of the actions taken to implement them. This follow-up action is a vitally important part of this program.

A copy of this report has been forwarded to the Water Resources Board, the cooperating agency for the State of New Hampshire. In addition, a copy of the report has also been furnished the owner, Water Resources Board, Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

Copies of this report will be made available to the public, upon request, by this office under the Freedom of Information Act. In the case of this report the release date will be thirty days from the date of this letter.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and the Water Resources Board for your cooperation in carrying out this program.

Sincerely,

Incl As stated

Colonel, Corps of Engineers Division Engineer SACO RIVER BASIN CHATHAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE

UPPER KIMBALL LAKE DAM NH CO149

Acces	sion Fo	r	$\mathbf{V}$
NTIS	GRA&I		<u>X</u>
DTIC	TAB	J	
Unanr	ounced		
Justi	ficatio	n	
By Distr Avai	ibution labilit	y Co	des
	Avail a	and/c	or
Dist	Spec	ial	
A/,	5	4	y M

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

;

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

MARCH 1980

# NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM PHASE I INVESTIGATION REPORT

Identification No.: Name of Dam: Town: County and State: Stream: Date of Site Visit: NH 00149 Upper Kimball Lake Chatham Carroll, New Hampshire Kimball Brook tributary to Old Course Saco River 31 October 1979

BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Upper Kimball Lake Dam consists of an earth embankment on the right with a concrete gravity spillway and earth abutment on the left. The spillway weir is broad crested with no means of affixing flashboards to it. The outlet works is stoplog-controlled and forms the left end of the spillway structure. The crest length of Upper Kimball Lake Dam is approximately 230 ft. and it has a height of about 10.2 ft. The dam was reconstructed in 1956 and serves primarily as a recreation dam.

Due to the extent of downstream development that would be affected in the event the dam were to fail, Upper Kimball Lake Dam is confirmed as having a "significant" hazard potential in accordance with Corps of Engineers Guidelines.

The dam is in fair condition, based on visual examination. Although several deficiencies were noted, there was no evidence of settlement, lateral movement or signs of structural failure, or other conditions which would warrant urgent remedial action.

Based on the "small" size and "significant" hazard potential classifications, in accordance with Corps of Engineers Guidelines, the adopted test flood for this dam is 1/4 of the Probable Maximum Flood (1/4 PMF). With the water level at the top of the dam and stoplogs in place, the total spillway and outlet works capacity is equal to the test flood outflow of 1,660 cfs (inflow 2,760 cfs or 450 csm). Hydraulic analyses indicate that 1,660 cfs can be passed with a freeboard of about 0.5 ft. with all stoplogs removed.

The State of Naw Hampshire Water Resources Board, owner of the dam, should perform remedial measures, including clearing sunken logs from the outlet works approach, cutting trees and placing earthfill on the right embankment adjacent to the spillway, restoring the upstream slope of the right embankment to design grade and repairing the failed area on the downstream side of the left abutment. This work, as outlined in Section 7.3, should be implemented within one year after receipt of this report. The Owner should also prepare a formal operations and maintenance manual for the dam and establish an emergency preparedness plan and downstream warning system that would compliment the State's existing disaster operations plan, "Link-Up".

HALEY & ALDRICH, INC. by:

Harl Aldrich President



•

ē

•

This Phase I Inspection Report on Upper Kimball Lake Dam has been reviewed by the undersigned Review Board members. In our opinion, the reported findings, conclusions, and recommendations are consistent with the <u>Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of</u> <u>Dams</u>, and with good engineering judgment and practice, and is hereby submitted for approval.

chard Q. D. Burno

RICHARD DIBUONO, MEMBER Water Control Branch Engineering Division

matterm he

ARAMAST MAHTESIAN, MEMBER Foundation & Materials Branch Engineering Division

MIL

CARNEY M. TERZIAN, CHAIRMAN Design Branch Engineering Division

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

OE B. FRYAR

Chief, Engineering Division

# 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, DC 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. 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 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 be any chance that unsafe conditions will be detected.

Phase I Investigations are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the test flood is based on the estimated "probable maximum flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm run-off), or a fraction 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 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. Consideration of downstream flooding other than in the event of a dam failure is beyond the scope of this investigation.

The Phase I Investigation does not 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 public. An evaluation of the project for compliance with OSHA rules and regulations is also excluded.

ī

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL BRIEF ASSESSMENT REVIEW BOARD PAGE PREFACE i TABLE OF CONTENTS iii-v OVERVIEW PHOTO vi LOCATION MAP vii

Page

# REPORT

1.	PROJECT	INFORMATION	
	1.1 Gene	eral	1-1
	a. b.	Authority Purpose of Inspection	1-7
	1.2 Des	cription of Project	1-1
	a. b. c. d. f. y. h. i.	Location Description of Dam and Appurtenances Size Classification Hazard Classification Ownership Operator Purpose of Dam Design and Construction History Normal Operational Procedures	1-1 1-2 1-2 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3
	1.3 Per	tinent Data	1 - 4
2.	ENGINEE	RING DATA	
	2.1 Des	ign Data	2-1
	2.2 Con	struction Data	2-1
	2.3 Ope	ration Data	2-1
	2.4 Eva	luation of Data	2-1
З.	VISUAL	EXAMINATION	
	3.1 Fin	dings	3-1

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page	•
	a. General b. Dam c. Appurtenant Structures d. Reservoir Area e. Downstream Channel	3-1 3-1 3-2 3-2 3-2	
	3.2 Evaluation	3-3	
4.	OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES		
	4.1 Operational Procedures	4-1	•
	<ul> <li>a. General</li> <li>b. Description of any Warning System in Effect</li> </ul>	4 - 1 4 - 1	
	4.2 Maintenance Procedures	4-1	•
	a. General b. Operating Facilities	4-1 4-1	
	4.3 Evaluation	4-1	•
5.	EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES		
	5.1 General	5-1	
	5.2 Design Data	5-1	•
	5.3 Experience Data	5-1	
	5.4 Test Flood Analysis	5-1	
	5.5 Dam Failure Analysis	5-2	
б.	EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY		
	6.1 Visual Observations	6-1	•
	6.2 Design and Construction Data	6-1	
	6.3 Post-Construction Changes	6-2	
	6.4 Seismic Stability	6-2	► •
7.	ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES		
	7.1 Dam Assessment	7-1	

<u>i</u> ...

SECTION 4 - OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

# 4.1 Operational Procedures

a. <u>General</u>. In general, there are no formal operational procedures for Upper Kimball Lake Dam. A total of seven stoplogs are maintained in the outlet works year round. The Owner's instruction for emergency operations state; "Pull stoplogs if (the) dam (is) threatened."

b. Description of Any Warning System in Effect. There is no specific warning system or emergency preparedness plan in effect for this structure. However, the Owner is within the framework of the operations plan "Link-Up", an inter-agency plan in the State of New Hampshire for natural and man-made disaster operations. The plan establishes the procedure for notifying and calling upon the resources of other state agencies in times of emergency.

# 4.2 Maintenance Procedures

a. <u>General</u>. There are no established procedures or manuals for inspection and maintenance of the dam. Remedial measures such as replacement of stoplogs are reportedly performed on an as-needed basis.

b. Operating Facilities. The spillway structure appears to have received regular maintenance. There are no provisions for flashboards and the stoplogs in the outlet works are maintained at spillway crest level year round. The outlet works provide the only means of draining or lowering the level of Upper Kimball Lake. Although no attempt was made to remove the stoplogs during the site inspection, no conditions were observed which would unusually hinder their removal during times of emergency.

# 4.3 Evaluation

Maintenance of the facility is being performed on the basis of need. There is currently no formal operational procedures in effect for this dam. Formal operational procedures and maintenance programs should be established. A detailed emergency preparedness plan and warning system should be established for the specific dam to compliment the existing operations plan "Link-Up". No. 9. The culvert and downstream channel appear adequate to convey the maximum spillway discharge without causing significant flooding. About midway between the dam and Lower Kimball Pond is the ruins of a breached dam which is reported to have been privately owned and previously operated for hydroelectric power generation.

# 3.2 Evaluation

Based on the visual examination conducted on 31 October 1979, Upper Kimball Lake Dam is considered to be in fair condition. The conditions at the upstream slope of the right embankment and at the downstream side of the left abutment have been reported by the New Hampshire Water Resources Board since 1972 and appear to be somewhat stable. The spillway structure appears to be in good condition and performing satisfactorily at the present time. However, the remedial measures outlined in Section 7.3 should be implemented to correct the noted deficiencies in the dam at the right embankment, left abutment and outlet works approach. .

. . .

The masonry portion of Upper Kimball Lake Dam, the spillway, appeared to be in good condition, Photo No. 6. However, flow over the weir precluded close examination. Overall, the spillway is in good alignment as shown on Photo No. 3, with no settlement noticeable. The concrete accessible for examination appeared sound, with only one minor crack in the right training wall noted during the site inspection.

The left abutment is grass covered. The upstream slope and crest are in generally excellent condition. However, on the downstream side and immediately adjacent to the spillway training wall there is a small failed area, Photo No. 7. The failure extends as far as 2 ft. in the upstream direction and to a depth of 3 ft. below the top of the training wall. The abutment slopes steeply to meet the downstream channel at this location; this contributes to the instability. The failure appears to be a combination of erosion and sloughing. Boulders which were placed along the left downstream channel for erosion protection appear to be locally dislodged. The boulders closest to the outlet works have been displaced the most as part of the failed slope.

c. Appurtenant Structures. The outlet works appears to be in excellent condition with no major defects apparent, Photo No. 7. The access bridge (catwalk) and training walls are in good alignment. Minor erosion of the concrete was noted at the training walls on the downstream side. The condition of the stoplogs could not be determined as flow obscured their direct viewing.

There are sunken logs present at the approach to the outlet works. However, they appeared sufficiently upstream as not to create an obstruction to flow.

d. <u>Reservoir Area</u>. Upper Kimball Lake, Photo No. 11, is bordered by heavily forested rolling terrain to the northwest, west and east and by marsh lands to the south. The shoreline is lightly developed with summer cottages. There is no significant probability of landslides into the reservoir affecting the safety of the dam. No conditions were noted that could result in a sudden increase in sediment load into the reservoir.

e. <u>Downstream Channel</u>. An unnamed brook, Photo No. 10, conveys discharge from the spillway approximately 800 ft. to Lower Kimball Pond. The elevation difference between Upper Kimball Lake and Lower Kimball Pond is approximately 50 ft. according to USGS Quadrangle Sheets. About 100 ft. downstream of the dam is a roadway embankment with a 9 ft.-2 in. x 15 ft-2 in. steel pipe arch culvert, Photo

#### SECTION 3 - VISUAL EXAMINATION

. .

-

17

-

]

\_

-

\_.(

#### 3.1 Findings

a. <u>General</u>. The Phase I visual examination of Upper Kimball Lake Dam was conducted on 31 October 1979. The upstream water surface elevation was about 0.1 ft. above the spillway crest that day.

In general, the project was found to be in fair condition. Several deficiencies which require correction were noted.

A visual inspection check list is included in Appendix A and selected photographs of the project are given in Appendix C. A "Site Plan Sketch", page C-1, shows the direction of view for each photograph.

b. Dam. The earth embankment that forms the right side of the dam, Photo No. 2, is covered with moss, grass and weeds; the latter are typically less than 1 ft. in height. Minor erosion from the water line to about 1 ft. above the water surface has occurred along the upstream slope of the embankment. The exposed upstream slope is irregular in shape, due to erosion, and appears to be steeper than the 2 horizontal to 1 vertical that was designed.

Adjacent to the right spillway training wall on both the upstream and downstream sides, the crest is deficient as the embankment is significantly lower than the concrete as shown on Photo No. 3. On the upstream side this difference is 1 to 2 ft. and on the downstream side 0.5 to 1.5 ft. There is active erosion; however, it is doubtful that the difference in grade has been caused by this action alone. The embankment might have been constructed low or the difference may be caused, in part, by settlement of the earth embankment due to insufficient compaction during the placement of the fill.

There are no structural or natural items on the embankment other than two oak trees approximately 6 in. and 3 in. in diameter, respectively, located on the downstream side as shown on the right side of Photo No. 4. At several locations, particularly adjacent to the spillway, stone that formed the downstream side of the former dam is visible, Photo No. 5. The vertical alignment of the embankment appears goods. The horizontal alignment is slightly curved in agreement with the design drawings.

# SECTION 2 - ENGINEERING DATA

## 2.1 Design Data

No design data for the former dry-laid stone masonry dam were located and none are believed to exist. Design drawings for the reconstruction of Upper Kimball Lake Dam dated 1955 and 1956 were located. The above documents and a summary of the dam's hydraulic/hydrologic features tabulated by the New Hampshire Water Resources Board comprises all the available design information known to exist.

## 2.2 Construction Data

No as-built data or records of the reconstruction of the dam were located and none are believed to exist.

# 2.3 Operational Data

No operational data, other than prior inspection reports, were located for the facility.

# 2.4 Evaluation of Data

a. <u>Availability</u>. A list of the engineering data available for use in preparing this report is included on page B-1. Selected documents from the listing are also included in Appendix B.

b. <u>Adequacy</u>. There was a considerable amount of engineering data available to aid in the evaluation of Upper Kimball Lake Dam. A review of these data in combination with visual examination, preliminary hydraulic and hydrologic computations, consideration of past performance and application of engineering judgement, was adequate for the purposes of a Phase I assessment.

c. Validity. The information contained in the engineering data may generally be considered valid. However, details on the drawings are shown as designed and some vary from those actually built. For example, areas of riprap adjacent to the spillway are absent, the alignment of the downstream channel is not as shown on the design drawings and the slope of the upstream side of the right embankment appears steeper than 2 horizontal to 1 vertical.

9. Grout curtain..... None 10. Other..... Rebuilt over former composite dry-laid stone and earth fill dam in 1956 h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel Not applicable i. Spillway 1. Type..... 2 ft. wide broad crested concrete weir 2. Length of weir..... 44 ft. 3. Crest elevation..... 95.2 4. Gates..... None 5. U/S channel..... Upper Kimball Lake 6. D/S channel..... Unnamed brook approx. 800 ft. long at S =0.06 to Lower Kimball Pond 7. General..... D/S channel has sufficient capacity to convey test flood

-

•

-

]

•

. (

j. Regulating Outlets. The reservoir outlet works consists of one 6-ft. wide stoplog bay located at the left abutment of the spillway with provisions for seven 6 ft.-6 in. x 4 in. x 8 in. wood stoplogs. The invert of the stoplog bay is 4.7 ft. below the spillway crest.

Elevation (Assumed Datum not NGVD) c. 1. Streambed at centerline of dam..... 89.5 2. Maximum tailwater..... Unknown 3. Upstream portal invert diversion tunnel..... Not applicable 4. Recreation pool..... 95.2 5. Full flood control pool.... Not applicable 6. Spillway crest..... 95.2 7. Design surcharge - original design..... Unknown 8. Top of dam..... 99.7 9. Test flood surcharge..... 99.7 d. Length of Reservoir 1. Maximum pool..... Unknown 2. Recreation pool..... Unknown 3. Flood control pool..... Not applicable e. Storage (acre-ft.) 1. Recreation pool..... 200 2. Flood control pool..... Not applicable 3. Spillway crest..... 200 4. Top of dam..... 800 5. Test flood pool..... 800 f. Reservoir Surface (acres) 1. Recreation pool..... 136 2. Flood control pool..... Not applicable 3. Spillway crest..... 136 4. Top of dam..... Unknown 5. Test flood pool..... Unknown Dam g. 1. Type..... Gravity, earth fill 2. Crest length..... 230 ft. approximately 3. Structural height..... 10.2 ft. 4. Embankment crest width..... 6 ft. 5. Side slopes..... Approx. 2H to 1V U/S, variable D/S 6. Zoning..... None 7. Impervious core..... None 8. Cutoff...... 7.2 ft. long concrete cutoff walls from spillway training walls into earth fill at either side of spillway and below spillway to impervious soil

that the dam is periodically inspected by the Owner and that repairs are made when required.

# 1.3 Pertinent Data

All elevations reported herein are approximate and based on an assumed datum given on drawings prepared for the reconstruction of the dam by the New Hampshire Water Resources Board. Based on the assumed datum, the crest of the spillway weir is at El. 95.2. •••;;

.

---

-

.

-

\_

The level of Upper Kimball Lake is given at El. 430 (USGS) on a New Hampshire Water Control Commission data report dated 2 November 1938. The level of the lake is also shown on the USGS North Conway, New Hampshire-Maine Quadrangle Map at El. 430. Although the data report and North Conway Quadrangle Map were both made prior to the dam's reconstruction, the lake surface is believed to be close to the level it was retained at by the former dam.

a. Drainage Area. The drainage area tributary to the dam site is 6.1 sq. mi. of moderate to steeply sloped hills which are heavily forested. There is essentially no development in the watershed, which is drained by three brooks. Upper Kimball Lake constitutes approximately 3.5 percent of the total drainage area.

b. Discharge at Dam Site

1.	Outlet works	
	(stoplogs removed)	200 cfs with water sur-
		face at spillway crest
	(stoplogs in place)	550 cfs with water sur-
		face at top of dam
	(stoplogs in place)	190 cfs with water sur-
		face at top of dam
2.	Maximum known flood at dam	
	site	Unknown
3.	Ungated spillway capacity	
	at top of dam	1,470 cfs at El. 99.7
4.	Uncated spillway capacity at	
	test flood pool elevation	1,470 cfs at El. 99.7
5.	Gated spillway capacity at	•
	normal pool elevation	Not applicable
6.	Gated spillway capacity at	
	test flood pool elevation	Not applicable
7.	Total spillway capacity at	
	test flood pool elevation	1.470 cfs at El. 99.7
8.	Total project discharge at	1,110 010 de 11. 55.1
••	test flood pool elevation	1 660 cfs at F1 99.7
٩	Total project discharge at	1,000 CL5 at L1. 55.7
	top of dam (with stoplage	
	romound)	2 020 of c at El 99 7
		2,020 CIS at EI. 99./

for Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs", confirm this classification. A failure of Upper Kimball Lake Dam would jeopardize the occupants of one home immediately downstream of the dam. Potential loss of life is a few.

e. <u>Ownership</u>. The name, address and phone number of the current owner of Upper Kimball Lake Dam are:

Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire 37 Pleasant Street Concord, New Hampshire 03301 Phone: (603) 271-3406

Mr. Vernon A. Knowlton is the Chief Engineer of the Water Resources Board.

f. Operator. The Water Resources Board of the State of New Hampshire has been responsible for operation, maintenance and safety of the dam since about 1955. The board may be reached at the address and phone number listed above. The Water Resources Board does not designate a particular individual as operator of a specific dam but operates all state-owned dams by their staff of engineers and operators on a continual basis.

· ·

g. <u>Purpose of Dam</u>. A stone masonry and earth fill dam was built at the site shortly after the year 1800. At that time, water was stored primarily for use by three mills located downstream of the dam. The industrial uses of the dam are believed to have been abandoned sometime in the late 1800's or early 1900's. Since that time, to the present, the primary purpose of Upper Kimball Lake Dam has been to maintain a reservoir for recreational use.

h. Design and Construction History. No records of the former dam are known to exist other than the deteriorated conditions of stone masonry and embankment reported, after the dam was abandoned, by New Hampshire state agencies. Between 1954 and 1956, the dam was redesigned by the Water Resources Board. In the fall of 1956 a contractor, Gordon T. Burke, was engaged and the dam was reconstructed to its existing configuration.

i. Normal Operational Procedures. There is no formal written procedure for the operation of Upper Kimball Lake Dam. The spillway weir has a fixed crest with no provisions for flashboards. The outlet works is not operated seasonally. The wooden stoplogs, which may be removed in times of emergency, are maintained by the state. It is understood N44<sup>0</sup>05.8' and W71<sup>0</sup>00.4', respectively. Flow from the dam is conveyed about 800 ft. by an unnamed brook to Lower Kimball Pond. The lake, pond and associated watershed system are tributary to the Old Course Saco River. The dam is also known as Upper Kimball Pond Dam and the reservoir, locally, as Webb Pond.

b. <u>Description of Dam and Appurtenances</u>. Upper Kimball Lake Dam consists of an earth embankment on the right with a concrete gravity spillway and earth abutment on the left. The crest length of the dam is approximately 230 ft. and it has a height, at the spillway, of about 10.2 ft.

The earth embankment on the right is about 140 ft. long with a 6-ft. crest width. The upstream slope is about 2 horizontal to 1 vertical and has no riprap or slope protection. On the downstream side, the embankment slopes down to a ground surface that is about 3 ft. lower than the crest and relatively flat.

The spillway is a broad crested concrete gravity structure. The spillway weir is 44 ft. long with no means of affixing flashboards to it. The outlet works, which is incorporated into the left side of the spillway, is 6 ft. long and stoplog controlled. The overall length of the spillway structure, weir and outlet works, is 51 ft. Concrete training walls form abutments at either end of the spillway structure. Short concrete cutoff walls extend out from the training walls into the earth embankment and earth abutment on the right and left ends, respectively.

Upper Kimball Lake Dam underwent reconstruction in 1956. In the reconstruction, an earth embankment on the left side of the prior outlet works was removed and the new spillway constructed. The remnants of the left end of the prior embankment were rebuilt and now form the left earth abutment. The abutment is in the same general configuration as the right embankment.

c. <u>Size Classification</u>. The storage to the top of Upper Kimball Lake Dam is reported to be 800 acre-ft., and the corresponding hydraulic height of the dam is approximately 10 ft. Storage of less than 1,000 acre-ft. and a height of less than 40 ft. classifies this dam in the "small" size category according to guidelines established by the Corps of Engineers.

d. <u>Hazard Classification</u>. The dam is currently classified as having a "significant" hazard potential in the Corps of Engineers National Inventory of Dams. Dam failure computations in Appendix D, which are based on "Guidance

# PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

## UPPER KIMBALL LAKE DAM NH 00149

#### SECTION 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

# 1.1 General

F

.

.

•

L

a. <u>Authority</u>. 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.

Haley & Aldrich, Inc. has been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the States of New Hampshire and Maine. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to Haley & Aldrich, Inc. under a letter dated 31 October 1979 from Colonel William E. Hodgson, Jr., Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW33-80-C-0009 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work. Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc. was retained as consultant to Haley & Aldrich, Inc. on the structural, mechanical/electrical and hydraulic/hydrologic aspects of the Investigation.

b. Purpose of Inspection. The primary purposes of the National Dam Inspection Program are to:

1. Perform technical inspection and evaluation of non-Federal dams to identify conditions which threaten the public safety and thus permit correction in a timely manner by non-Federal interests.

2. Encourage and prepare the states to initiate effective dam safety programs for non-Federal dams.

3. Update, verify and complete the National Inventory of Dams.

# 1.2 Description of Project

a. Location. The dam is located at the northern end of Upper Kimball Lake as shown on the Location Map, page vii. The latitude and longitude of the dam site are





Ţ	AE	BLE	OF	CON	TENTS

<u>Page</u>

•

-

•

1

۰.

•

.

•.

, . , .

.

	a. b. c.	Condition Adequacy of Information Urgency	7-1 7-1 7-1
7.2	Reco	ommendations	7-1
7.3	Rem	edial Measures	7-1
	a.	Operation and Maintenance Procedures	7-2
7.4	Alt	ernatives	7-2
APPENDIX APPENDIX APPENDIX APPENDIX APPENDIX	A - B - D - E -	INSPECTION CHECKLIST ENGINEERING DATA PHOTOGRAPHS HYDRAULIC AND HYDROLOGIC COMPUTATIONS INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY: OF DAMS	A-1 B-1 C-1 D-1 E-1

# SECTION 5 - EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES

#### 5.1 General

Upper Kimball Lake Dam is a recreational dam. It is approximately 230 ft. long including the spillway and outlet works. The 44-ft. long broad crested concrete spillway has a freebeard height of 4.5 ft. The left abutment of the spillway incorporates a 6-ft. long stoplog bay having an invert elevation 4.7 ft. below the crest of the spillway. Discharge from the spillway and outlet works is conveyed approximately 800 ft. by an unnamed brook to Lower Kimball Pond. The essentially undeveloped 6.1-sq. mi. drainage area is sloped in its upper regions, moderately sloped in the lower portion and heavily forested throughout.

# 5.2 Design Data

Hydraulic/hydrologic design data as reported by the Owner is as follows:

15 year storm	555	cfs
100 year storm capacity	1,400	cfs
Design flow capacity	1,675	cfs
Discharge (manual)	300	cfs
(automatic)	1,375	cfs

# 5.3 Experience Data

There are no records of any major hydrological occurrances at the dam site since its reconstruction in 1956. According to the Owner, the dam has not been overtopped since that time.

# 5.4 Test Flood Analysis

Based on the Corps of Engineers Guidelines, the recommended test flood range for the size "small" and hazard potential "significant" is the 100 year flood to 1/2 PMF (Probable Maximum Flood). The 1/4 PMF was selected for the test flood as the size of the facility places it near the low end of the classification range. The PMF was determined using the Corps of Engineers Guidelines for "Estimating Maximum Probable Discharge" in Phase I Dam Safety Investigations. The 6.1-sq. mi. drainage area

5-1

consists of rolling to moderately steep terrain with swamp and marsh lands in the southern portion of the watershed. A peak inflow rate of 1,800 csm was selected for the PMF inflow which results in a test flood inflow (1/4 PMF) of 2,760 cfs.

Surcharge storage routing of the test flood inflow was performed, assuming the top of stoplogs to be at spillway crest elevation, resulting in a routed test flood outflow of 1,660 cfs at a pond stage of El. 99.7 (top of dam). This value compares favorably with hydraulic/hydrologic data of 1,400 cfs for the 100 year storm and 1,675 cfs for the design flow furnished by the Owner. Since the maximum project discharge capacity computed during this inspection is 1,660 cfs with all stoplogs in place and the emergency operating procedures calling for the removal of stoplogs "if (the) dam (is) threatened", the project is considered hydraulically adequate to pass the test flood. 

# 5.5 Dam Failure Analysis

10

Based on the Corps of Engineers Guidelines for estimating dam failure hydrographs, and assuming that a failure would occur along 40 percent of the mid-height of the dam with pond level at top of dam, the peak failure outflow is estimated to be 2,190 cfs in addition to the 1,660 cfs spillway and outlet works discharge occurring before a failure of the dam. Prior to failure, approximately 70 cfs would overtop the left downstream channel bank and flow overland a short distance before returning to the downstream channel. The roadway which crosses the downstream channel would be overtopped by about 4 ft. depth of water at its lowest point. One house located on the downstream channel left overbank, just downstream of the roadway embankment would be flooded by approximately 1,900 cfs to a depth of about 3 to 4 ft. Most of the 1,900 cfs overland flow would return to the downstream channel and be conveyed to Lower Kimball Pond with the remainder of the flow dispersing to sheet flow with no resulting hazard.

The potential loss of life resulting from a dam failure is a few and the dam is accordingly classified in the "significant" hazard category. SECTION 6 - EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY

# 6.1 Visual Observations

There was no visual evidence of major settlement or lateral movement in the earth fill or concrete portions of Upper Kimball Lake Dam. Erosion at the upstream slope of the right embankment and a failure at the downstream side of the left abutment warrent attention. Despite these conditions, the earth fill parts of the dam appear to be structurally stable at this time.

The spillway was obscured by flowing water during the site inspection making a detailed examination of it impossible. However, based on those conditions that were observed, no reason was found to question the structural stability of the spillway structure.

#### 6.2 Design and Construction Data

Design plans for the reconstruction of the dam were located. The plans show a typical cross section of the prior embankment and the, then proposed, addition to the embankment. The embankment was redesigned to be at a higher elevation with a 6-ft. crest width and an upstream slope of 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, the approximate slope of the former embankment. No theoretical calculations on the stability of the embankment or specifications for the type of fill used are available. However, the configuration of the embankment is generally consistent with usual design practice. Past performance of the reconstructed embankment has apparently been satisfactory and, in the absence of seepage problems, the embankment is expected to be stable.

The spillway structure was designed to be constructed over portions of the former dam with part of the structure founded directly on the streambed soils. The exact nature of the spillway's foundation is not delineated on the plans other than it is essentially the same foundation used for the former dam. A 12-in. wide concrete cutoff wall is indicated on the plans, but, the extent of the wall as constructed is not known. However, the general dimensions of the spillway cross-section are within the range of what usually would be expected for a stable structure of this size. For this reason, combined with the conditions observed during the site examination, the spillway is expected to

have an adequate factor of safety relative to overall stability.

# 6.3 Post Construction Changes

The dam was reconstructed, over a former stone and earth dam, in 1956. During the reconstruction, the spillway and outlet works were enlarged. Since 1956, no material changes to the dam are known to have been made.

# 6.4 Seismic Stability

Å

.

Ľ,

~

1

L

Upper Kimball Lake Dam is located in Seismic Zone 2 and in accordance with Recommended Phase I Guidelines does not warrant seismic analysis.

# SECTION 7 - ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES

#### 7.1 Dam Assessment

a. <u>Condition</u>. The visual examination of Upper Kimball Lake Dam revealed that the dam was in fair condition. Although there were no signs of impending structural failure or other conditions which would warrant urgent remedial action, several deficiencies were noted.

Based on the results of computations included in Appendix D and described in Section 5, the facility is capable of passing the test flood, which for this structure is the 1/4 PMF, without overtopping the dam. With the water level at the top of the dam, the 44-ft. long spillway capacity is approximately 1,470 cfs or 80 percent of the routed test flood outflow and the outlet works uncontrolled capacity is 190 cfs. The routed test flood outflow of 1,660 cfs (inflow of 2,760 cfs or 450 csm) could be passed with the pond level at top of dam. If all stoplogs were removed from the outlet works during the test flood, then the routed test flood outflow of 1,660 cfs could be passed with a freeboard of about 0.5 ft.

b. Adequacy of Information. This evaluation of the dam is based primarily on visual examination, approximate hydraulic and hydrologic computations, consideration of past performance and application of engineering judgement. The information available or obtained within the scope of this investigation was adequate for the purposes of a Phase I assessment.

c. <u>Urgency</u>. The recommended remedial measures outlined in Section 7.3 should be undertaken by the Owner and completed within one year after receipt of this report.

#### 7.2 Recommendations

None

# 7.3 Remedial Measures

Although the dam is generally in fair condition, it is considered important that the following items be accomplished. a. Operation and Maintenance Procedures. The following should be undertaken by the Owner:

- 1. Clear sunken logs in upstream channel from the outlet works approach.
- 2. Cut the two trees on the downstream side of the right embankment.
- 3. Place earth fill on the upstream and downstream side of the right embankment adjacent to the spillway and establish a good growth of vegetation to retard erosion and restore the crest to its intended grade and width.
- 4. Regrade the exposed upstream slope of the right embankment to 2 horizontal to 1 vertical and provide riprap for slope protection within the range of wave action.
- 5. Reconstruct the failed area on the downstream side of the left abutment adjacent to the training wall, providing riprap protection for the steep slope, under the guidance of a registered professional engineer.
- 6. Prepare an operations and maintenance manual for the dam. The manual should include provisions for annual technical inspection of the dam and for the removal of stoplogs during periods of heavy precipitation and high project discharges. The procedures should delineate the routine operational procedures and maintenance work to be done on the dam to ensure safe, satisfactory operation and to minimize deterioration of the facility.
- 7. Develop a written emergency preparedness plan and warning system to be used in the event of impending failure of the dam or other emergency conditions. The plan should be developed in cooperation with local officials and downstream inhabitants and should compliment the existing disaster operations plan, "Link-Up".
- 7.4 Alternatives

ţ

Not applicable.

APPENDIX A - INSPECTION CHECK LIST

	Page
VISUAL INSPECTION PARTY ORGANIZATION	A-1
VISUAL INSPECTION CHECK LIST	
Dam Embankment	A-2
Outlet Works - Spillway, Weir, Approach and Discharge Channels	A-3
Outlet Works - Intake Channel and Intake Structure	A-4
Outlet Works - Outlet Channel	A-5

# VISUAL INSPECTION PARTY ORGANIZATION

# NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

Dam: Upper Kimball Lake

Date: 31 October 1979

Time: 0745-1015

Weather: Clear and cold (32<sup>O</sup>F)

Water Surface Elevation Upstream: El. 95.3 (0.1 ft. over

spillway)

Stream Flow: Not known

Inspection Party:

Harl P. Aldrich, Jr. - Soils/Geology Charles R. Nickerson Haley & Aldrich, Inc. Roger Wood - Structural/Mechanical Joseph E. Downing - Hydraulic/Hydrologic Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc.

# Present During Inspection:

Kenneth T. Stern, New Hampshire Water Resources Board
DAM: <u>Upper Kimball Lake</u>	DATE: <u>31 Oct 79</u>
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
DAM EMBANKMENT	
Crest Elevation	El. 99.7 (based on an assumed datum; see Appendix B-8 for B.M. No. 1)
Current Pool Elevation Maximum Impoundment to Date	El. 95.3 (0.1 ft. over spillway crest) Unknown
Surface Cracks Bayement Condition	None observed
Movement or Settlement of	None observed; however some settlement
Crest Lateral Movement	None observed, except as noted else- where
Vertical Alignment	Good (clichtly surved)
Condition at Abutment and at Concrete Structures	Some old erosion (or settlement) right of spillway, up to 2 ft. each side of concrete seepage cutoff wall (see Photo No. 3)
Indications of Movement of Structural Items on Slopes	No structural items on slope
Trespassing on Slopes Animal Burrows in Embank- ment	No restrictions (area not posted) None observed
Vegetation on Embankment	Moss, grass and weeds; 3 in. and 6 in. diameter trees downstream of crest toward right end
Sloughing or Erosion of Slopes or Abutments	Some erosion at waterline, upstream slope (not active). Severe erosion and movement of rock fill at left abutment, downstream of outlet works (see Photo No. 7)
Rock Slope Protection -	No riprap
Unusual Movement or	None observed
Unusual Embankment or Downstream Seepage	None observed
Piping or Boils	None observed
Toe Drains Instrumentation Systems	None known to exist None

•

.

Very good None None Some minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
Very good None None Some minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
Very good None None Some minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
Very good None None Some minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
None None Some minor reeds Yery good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
None Some minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
ome minor reeds Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
Very good - one very minor crack at right training wall U/S end None observed
lone observed
one observed
linor efflorescence at crack U/S right side
one observed
ood Ione observed
one tree left side-no problem
ioung trees right side overhanging ood ravel island with weeds and grass in center of channel; minimal obstruction to flow. Channel passes under road in arch culvert in good condition

.

, ille

٠

.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

ŀ

.

۰.

٠.

.

· . . .

÷.,

DAM: Upper Kimball Lake DATE: 31 Oct 1979						
CONDITION						
Good						
Not visible						
None observed						
None						
Two sunken logs at entrance to channe but, in present location, do not form an obstruction to flow						
Excellent						
None observed						
Excellent						
Both in excellent condition						
Not observable due to flow						
None - hand lifted stop logs						
Concrete in excellent condition						
A-4						

.

Datas Upper Kimball Tak					
DAM: <u>Opper Kimball Lake</u> DATE: <u>31 Oct 1979</u>					
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION				
UTLET WORKS - OUTLET HANNEL					
General Condition of Concrete	Excellent				
Rust or Staining	None observed				
Spalling	None observed				
Erosion or Cavitation Visible Reinforcing	Very slight erosion side walls; invert not observable due to flow None observed				
Any Seepage or Efflo- resecnce Condition at Joints	None observed None observed				
Drain holes	None observed				
Channel	Good				
Loose Rock or Trees Overhanging Channel Condition of Discharge Channel	No trees - some loose rocks on left side Very good				

IDGE,

# APPENDIX B - ENGINEERING DATA

LIST OF AVAILABLE DATA B- PRIOR INSPECTION REPORTS Date Description 12 October 1972 New Hampshire Water Resources Board B- DRAWINGS "Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 16 May 1955 B- "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956 B-			
Date       Description         12 October 1972       New Hampshire Water Resources Board       B-         DRAWINGS       "Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire       B-         "Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire       B-         "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire       B-         "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire       B-	LIST OF AVAILABLE DATA		B-1
DateDescription12 October 1972New Hampshire Water Resources BoardB-DRAWINGS"Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 16 May 1955B-"Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956B-	PRIOR INSPECTION REPORTS		
12 October 1972 New Hampshire Water Resources Board B- DRAWINGS "Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 16 May 1955 B- "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956 B-	Date	Description	
DRAWINGS "Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 16 May 1955 "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956 B-	12 October 1972 New Hampshi	ire Water Resources Board	B-4
"Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N.H.", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 16 May 1955 B- "Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956 B-	DRAWINGS		
"Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Concrete Plan", New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 10 October 1956 B-	"Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham, N Water Resources Board, 16 May	N.H.", New Hampshire 1955	B-8
	"Upper Kimball Pond Spillway Co Hampshire Water Resources Boar	oncrete Plan", New rd, 10 October 1956	B-9

Page

Document	Contents	Location
Correspondence to and from State of New Hampshire Public Service Commission	Three items concerned with the Pond surface elevations dated 6 to 11 August 1934	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire 37 Pleasant Street Concord, New Hampshire 03301
State of New Hampshire, Public Service Commission, Inspection Report and associated correspondence	Four items concerned with dam inspection report dated 16 July 1936	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire
Raymond Seabrook letter to Public Service Commission	Correspondence on research of ownership concerning Upper Kimball Lake Dam dated 28 April 1937	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire
New Hampshire Water Control Commission, Data on Dams in New Hampshire	Two forms with inspection information on dam dated 2 November 1938	Vater Resources Board State of New Hampshire
Information for State Council Resources and Development	Four items in reference to the reconstruction of dam dated from 21 April 1953 to 31 May 1956	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire
Upper Kimball Pond design plans	Six drawings on the recon- struction of the dam dated from 5 August 1954 to 10 October 1956	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire

UPPER KIMBALL LAKE DAM

B-1

APPENDIX C - PHOTOGRAPHS

Deee

				rage
LOCAT	TION PLAN			
Site	Plan Sketch			C-1
PHOTO	DGRAPHS			
No.	Title	<u>Roll</u>	Frame	Page
1.	Overview of Upper Kimball Lake Dam			
	showing downstream side	B-5	16A	vi
2.	Overview of right embankment showing			
	upstream side	B <b>~</b> 5	8A	C-2
3.	Top of right embankment and align-			_
	ment of spillway	B-5	9A	C-2
4.	Right embankment, downstream	8	3	C-3
5.	Right embankment adjacent to			
~	spillway, downstream	8	18	C-3
6.	Spillway and outlet works, down-	0	-	<b>a</b> 4
-	stream Reiled and alignment has a black of the	8	T	C-4
/•	Falled area adjacent to outlet works	0	0	0.4
0	at left abutment	0	0	<u> </u>
٥.	upstroom side	0	11	C-5
a	Downstream stue	0	* *	<u> </u>
۶.	embankment with culvert	8	15	C-5
10	Unnamed brook downstream from	0	2.2	
10.	roadway embankment	B-5	78	C-6
11.	Overview of dam site looking		, <b></b>	
	upstream	B-5	6A	C-6













Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham 43.01

NO SEASONAL OPERATION

EMERGENCY OPERATION - Pull stoplogs if dam threatened

## SITE VISIT CHECK LIST

Check erosion downstream of stoplogs.

BEFORE ANY EMERGENCY OPERATION Call N. H. Water Resources Board Office - 271-3406





Upper Kimball Pond, Chatham 43.01

-

D

.

Ľ

.

NO SEASONAL OPERATION

EMERGENCY OPERATION - Pull stoplogs if dam threatened

#### SITE VISIT CHECK LIST

Check erosion downstream of stoplogs.

BEFORE ANY EMERGENCY OPERATION Call N. H. Water Resources Board Office - 271-3406





Upper Kimball	Pond
<u>Chatham</u>	
43.01	#

i

5

Drainage Area (mi <sup>2</sup> )6.1	_ Freeboard w/o flashboards (fr.)4.5
Pond Area (Acres) 136	_ Flashboard height (ft)
Storage Perm. (Ac. Ft.)	_ Freeboard w/ flashboards (ft)
Artificial (Ac. Ft.)	_ Spacing of pins (ft)
Sesex reding X Full Lake _ spillway crest	_ Number of pins
"O" 977 2798 translates to	Design head over flashboards for
U.S.G.S. Elev. at full pond	
"Fish Flow" 0.2 cfs per mi <sup>2</sup> 2 cfs	Cate #1 on loft/right (circle and)
15 year storm flow (cfs) 555	_ bank looking downstream
100 year storm capacity (cfs) 1400	Number of gates
- Design flow capacity (cfs) 1675	_ Size of gates
Time to Peak (hours)	_ Gate sill elev. (gage)
Discharge (manual-cfs) 300	
(automatic-cfs) 1375	_ # 1 Stoplog bay on right/left bank
Spillway length (ft.) 44	-
Spillway crest elev. 95.2 (Local)	Number of stoplog bays1
Flowage of fee ownership elev. Top of Dam 99.7 (Local)	Number of S.L.'s in each bay7
Flood Stage (gage-it) Name	Size of each S.L. <u>6'6" x 4" x 8"</u>
Contracts Prior to a) #	Elev. of sill of stoplog sect. <u>91.0 Loca</u>
Operation of dam Name	
How much b) #	28.7" rise per inch runoff
When Name	
c) #	
Name	
å) #	B-6



N. H. WATER RESOURCES BOARD Concord, N. H. 03301

1.

1

.

έ.

.

ŧ

E

.

-

. • .

1

## DAM SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT FORM

Town:	ham	Dam Number:	43.01			
Inspected by	Robert_B. Chamberlin	Date:	<u>_Oct_12_1972_</u>			
Local name o	f dam or water body: Upper	Kimball Pond				
Owner: N	H. Water Resources Board	Address:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Cwner was/wa	s not interviewed during inspe	ection.				
Drainage Are	a:6.13sq. mi.	Stream: <u>Kimball</u>	Brook			
Pond Area:	Acre, Store	age 200 Normal Ac-Ft.	Nax. Head 47 Ft			
Foundation:	Туре, Se	epage present at toe	- Yes/No,			
Spillway:	Type <u>Concrete</u> , Fr	ceeboard over perm. cr	est:4.5			
	Width 44	lashboard height				
	Max. Capacity1500	c.f.s.				
Embankment:	Type Earth - stone, Co	overVegetated Width	6			
	Upstream slope 2 to 1	l; Downstream slope	<u>1/2</u> to 1			
Abutments:	Type <u>Concrete</u> , Co	ondition: <u>Good</u> , Fair,	Poor			
Gates or Por	nd Drain: Size <u>6'</u> Ca	apacity Ty	pe <u>Stop logs</u>			
	Lifting apparatus	Cperational	l condition <u>Good</u>			
Changes since construction or last inspection:						
- <u></u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Downstream d	ievelopment:					
This dam wou	ald/would not be a menace if it	t failed.				
Suggested re	einspection date:	·				
Remarks:	Erosion of bank below stop los	section. Brush need	cutting on right			
_embankment.						
······································						
			B-4			

MEMO

Date: June 15, 1979

To: Vernon A. Knowlton, Chief Engineer

From: Gary L. Kerr, JAK Water Resources Engineer

Subject: Upper Kimball Pond, No. 43.01 Date of Inspection: June 12, 1979

I visited the subject dam and noted some general maintenance items in need

of attention:

r

•

•

\_\_\_\_

•

1

L

1- Several trees on the right embankment still need to be removed or cut,

2~ The grass on both embankments needs to be cut,

3- The same eroded slope exists just downstream of the stoplog section (left bank); does not appear to be any worse than last year, but warrents surveilance.

GLK:paf

	Location	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire (See Appendix pages B-4 and B-5)	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire (See Appendix page B-3)	Water Resources Board State of New Hampshire (See Appendix pages B-6 and B-7)
LIST OF AVAILABLE DATA UPPER KIMBALL LAKE DAM	Contents	List and associated topo- graphical map showing location of dams in Chatham dated 26 May 1969	Inspection report and memo- randum dated 12 October 1972	Two sheets with three pictures of dam dated 20 March 1974	Notice of dam inspection dated 27 February 1976	Note on needed dam maintenance dated 14 April 1978	Note on needed dam maintenance dated 12 June 1979	Hydraulic/hydrologic data on the dam
	Document	New Hampshire Water Resources Board, Dams in the Town of Chatham	New Hampshire Water Resources Board, Dam Safety Inspection Report Form	Army Corps of Engineers Dam Inventory Program	Water Resources Board letter to Board of Selectmen Town of Chatham	Memo to File	Gary L. Kerr memo to Vernon A. Knowlton, Water Resources Board	Tabulated information on Upper Kimball Pond

1 : .

.

B-2





2. Overview of right embankment showing upstream side

l

.

ļ

.

i



Top of right embankment and alignment of spillway



4. Right embankment, downstream

.

•

ľ

•

\_

l

Ľ



5. Right embankment adjacent to spillway, downstream

C-3



6. Spillway and outlet works, downstream

2

•

Г

,

\_

L. L

Ē

L



7. Failed area adjacent to outlet works at left abutment

C-4



8. Overview of spillway showing upstream side



9. Downstream channel and roadway embankment with culvert

<u>.</u>

C-5



10. Unnamed brook downstream from roadway embankment



11. Overview of dam site looking upstream

APPENDIX D - HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS

MAPS	Page No.
Drainage Area and Dam Failure Impact Area Map	D-1
COMPUTATIONS	
Elevations, Surface Areas, Storage Capacities, Size Classification and Hazard Classification Test Flood Determination, Stage-Discharge	D-2
Relationships and Surcharge-Storage Routing	D-3
Stage-Discharge and Storage-Elevation Curves	D-4
Outlet Works	D-5
Dam Failure Analysis	D-6



DRESSER & MCKEE CLIENT <u>HALEY & ALORICH</u> JOB NO. <u>5/6/-10-R7-5</u> COMPUTED BY <u>EO</u> PROJECT <u>DAM INSR</u> DATE CHECKED <u>1-2-80</u> DATE <u>12-28-79</u> DETAIL <u>LAPER KIMBALL LAKE</u> CHECKED BY <u>be A</u>. PAGE NO. <u>1</u>

ELEVATIONS (Local Datum)

To of Darn Eler. 99.7 Spillway Crest Eler. 95.2 Toe of Darn Eler. 89.5 Length of Darn: 230 ft. Length of Spillway: 44 ft. Cutlet Works: 6 ft. wide concrete stop log bay Inv. Elev. 90.5

\* SURFACE AREAS

Drainage Area = 6.13 sq mi. W.S. Area at spillway crest (El. 95.2) = 136 acres Other wrfaces areas can not be determined as most recent USGS quad for North Conviay is 1942 and dam was rebuilt in 1956 at a different spillway crest elevation

\* STORAGE CAPACITIES

Normal Pool (EKV. 95.2) = 200 ac-ft. Max, Pool (Elev. 99.7) = 800 ac-ft.

\* Note: data reported by N.H. Water Resources Board (owner)

<u>SIZE CLASSIFICATION</u> Height = 99.7-89.5 = 10.2 ft. Storage at top of dam = 800 ac.ft. .: Size is SMALL

HAZARD CLASSIFICATION

Eased on the results of the dam failure analysis, a failure would result in the potential loss of a few lives. .: Hazard Classification is SIGNIFICANT

D-2

	CLIENT <u>HALEY &amp; ALORICH</u> JOB NO. <u>501-10-RT-5</u> COMPUTED BY <u>UED</u> PROJECT <u>DAM INSP</u> DATE CHECKED <u>1-2-80</u> DATE <u>12-28-79</u> DETAIL <u>UPPER KIMBALL LAKE</u> CHECKED BY <u>JOC A</u> . PAGE NO <u>2</u>					
TE	ST FA	1000 DE.	TERMINI	TION		
	For Guide (14, Adop	a Small elines gi PMF) to ot 1/4 Pl	size a ive test '/z PMF MF for ;	nd Signi, flood ra (Robable lest floo	ficant h ange of Maximu d.	12ard, COE 100-YR Fload om Flood).
	The d regio Becal Use	drainage ns and use of th ROLLING.	ASEA IS ROLLING e elango	MOUNTAN in the ted shap	lower po lower po pe of the	he upper rtion. e watershed,
	7	then test	flood = 6.1	13 59.Mi × 18	300 csm * '/-	4 = 2760 cfs
57/	46 <b>E -</b> ,	DISCHARGE	E RELATI	ONSHIPS		
		· · //	Ch land	11/0 1 1/200		
	50://2	vay: 44	FF. Jong		5	
	50:111 Art1e:	vay: 44 + Works;	6 ft. Wide stoplogs	s w/stopla = spillwoy	ngs ; assum erest du	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 2.3
	Spille Wile: Earti	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibani	6 ft. wide stoplags : Kuncuts :	: w/ stop lo = opillwoy 180 ft. ov	s; gs ; assum arest du ver flow /e.	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 2.3 ring Hi, "C"= 2.8
W. El	Spille Artie Earth 5. EV.	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibani <u>- 5PILL</u> "C"	(275)	E W/ Stop lo = opillwoy 180 ff. O OUTLET WORKS (Cfs)	erest du ver flow /e embankment (cfs)	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 3.3 rigHi, "C"= 2.8 T TOTAL (cfs)
W. Ek	50:// Atle: Earth 5. EV.	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibani  "C"	Kinents: WAY 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	BUJ Stop 10 = opillwoy 180 FF. O OUTLET WORKS (CFS) 0	erest du erest du ver flow /e EMBANKMENT (cfs)	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 2.3 rug Hu, "C"= 2.8 TOTAL (c+5)
W. Ell 99. 91	50://2 &+/e Earth 5. EV. 75.2 5.7 6.2	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibant <u>5PILL</u> ) "C" - 2.65 2.70	6 ft. Wide stoplogs Kinents: WAY (CTS) 0 40 120	C Varie = u/ 5top lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or 00TLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20	-3 g5 ; ASSUM erest du ver flow /e EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - -	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 3.3 ring Hi, "C"= 2.8 TOTAL (cfs) 0 50 140
W. Ell 99.90 90	5, 2, 5, 5, 5, 5, 7, 5,2 5,7 6,2 6,2 6,7 7,2	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibani <u>5PILL</u> ) "C" - 2.65 2.70 2.85 2.0	KINEN KS: WAY (C+5) 0 40 120 230 270	C Varie = u/ 5top lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or 00TLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20 40 (cr	-3 g5 ; & 35 un erest du ver flow /e. EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - - - -	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{me top of} \\ \text{ring T.F.} & C'' = 3.3 \\ \text{mg H}, & C'' = 2.8 \\ \end{array} $ $ \begin{array}{c} \text{TOTAL} \\ (c+5) \\ 0 \\ 50 \\ 140 \\ 270 \\ 430 \\ \end{array} $
W. Ell 99.90 99.90 91.91 91.91 91.91 91.91	50:// Difles Earth 5. EY. 75.2 5.7 6.2 7.2 7.7 7.7	vay : 44 + Works ; h Enibani  "C"  2.65 2.70 2.85 3.0 3.15	6 ft. Wide stoplogs Kinents: WAY (cts) 0 230 270 550	C Varie = u/ 5top lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or 00TLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20 40 60 80	-5 g5 ; ASSUM erest du ver flow /e EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - - - - - -	ne top of ring T.F., "C"= 2.3 rug Hu, "C"= 2.8 T TOTAL (cfs) 0 50 140 270 430 630
W.E. 99.999.99	5,01/1 Atle: Earth 5.2 5.7 6.7 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.7 8.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7.2 7	vay : 44 + Works : h Enibani <u>5P1LL</u> ) "C" - 2.65 2.70 2.85 3.0 3.15 3.3	6 ft. Wide stoplogs Kinents: WAY (cfs) 0 40 120 230 270 550 750	C Varie = w/ stop lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or 00TLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20 40 60 80 100 100 20	-5 g5 ; ASSUM erest du ver flow le EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - - - - - - - - - - -	$T = \frac{1}{100} \text{ of } C'' = 2.3$ $T = 2.8$ $T = 70TAL$ $(c+5)$ $0$ $50$ $140$ $270$ $430$ $630$ $850$ $140$
WE 9999999999999	5,01/1 Deflet Earth 5.2 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7	vay : 44 + Works : + Enibani <u>5PILL</u> "C" - 2.65 2.70 2.85 3.0 3.15 3.3 3.4 3.4 3.45	KINEN KS: WAY (CFS) 0 40 120 230 270 550 750 980 1210	C Varie = u/ stop lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or 00TLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20 40 60 80 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	-5 g5 ; ASSUM erest du ver flow /e. EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - - - - - - - - - - -	$ \begin{array}{c} ne \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
W.E. 9999999999999	5,01/1 Differ Earth 5.2 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7 5.7	vay : 44 + Works : + Enibani <u>5PILL</u> "C" - 2.65 2.70 2.85 3.15 3.3 3.45 3.45 3.45 3.5	6 ft. wide stoplogs Kinents: WAY (Cf5) 0 40 120 230 270 550 750 980 1210 1470	C Varie = u/ stop lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or OUTLET WORKS (Cfs) 0 10 20 40 60 10 20 40 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	erest du erest du ver flow le EMBANKMENT (cfs) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	$\begin{array}{c} ne \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
WE 9999999999999	501/1 Deflet Earth 5.27 5.7727 5.77727 5.7775 5.7755 5.7755 5.77555 5.775555 5.7755555 5.775555555555	vay : 44 + Works : + Enibani <u>5PILL</u> "C" - 2.65 2.70 2.85 3.15 3.3 3.4 3.45 3.45 3.55 3.6	KINEN K KINEN K KINEN K (CFS) 0 40 120 230 270 550 750 980 1210 1470 1750 2040	C Varie = u/ 5top lo = opillwoy 180 ff. or OUTLET WORKS (Cf5) 0 10 20 40 60 10 20 40 60 10 20 40 10 20 40 10 20 40 10 20 40 100 20 40 100 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	-3 g5 ; assum arest du ver flow /e EMBANKMENT (cf5) - - - - - - - - - - - - -	$\begin{array}{c} for \ for \$

Surcharge Height to pass Qp1 = El. 100.67



D-4

- 2. capacity at top of dam with all stoplogs removed:  $a = 3.3 \times 6 \times (9.2)^{1.5} = 550 \text{ cfs}$
- 3. capacity at top of dam with stop logs at spillway crest elev. Q = 3.3 × 6 × (4.5) = 190 cfs

D-5

CLIENT HALEY & ALDEKH JOB NO. 501-10-RT-5\_ COMPUTED BY\_ IFD SER & McKEE DATE CHECKED 1-2-80 PROJECT UPPER KIMBALL LAKE DATE\_11.6.79 stal Engineers DETAIL DAM FAILURE ANNLYSIS CHECKED BY 5 PAGE NO. DAM FAILURE ANALYSIS Top of Dam Eley. 99.7 Spillway Crest Elev. 95.2 Toe of Dan Elev. 69.5 .: Height of dam = 99.7-89.5 = 10.2 Estimated mid-height length of dani = 100 ft. (including spillway) Length & top of dani (incl. spillway) = 230 ft. Assume 40% of the mid-height length fails and that the failed section is to the right of the spilling abutment. Qp, = 8/27 Wb Ta Yo 3/2 = E/27 (0.4 × 100) (32.2) .5 (10.2) = 2190 cfs Project discharge at top of clam: Spillury: "C"=3.5; L=44 ft; H=4.5ft.; Outletworks: "C"= 3.3; L=6'; H=4.5'  $= (2.5)(44)(4.5)^{1.5} + (3.3)(6)(4.5)^{1.5} = 1470 + 190 = 1660 \text{ :} fs$ Cambined discharge at failure = 1600 + 2190= 3850 sts Approx. 75' d/5 of dam is a road with a Steel pipe arch 9'z" x 15'z" EKY. 100 Elev. 98.4 Elev. 96.5 15.3' õ Q. 9z Elev. 89.2 5=0.01 ~50' ~60' R=0.02 A= 107 ft.2, R= 2.71', C= 0.85 C = 2.8 C = 2.6 Elevation of Culvert and Effective Weir D/5 of Dam CULVERT (cfs) Q1 (cfs) Q2 (cfs) Q TOTAL W.S. ELEV. 1550 cfs 96.5 1550 0 0 160 10 1830 cts 1660 97.5 2090 cHs 98.4 1550 410 190 99.7 280 2940 crs 1770 890 320 3160 cts IBZO 1020 100.0 D-6 5030 cfs 020 2000

ACKEE CLIENT HALEY & ALDRICH JOB NO. 56-10-RT-5\_ COMPUTED BY\_ PROJECT UPPER KIMBALL DATE CHECKED 1-2-80 DATE 11-6-75 CHECKED BY Joe DETAIL DAM FAILURE PAGE NO. Discharge prior to failure = 1660 cfs at d/5 approx. backwater elev. 96.9. About 70 cts would be overtopping the the left dis channel bank and flowing overland and back into the channel. No apparent hazards would exist as a result of an overland flow of 70 cfs. In the event of a dam failure, the failure outflow of 3850 cfs would the left d/s overbank by approx. 4 ft. resulting in an overland flow of about 1960 Cts. A house located on the left bank of the channel, immeadiately dis of the roadway, would be impacted by the est. 1960 sts overland flow. No other existing development would appear to be in danger. .: Hazard Classification is "SIGNIFICANT" ----D-7 



•

. .

•

•

1

F

E

. .

÷

.

### NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME

[ ``

2

ъ. **г**.


## FILMED

8-85

## DTIC