AD-A156 391	NATIONAL BROOK DA	PROGRAM I M (NH 001.	FOR INSP (U) CO	ECTION RPS OF	OF NO Engin	N-FEDE	RAL DI	nis Bo 1 Ma	6 1/	1	
UNCLASSIFIED	NEN ENGL						F/G 1	3/13	NL		
	<b>w</b> '										
							-				
											A-1



AD-A156 39'

( I.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN SPRINGFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

> BOG BROOK DAM NH 00194 NHWRB 220.16

# PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM



85 00 10 150

5

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

**JULY 1980** 

OTTIC FILE CUPY

#### NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

#### PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

Identification No.: NHWRB No.: Name of Dam: Town: County and State: Stream: NH 00194 220.16 Bog Brook Dam Springfield Sullivan County, New Hampshire Bog Brook, A Tributary of the Stocker Brook which is a tributary of North Branch which is a tributary of the Sugar River May 6, 1980 2

Date of Inspection:

#### BRIEF ASSESSMENT

The Bog Brook Dam is located on Bog Brook, approximately one half mile upstream of Stocker Pond in Springfield, New Hampshire. The dam is an 817 feet long and 18 feet high. It is an earth embankment with a concrete drop inlet type principal spillway and an earth channel emergency spillway at the right abutment.

The dam is owned by the Palazzi Corporation of Hooksett, New Hampshire. It was designed and constructed to serve as a siltation basin but is presently used only for recreational purposes.

The drainage area of the dam covers 0.8 square miles and is made up primarily of rolling woodland with some minor development and pasture. The dam has a maximum impoundment of 210 acre feet. The dam is SMALL in size and its hazard classification is SIGNIFICANT since appreciable economic loss and the potential for loss of less than a few lives could result in the event of a dam failure.

Because of its small size and significant hazard, the required test flood for this dam would range from the 100-year frequency flood to one half of the PMF flood. A 100-year flood with an estimated peak inflow of 153 cfs was adopted. Because of storage, the resulting peak discharge is 120 cfs compared to a total spillway capacity of 580 cfs. The water surface would be at elevation 1041.5 feet (msl) or 2.5 feet below the top of the dam for this flood. The combined spillways are capable of passing 100 percent of the test flood.

The dam is in FAIR condition at the present time. Remedial measures to be undertaken by the owner include: implementing annual maintenance and inspection programs, monitoring the seepage at the right downstream toe, removing trees and brush from slopes and backfilling the holes left by the roots, regrading the upstream slope and placing rip rap or other form of slope protection, and developing a formal written system for warning downstream officials in the event of an emergency. No conditions were observed which warrant the attention of a registered engineer.

The remedial measures outlined above should be implemented within one year of receipt of this report by the owner.



1 1



William Szinc

William S. Zoir N.H. Registration No. 3226

Mulalas G. Campager, J

Nicholas A. Campagna, Jr. California Registration No. 2100€



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

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

i

#### PREFACE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

1

11

•

•

Section	Page
Letter of Transmittal	
Brief Assessment	
Review Board Page	
Preface	i
Table of Contents	ii
Overview Photo	v
Location Map	vi

# REPORT

1.	PROJ	ECT	INFORMATION	1-1
	1.1	Gen	leral	1-1
		а. Ь.	Authority Purpose of Inspection	1 - 1 1 - 1
	1.2	Des	cription of Project	1-1
		a. b. d. f. j. h.	Location Description of Dam and Appurtenances Size Classification Hazard Classification Ownership Operator Purpose of Dam Design and Construction History Normal Operational Procedure	1-1 1-2 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3
	1.3	Per	tinent Data	1-3
2.	ENGI	NEER	ING DATA	2-1
	2.1	Des	ign Data	2-1
	2.2	Con	struction Data	2-1

1:

# TABLE OF CONTENTS - (cont.)

EL 5.

ŀ.

2

11

•

<u>Sec</u>	ction	Page
	2.3 Operation Data	2-1
	2.4 Evaluation of Data	2-1
3.	VISUAL INSPECTION	3-1
	3.1 Findings	3-1
	a. General b. Dam c. Appurtenant Structures d. Reservoir Area e. Downstream Channel	3-1 3-1 3-1 3-2 3-2
	3.2 Evaluation	3-2
4.	OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	4 - 1
	4.1 Operational Procedures	4 - 1
	a. General b. Description of any Warning System	a in Effect 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 5-1
	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

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS - (cont.)

	<u>Sec</u>	tion		Page
le J.	6.	EVAL	UATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY	6-1
		6.1	Visual Observation	6-1
		6.2	Design and Construction Data	6-1
		6.3	Post-Construction Changes	6-1
		6.4	Seismic Stability	6-1
	7.	ASSE	SSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES	7-1
1.		7.1	Dam Assessment	7-1
-			a. Condition b. Adequacy of Information c. Urgency	7 - 1 7 - 1 7 - 1
•		7.2	Recommendations	7-1
		7.3	Remedial Measures	7-1
		7.4	Alternatives	7-2

ŀ **11** 1

•

# APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	INSPECTION CHECKLIST	A-1
APPENDIX B	ENGINEERING DATA	B-1
APPENDIX C	PHOTOGRAPHS	C-1
APPENDIX D	HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS	D-1
APPENDIX E	INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS	E-1

ίv



.

<u>na dén an</u>atér dén de la composition des

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUMBER 2. COVT ACCESS	RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
NH 00194 HI303	7/
4 TITLE (and Sublile)	5 TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVENE
Bog Brook Dam	INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL	6 PERFORMING ORU. REPORT NUMBER
UNITA 7 AUTHOR(#)	B CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(#)
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION	
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 ENGINEERS	July 1980
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED 424 TRAPELO ROAD, WALTHAM, MA. 02254	13 NUMBER OF PAGES
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSII different from Controlling O	IIIce) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	UNCLASSIFIED
	UNCLASSIFIED
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract galaria in Biock 20. 11 diffe	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ITED
APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM <sup>7</sup> DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the efforted in Block 20. 11 diffe Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, however, the official title of the program is: I Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of re	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ITED National Dam Inspection Program; lational Program for Inspection o sport.
APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM 2 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Block 20, 11 diffe 2 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Block 20, 11 diffe Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, however, the official title of the program is: 1 Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of re KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block of DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY,	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING BCHEDULE ITED National Dam Inspection Program; lational Program for Inspection of eport.
APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Block 20, 11 diffe Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, however, the official title of the program is: I Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of re KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse and if necessary and identify by block of DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Connecticut Bitter Barin	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ITED National Dam Inspection Program; lational Program for Inspection c sport.
APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the efforts in Block 20, 11 difference of the program is in Block 20, 11 difference of the program is: I Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of re- KEY WORKS (Continue on reverse ofde if necessary and identify by block of DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Connecticut Biver Bacin Springtield, New Hampebire Sugar River	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ITED National Dam Inspection Program; lational Program for Inspection of sport.
APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM APPROVAL FOR PUELIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIM DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed on Biock 20, 11 difference) Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, however, the official title of the program is: I Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of re KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block of DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Connecticut River Bacin Sprincticut, New Hommebine Such River	UNCLASSIFIED The DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ITED National Dam Inspection Program; lational Program for Inspection of sport. Heather;

DD 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE

(

3

1.

.

fi

# **DISCLAIMER NOTICE**

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



National Dam Inspection Program

Phase I Inspection Report

Bog Brook Dam

Section I: Project Information

#### 1.1 General

5

## (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. Goldberg-Zoino & Associates, Inc. (GZA) has been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the State of New Hampshire. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to GZA under a letter of April 17, 1980 from Colonel William E. Hodgson, Jr., Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW 33-80-C-0055 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

## (b) Purpose

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 quickly effective dam safety programs for non-federal dams.

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

#### 1.2 Description of Dam

#### (a) Location

The Bog Brook Dam is located on Bog Brook approximately one half mile upstream of Stocker Pond in Springfield, New Hampshire. It can be reached from Stoney Brook Road which intersects State Route 10 in Grantham, New Hampshire. The dam is shown on U.S.G.S. Sunapee-New Hampshire Quadrangle at approximate coordinates N4328.2, W7206.5 (see location map on page vi). Page B-2 of Appendix B is a Site Plan for this dam.

#### (b) Description of Dam and Appurtenances

The dam consists of an earth embankment with an earth fill cutoff trench below the embankment, a principal spillway with a reinforced concrete riser and corrugated metal outlet pipe, and an emergency spillway located at the right abutment. The total length of the dam is 862 feet of which 45 feet is the emergency spillway.

1) Embankment (See page B-3)

The embankment is made up primarily of silty sand and gravel. It is 817 feet long with a 30 degree, horizontal bend approximately 175 feet from the left abutment. It is a maximum of 18 feet high, the crest width is 30 feet and the side slopes are 2 horizontal to 1 vertical.

According to available plans there is an earthfill cutoff trench which is 20 feet wide and approximately 2 feet deep and backfilled with the same material as the embankment.

#### 2) Principal Spillway (see page B-3)

The principal spillway consists of a precast concrete block drop inlet manhole structure with a sealed pond drain inlet pipe and an uncontrolled orifice inlet. The outlet pipe is 30 inch diameter corrugated metal pipe with bituminous coating and it is approximately 83 feet long.

The riser structure is 10 feet high and 4 feet in inside diameter. The walls are 6 inches thick. At the bottom of the structure is a 12 inch diameter pond drain inlet pipe which extends 30 feet into the reservoir. The pond drain invert is at elevation 1029.0 feet (msl). The pond drain pipe is sealed at the upstream end.

The 4 foot diameter drop inlet opening is at elevation 1039.C. It is 5.0 feet below the crest of the dam. There is a conical trash rack of 1 inch diameter metal bars over the top of the inlet.

3) Emergency Spillway (see page B-3)

The emergency spillway was excavated in the right abutment. It is 25 feet wide at the control section and it curves left around the embankment. It is approximately 100 feet long and lies approximately 3.5 feet below the crest of the dam. The side slopes are 3 horizontal to 1 vertical. The control section is at elevation 1040.5

## (c) Size Classification

The dam's maximum impoundment of 120 acre feet and height of 18 feet place it in the SMALL size category according to the Corps of Engineer's Recommended Guidelines.

#### (d) Hazard Potential Classification

The hazard potential classification for this dam is SIGNIFICANT because of the loss of a town road and damage to two houses and the small potential for loss of less than a few lives which could occur in the event of a dam failure. Section 5 of this report presents more detailed discussion of the hazard potential.

## (e) Ownership

F.

The dam is owned by the Palazzi Corporation, Box 717, Hookset, New Hampshire 03106. The owner can be reached by telephone at (603) 485-9575.

#### (f) Operator

The operation of the dam is controlled by the Owner, The Palazzi Corporation. Mr. David Hurst, the owner's representative, can be reached by telephone at (603) 485-9575.

4

#### (g) Purpose of the Dam

The dam was constructed as a siltation basin for a gravel operation. It now serves only recreational purposes.

#### (h) Design and Construction History

The dam was designed by the Palazzi Corporation. It was completed in 1968. Some hydraulic and hydrologic calculations were made by the USDA Soil Conservation Service in connection with this dam.

(i) Normal Operating Procedure

The dam is self regulating.

#### 1.3 Pertinent Data

#### (a) Drainage Area

The drainage area for this dam covers 0.8 square miles. It is made up primarily of rolling woodland with some pasture and minor development.

#### (b) Discharge at Dam Site

#### 1) Outlet Works

Normal discharge at the site is through the drop inlet structure, into the 30 inch diameter outlet pipe. In the event of severe flooding, water would flow over the emergency spillway. The drop inlet crest is at elevation 1039.0 feet (msl) and the emergency spillway is at elevation 1040.5 feet (msl).

#### 2) Maximum Known Flood

There is no data available for the maximum known flood at this dam site.

#### 3) Ungated Spillway Capacity at Top of Dam

The capacity of the principal spillway with the reservoir at top of dam elevation (1044.0 feet msl) is 70 cfs. The capacity of the emergency spillway is 510 cfs at this level.

#### 4) Ungated Spillway Capacity at Test Flood

The capacity of the principal spillway with the reservoir at test flood elevation (1041.5 feet msl) is 70 cfs. The capacity of the emergency spillway is 50 cfs at this level.

5) Gated Spillway Capacity at Normal Pool

There are no gated spillways.

#### 6) Gated Spillway Capacity at Test Flood

There are no gated spillways.

#### 7) Total Spillway Capacity at Test Flood

The total spillway capacity at test flood elevation (1041.5 feet msl) is 120 cfs.

#### 8) Total Project Discharge at Top of Dam

The total project discharge at top of dam elevation (1044.0 feet msl) is 580 cfs.

9) Total Project Discharge at Test Flood Elevation

The total project discharge at test flood elevation (1041.5 feet msl) is 120 cfs.

(c) Elevation (feet above msl)

ĥ

- 1) Streambed at toe of dam: approximately 1026
- 2) Bottom of cutoff: Unknown
- 3) Maximum tailwater: Unknown
- 4) Recreation Pool: Approximately 1039.0
- 5) Full flood control pool: Not applicable
- 6) Spillway crest:

Principal Spillway: 1039.0 Emergency Spillway: 1040.5

- 7) Design surcharge: 1041.7
- 8) Top of dam: 1044.0
- 9) Test flood surcharge: 1041.5
- (d) Reservoir (length in feet)
  - 1) Normal pool: 800
  - 2) Flood control pool: Not applicable
  - 3) Spillway crest pool: 1200
  - 4) Top of dam pool: 1600
  - 5) Test flood pool: 1400

- (e) Storage (acre-feet)
  - 1) Normal pool: 40
  - 2) Flood control pool: Not applicable
  - 3) Spillway crest pool: 40
  - 4) Top of dam pool: 120
  - 5) Test flood pool: 80
- (f) Reservoir Surface (acres)
  - 1) Normal pool: approximately 12
  - 2) Flood control pool: Not applicable
  - 3) Spillway crest: approximately 16
  - 4) Test flood pool: approximately 16
  - 5) Top of dam: approximately 16
- (g) <u>Dam</u>
  - 1) Type: Earth embankment
  - 2) Length: Approximately 817 feet
  - 3) Height: Approximately 18 feet
  - 4) Top width: Approximately 30 feet
  - 5) Side slopes: Approximately 2 horizontal to 1 vertical
  - 6) Zoning: Homogeneous, silty sand and grave?
  - 7) Impervious core: Unknown
  - 8) Cutoff: Earthfill, 20 feet wide, 2 feet deep
  - 9) Grout curtain: Unknown

(h) <u>Diversion and Regulating Tunnel</u>
Not applicable

(i) Spillways

1) Type:

Principal Spillway: Precast concrete manhole drop inlet Emergency Spillway: Grass and stone lined earth channel cut in the right abutment

- 2) Length of weir: Principal Spillway: 48 inch diameter rim Emergency Spillway: 25 feet
- 3) Crest elevation: Principal Spillway: 1039.0 Emergency Spillway: 1040.5
- 4) Gates: None
- 5) Upstream channel: Reservoir
- 6) Downstream channel: Winding sluggish stream across wide floodplain.

# (j) Regulating Outlets

1

There are no regulating outlets on this dam. The pond drain consists of a pipe with a concrete plugged clay section which must be broken to allow water to exit the reservoir.

#### Section 2: Engineering Data

## 2.1 Design Data

Design data available for this dam includes hydraulic/hydrologic calculations by the Soil Conservation Service and a site plan drawing by the Palazzi Corporation. Significantly lacking are data on the foundation conditions.

## 2.2 Construction Records

No construction records are available for this dam.

## 2.3 Operational Records

No operational records are available for this dam.

#### 2.4 Evaluation of Data

#### (a) Availability

The lack of detailed design and construction data warrants an unsatisfactory assessment for availability.

#### (b) Adeguacy

The lack of in-depth engineering data does not permit a definitive review. Therefore, the adequacy of the dam cannot be assessed from the standpoint of reviewing design and construction data. This assessment of the dam is based primarily on the visual inspection, past performance and sound engineering judgement.

#### (c) Validity

Since the observations of the inspection team generally confirm the information contained in the records of the New Hampshire Water Resources Board, a satisfactory evaluation for validity is indicated.

#### Section 3: Visual Inspection

#### 3.1 Findings

#### (a) General

The Bog Brook Dam is in FAIR condition at the present time.

(b) Dam

1) Main Dam Embankment (see photos 1,2,3,84)

The upstream slope of the embankment has no rip rap or slope protection and has considerable erosion and sloughing over its length.(see photo 1) It appears that this slope was seeded but the sod has slumped from being undercut at the waterline. There are 5 to 10 erosion gullies on the upstream slope. The measured slope is 1.8 horizontal to 1 vertical.

The crest has tire ruts up to 3 inches deep along its entire length. The crest appears to be 1/2 to 3/4 of a foot higher at the left end than at the right end.

The downstream slope is 2 horizontal to 1 vertical. There is ar irregularity approximately 180 feet left of the outlet pipe. This appears to be a local slough approximately 15 feet wide and 1 or 2 feet deep. From the outlet pipe to the right abutment is a wet area at the downstream toe which appears to be seepage although there are no signs of turbidity and no signs of moving flow. There is a deep erosion gully in this slope near the emergency spillway. There is much brush growth on the slopes and two small trees growing on the upstream slope to the left of the principal spillway. (see photos 1 & 4)

The emergency spillway is randomly lined with rock fill and is overgrown with brush and small trees. It is irregular in section and measures 25 feet wide at the highest point.

#### (c) Appurtenant Structures

The spillway structure appears to be in good condition. The trash rack is clear of debris. The rim of the inlet has three slots, measuring approximately 6 inches deep, cut into it. These show signs of erosion.

(d) Reservoir Area (see photo 4 and overview)

The shore of the reservoir is generally shallow sloping woodland or sandy beach. It appears stable and in good condition.

(e) Downstream Channel (see photo 6)

The outlet channel is a winding sluggish stream across a wide floodplain. It appears stable and in good condition.

3.2 Evaluation

1

4

The dam and its appurtenant structures are generally in fair condition. The problem areas noted during the visual inspection are listed as follows:

(a) Heavy brush and tree growth on slopes and emergency spillway channel.

(b) Signs of seepage at the downstream right toe.

(c) Lack of upstream slope protection.

(d) Irregular slope alignment, erosion gullies on slopes, and steep slopes.

# Section 4: Operational and Maintenance Procedures

# 4.1 Operational Procedures

(a) General

No written operational procedures exist for this dam. The dam is normally self regulating.

# (b) Description of any Warning System in Effect

There is no warning system in effect.

# 4.2 Maintenance Procedures

(a) General

No maintenance program exists for the dam. Maintenance is accomplished on an as-needed basis.

### (b) Operating Facilities

No maintenance program exists and maintenance is performed infrequently.

# 4.3 Evaluation

۱

Additional emphasis on routine maintenance will assist the Owner in assuring the long-term safety of the dam and operating facilities. A formal, written, downstream emergency warning system should be developed for this dam.

"Section 5: Evaluation of Hydraulic/Hydrologic Features

### 5.1 <u>General</u>

11

Bog Brook Dam is located approximately 2 miles southeast of Granthem, New Hampshire. It is situated on Bog Brook about 3500 feet upstream of Stocker Pond.

The dam is an earth embankment 817 feet long and 18 feet high. The top of dam elevation is 1044.0 feet (msl). The principal spillway is a 4 foot diameter circular riser with a crest elevation of 1039.0 feet (msl). A pond drain leading to the riser is a 15 inch pipe with its invert at 1029 feet MSL. This drain is sealed, and can be opened by breaking a clay plug. The outlet pipe is a 30 inch diameter corrugated metal pipe. The pipe is 100 feet long with an invert elevation of 1028.0 feet (msl). The emergency spillway is a 25 foot wide, earth and rock lined channel with 3:1 side slopes. Its control section is at elevation 1040.5 feet (msl).

Downstream of the dam, Bog Brook is a winding, sluggish stream, with many pools and shallows and a wide floodplain. The first development downstream of the dam is a group of three houses 7-10 feet above the stream some 1000 feet from the dam. A small dirt road embankment with two 60 inch culverts crosses Bog Brook 1500 feet further downstream.

Bog Brook Dam would pass the adopted test flood (100 year flood) through the principal and emergency spillways with the water surface 2.5 feet below the top of the dam.

## 5.2 Design Data

Data sources available for Bog Brook Dam include summaries of design calculations by the Soil Conservation Service dated October 22, 1963. Also available are design drawings dated 1968 by the Palazzi Corporation and correspondence between the Palazzi Corporation and the New Hampshire Water Resources Board regarding construction of the dam.

#### 5.3 Experience Date

In records of flow or stage are known to be available for Bog Brook Lamor the area immediately downstream.

#### 5.4 Test Flood Analysis

The Hydrologic conditions of interest in this Phase I investigation are those required to assess the dam's overtopping potential and its ability to safely allow an appropriately large flood to pass. This requires use of the discharge and storage characteristics of the structure to evaluate the impact of an appropriately sized Test Flood. Some original hydraulic and h prologic design analysis by the Soil Conservation Service was available for this dam. Guidelines for establishing a recommended Test Flood based on the size and hazard classification of a dam are specified in the "Recommended Guidelines" of the Corps of Engineers. The impoundment of less than 1000 acre-feet and the height of less than 40 feet classify this dam as a SMALL structure.

The appropriate hazard classification for this dam is SIGNIFICANT because of the appreciable economic losses and small potential for loss of life downstream in the event of failure of the dam. As shown in the Dam Failure Analysis section, the increase in flooding caused by failure would cause property damage to two of the three houses 1000 feet downstream of the dam.

As shown in Table 3 of the "Recommended Guidelines," the appropriate Test Flood for a dam classified as SMALL in size with a SIGNIFICANT hazard potential would be between the 100-year flood and one-half the probable maximum flood (PMF). Since the risk downstream in the event of dam failure is on the low side of SIGNIFICANT, the 100-year flood is the appropriate Test Flood.

The SCS calculations show a peak 100-year inflow of 153 cfs for the dam. This is 196 CSM for the 500 acre drainage area. Attenuation due to storage in the reservoir results in a Test Flood routed peak outflow of 120 cfs, with the principal spillway crest, 1.0 feet above the emergency spillway crest, and 2.5 feet below the dam crest. The peak Test Flood outflow of 120 cfs is only 20.7% of the total discharge capacity of 580 cfs with the water surface at the dam crest.

#### 5.5 Dam Failure Analysis

The peak downstream flows that would result from the failure of Bog Brock. Dam are estimated using the procedure suggested in "Rule of Thumb Guidelines for Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs." The failure is assumed to occur with the water surface elevation at the dam crest, 1044 feet MSL. The outflow prior to dam failure would be 580 cfs, creating a tailwater of about 3.3 feet in the channel downstream of the dam.

For an assumed breach width equal to 40 percent of the dam width at the half-height, the gap in the embankment due to failure would be about 250 feet. The resulting peak failure outflow would be 24,300 cfs given the 18 feet embankment height and 3.3 foot tailwater.

The peak flow resulting from dam failure would be attenuated to 11,100 cfs at the 3 houses 1000 feet downstream of the dam, resulting in a peak stage of 5.3 feet. This would cause 1-2 feet of flooding at one house and 0-1 feet at another. This would cause damage to the houses but would present only a small threat of loss of life.

About 1500 feet downstream of the three houses there is a small dirt road crossing Bog Brook with two-60 inch culverts. This embankment would probably be damaged or destroyed by dam failure flows.

Downstream of this road, Bog Brook flows about 1000 feet further to Stocker Pond. The large floodplain in this reach would continue rapid attenuation of the failure flood wave from the Bog Brook Dam. The dam failure flow would probably not cause damage to any property near Stocker Pond, and this large pond would further attenuate failure flows, rendering downstream effects negligible.

5

6

The table on the next page summarizes the downstream effects of the failure of Bog Brook Dam.

•			s <b>e</b> danger	ų	MO
( ). T	Comments		Some damage to hou & trailer. Little of loss of life	probably washed ou	negligible damage; pond attenuates fl
<b>.</b> .	i Stage After Failure	15,500 cfs. 9,1 ft.	11,100 cfs 8.3 ft.	٠	٠
•	Flow 8 Before Failure	580 cfs 3.3 ft.	580 cfs 3.3 ft.	L	¢
	Level above Stream (ft.)		10 7	~7	ı
f( )	# of Structures	ı	l house l house l trailer	road	
•	Distance Downstream of Dam (ft.)	500	1000	2500	500
•	Location No. (see Map)		-	2	Stocker Pond
•					5-4

i

ł

## Section 6: Structural Stability

# 6.1 Visual Observations

There does not appear to be significant displacement or distress. The side slopes are significantly steeper than those indicated on the typical cross section prepared by the Palazzi Corporation (see page B-3).

### 6.2 Design and Construction Data

No records of structural stability analyses are available for this dam.

#### 6.3 Post Construction Changes

There have been no known changes to any of the embankments or structures.

# 6.4 Seismic Stability

The dam is located in seismic zone No. 2 and, in accordance with the recommended Phase I guidelines, does not warrant seismic analysis.

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Fell of \_\_\_\_\_\_ and Remedial Measures

### 

:

The transmission of the second transmission of the present time. The second condition.

#### the state of the second second second

The late of credult endoneering data does not permit a definitive review. Therefore, the adeutacy of the dam cannot be assessed from the stand, or of neview no descar and construction data. This assessment is based protonicy or the visual inspection, past performance, and sound endoneering oudgetent.

# ic <u>chaercy</u>

The engineering studies and improvements described herein should be inclemented by the owner within one year of receipt of this Phase I Inspection Report.

#### 7.2 Recommendations

It is recommended that the services of a qualified registered professional engineer be retained to investigate the condition of the upstream slope and make recommendations for the regrading of the slope and the placement of slope protection such as riprap. The owner should implement the findings of the engineering study.

#### 7.3 Remedial Measures

It is recommended that the owner institute the following remedial measures:

1) Implement and intensify a program of diligent and periodic maintenance including, but not limited to: mowing brush on slopes; backfilling animal burrows or tire ruts with suitable well tamped material; cleaning debris from spillways and slopes.

2) Remove trees and saplings from slopes including the roots. Resulting voids should be backfilled with suitable compacted material.

3) Regrade and fill in the erosion gullies on the downstream slope. Reseed the disturbed areas.

4) Develop and implement a workable plan for lowering the reservoir level in an emergency situation.

5) Monitor the seepage in wet areas at the downstream toe.

6) Develop a written downstream flood warning system to alert the appropriate officials in the event of an emergency.

7) Develop and implement a program or annual technical inspections.

# 7.4 Alternatives

5

¶I –

There are no meaningful alternatives to the above recommendations.

# APPENDIX A

Kt 7.

# VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST

# Inspection Team Organization

DATE: May 6, 1980

117

ff.

- PROJECT: NH 00194 Bog Brook Dam Springfield, New Hampshire NHWRB No. 220.16
- WEATHER: Clear, warm

#### Inspection Team

Nicholas A. Campagna	Goldberg Zoino & Associates, Inc.	Tean Captair
William S. Zoino	Goldberg Zoino & Associates, Inc.	Sci's
Jeffrey M. Hardir	Goldberg Zoine & Associates, Inc.	Schls
Andrew Christo	Andrew Christo Engineers	Structures
Paul Razgtu	Andrew Christo Engineers	Structures
Carl Razght	Andrew Christo Engineers	Structures

Owners representantives present: Mr. David Hurst and Mr Charles Gilmore of the Palazzi Corporation

Robert Fitzgerald and Richard Laramie of Resource Analysis Inc. performed the hydrologic inspection of this dam on April 24, 1980.

BOGE	ROOK.	DAM
------	-------	-----

K1 3

MAY 6, 1980

Springfield, New Hampshire

NH 00194

AREA EVALUATED	BY	CONDITION & REMARKS
DAM EMBANKMENT		
Crest Elevation	NAC	Variable
Current Pocl Elevation		Approximately 1039.8 ft.
Maximum Impoundment to Date		Unknown
Surface Cracks		None noted
Palement Condition		Not Applicable
Movement on Settlement of Crest		None noted
Lateral Movement		None noted
Ventical Alignment		Irregular
Horfzortal Alignment		Good
Condition at Abutment and at Concrete Structures		Good
Indications of Movement of Structural Items on Slopes		None
Trespassing on Slopes Vegitation on Slopes		Brush and small trees grower on both up and downstrea slopes.
Staughting on Endsion of Slores on Ablighents		Upstream slope unprotecter. Evidence of undercutting due to wave action, encorr gullies in downstream slope.
Rock Slope Protection Riprap Failures		None
Unusual Movement or Cracking at or Near Toes		None noted
Unusual Embankment on Downstrea		Area downstream right of dar

A-3

BOG BROOK DAM

.

11 3

**,** 

**¶** 

•

•

MAY 6, 1980

Springfield, New Hampshire

NH 00194

# CHECKLISTS FOR VISUAL INSPECTION

SeepageNonePiping or BoilsNone notedFoundation Drainage FeaturesNone notedToe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureNone notedCondition of ConcreteFAGoodSpailingErosionNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash PacksNo deficiencies noteiQutlet ConduitNo deficiencies notei	SeepageMarchPiping or BoilsNone notedFoundation Drainage FeaturesNone notedToe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureFSCondition of ConcreteFSScallingNone notedErosionNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficienciesPeservoir Discharge ConduitNo deficiencies noted	DT CONDITION & REMARKS
Piping or BoilsNone notedFoundation Drainage FeaturesNone notedToe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureNone notedCondition of ConcreteF%GoodSpallingErosionNone notedOrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNone notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitNo deficiencies notedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Piping or Boils   None noted     Foundation Drainage Features   None noted     Toe Drains   None noted     Instrumentation System   None noted     Drop Inlet Spillway Structure   None noted     Condition of Concrete   FA     Spalling   None noted     Erostor   None noted     Cracking   None noted     None noted   No deficiencies     Submerged, could not   Inspected     No deficiencies note   No deficiencies note	has ponded water. Appears be seepage. No visible fl
Foundation Drainage FeaturesNone notedToe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureNone notedCondition of ConcreteF%ScallingNone notedErosiorNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash PacksNo deficiencies notedDutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Foundation Drainage Features   None noted     Toe Drains   None noted     Instrumentation System   None noted     Drop Inlet Spillway Structure   None noted     Condition of Concrete   FX     Scalling   None noted     Erosion   None noted     Oracking   None noted     Rusting or Staining of Concrete   None noted     Visible Reinforcing   None noted     Efflorescence   None noted     Trash Packs   No deficiencies     Outlet Conduit   No	None noted
Toe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureNone notedCondition of ConcreteFAScallingNone notedErosiorNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNone notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not trainspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Toe DrainsNone notedInstrumentation SystemNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureNone notedCondition of ConcreteFKScallingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficienciesPesenvoir Discharge ConduitNo deficiencies noteOutlet ConduitNo	age Features None noted
Instrumentation SystemNoneNone notedDrop Inlet Spillway StructureFAGoodCondition of ConcreteFAGoodStailingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPesenvoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Instrumentation SystemNoneDrop Inlet Spillway StructureGoodCondition of ConcreteFAGoodStallingErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting on Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash PacksNo deficienciesDutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	None noted
Drop Inlet Spillway StructureCondition of ConcreteFAScallingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Drop Inlet Spillway StructureCondition of ConcreteScallingErosionCrackingRusting or Staining of ConcreteVisible ReinforcingEfflorescenceTrash PacksPeserucin Discharge ConduitOutlet ConduitNoOutlet Conduit	System None noted
Condition of ConcreteF%GoodSpailingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPesericin Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Condition of ConcreteFLGoodSpailingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficienciesPesenvoir Discharge ConduitNoOutlet ConduitNo	Structure
SpallingNone notedErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Spailing   None noted     Erosion   None noted     Cracking   None noted     Rusting or Staining of Concrete   None noted     Visible Reinforcing   None noted     Efflorescence   None noted     Trash Racks   No deficiencies     Pesericin Discharge Conduit   Submerged, could not     Outlet Conduit   No deficiencies note	crete FR Good
ErosionNone notedCrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPesenvoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Erosion None noted Cracking None noted Rusting or Staining of Concrete Visible Reinforcing Efflorescence None noted Trash Racks No deficiencies <u>Peservoir Discharge Conduit</u> Outlet Conduit No deficiencies note	None noted
CrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not to inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies note:	CrackingNone notedRusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies <u>Peservoir Discharge Conduit</u> Submerged, could not inspectedOutlet ConduitNo	None noted
Rusting or Staining of ConcreteNone notedVisible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPesenvoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not be inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies note:	Rusting or Staining of Concrete   None noted     Visible Reinforcing   None noted     Efflorescence   None noted     Trash Racks   No deficiencies <u>Peservoir Discharge Conduit</u> Submerged, could not inspected     Outlet Conduit   No deficiencies note	None noted
Visible ReinforcingNone notedEfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not be inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies note:	Visible Reinforcing None note: Efflorescence None note: Trash Racks No deficiencies <u>Peservicir Discharge Conduit</u> Submerged, could not inspected No deficiencies note <u>Outlet Conduit</u> No deficiencies note	ing of Concrete None noted
EfflorescenceNone notedTrash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not be inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies noted	Efflorescence   None noted     Trash Racks   No deficiencies <u>Peservcir Discharge Conduit</u> Submerged, could not inspected <u>Outlet Conduit</u> No deficiencies note	ing None noted
Trash RacksNo deficiencies notedPeservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not be inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies note:	Trash Racks <u>Peservoir Discharge Conduit</u> <u>Outlet Conduit</u> No deficiencies No deficiencies note	None noted
Peservoir Discharge ConduitSubmerged, could not be inspectedOutlet ConduitNo deficiencies note:	Peserveir Discharge Conduit Submerged, could not inspected   Outlet Conduit No deficiencies note	No deficiencies noted
Outlet Conduit No deficiencies note:	Outlet Conduit No deficiencies note	Conduit Submerged, could not te inspected
		No deficiencies note:

# APPENDIX B

	Page
Site Plan	<b>B-</b> 2
Design Drawing	B-3
Hydrologic Calculations (SCS)	B-4

ki.

6

k

1

B-1


















/

and the second second

1. 61. 624 - 1



هه ۲ و د

.

the second s



. 

Ъ. . -.1

. •**-** · · .

• . · · · • •  $o_{1}$  : -.

where a second second second en de la compañía de

· .....

THE PAL A

-----





COMPUTATION SHEET S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SC5-522 REV 5-80 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE 600 1950 0-470044 STATE PALAZZI CORP DAM, SPRINGFIELD, N.H. 10-22-68 8. F.B. SUBJECT .... SUMMARY OF HIPATADOIC DATAS SPILL WAY INFO SHEET \_\_\_ OF\_ LOCATION OF PROPOSED DANI • •--- • -----SPRINGEIELD, N.M. LATITUDE N 43 - 28'-10" - LONGITUDE : 72"-06'-30" . 2.1" DOWN \$ 5.5" LEFT OF UPPER RICHT CORNET OF SUNAPEE, N.H. USGS. TOPOGRAPHIE MAP HYDROLDSIC DATA DISAINAGE AREA = 500AC. = 0.78 MI." S.C.C # (SOIL COVER CONPLEX NO) = 65 (A.M.O.T.) To (TIME OF CONCENTRATION) = 1.34 Mirs SITE DATA (FROM F. DREW) 5:5 = 3:1 . TOP HILTH OF DAN = 30' \_. ELEV. OF TOP OF DAM = 1043 MAX. HEIGHT OF DAM = 18' SURFACE AREA OF PERMANENT PORL = 842 PIPE SPILE WAY CRITERIA: RUNOFF FROM SYEAR GAR. FAINFALL RE PASSED & STORED AT OP BELOK THE CREST OF EMERGENCY SPILLNOY. (A.M.C.II) RAINFALL Fabre CAR = 3.35"

FEAR INFLOW 925-66+8 = 96.5 C.F.:

DEPTH OF RUNDEF FROM. D.A. = C.E.S." VOLUME OF FUNDER = 28.3 AL.FT.

**B-4** 

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE SC5-522 REV 5-84 CHED BY DATE JOB NO. 10-22-6 UMMARY - PIPE SPILLWAY (CONTD) SHEET 2 OF APPROXIMATE PROPILE, SIZES ELEYS. OF PIPE SPILL WAY (SEE SHEET 3) CRESTOF RISER ELEY. 1039. ". . . . ENER SPILL. 1040.5 Q. (PIFE, SPILL WAY, CAPACITY W/W.S. G. 1045.5) = 63 C.F.S. REQUIRED Qp = 56 C.F.S. (BY SHORT CUT ROUTING) EMERGENCY SPILLVIAY CANTEAA: Qp + EMER. SPILL CAP. (Ges) = FEAR RENOFT FROM ENIER GENCY SFILLMAN MyCROGRAPH (QES), 100 VR. GAR. RAINFALL AMCIE PIRCHAE 4.25 Runser = 1.18 (NO ROLTINS) ESH 9ES = 153 C.F.S. Qes = QES - Qp = 153 - 63 = 900.F.S. MAX. WATER SURFACE ELEY. FOR ESH = 104%7 X-SECT. OF SFILLWAY MAX W.S. ELEV 1040.5 40'

B-5



اد



CENTERINAR OF PIPE

and the second second second second

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COMPUTATION SHEET SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE SCS-522 REV 5-58 640 1954 0 -470944 DATE PALAZZI CORP. DAR SPRING FIELD, N.H. STATE N.H BY P.E SUBJECT SHEET 4 OF 5 SUNMARY - ENER SFILL (CONTD) ASSUMED FROFILE OF EMER. SPILL. FLOY -> 10405 Sou south ac 3. LE . EL M-7.2% Ø KIT FATOR TI ST ZAN ELEY. THEFT AN ELEY = SHE (GIVEN) CARE A STORE A SELAN I MATER SURFACE NEGONALL F. FASS THE FEAR INFLOR FRUM THE FLEEDCAPE FYDRUSEAFN TASU THE PINE & EMERGENCY SPILLKIAYS.  $F_{ro}, E_{HP} = E_3'$ 1. ... = 468 ... F.S. a set i the set of the set 1. 1. 2 5 1343 

B-7 -

₹Ĺ -

COMPLITATION SHEET U. S. DEPANIMENT OF AGRICULT BOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE 522 PALAFEL SPRINGELEL 10-23 R,2 \_ or <u>\_</u> ANEET \_5\_ SUMMA SPALMAY CAPAC WATER SURFACE ELEY .... PIPE SPILL WAY PA CAP. C. 4 5 c1 ~ 12405 (CREST OF ENER. SPILL.) 63 1941.7 (MAX. ELEY. OF.E.S.H. 90 ( +1 M 65 400 1043 (. JAP OF DAM) . 6.8 (@ 6.9 FT./Sta B-8

•

and the second second

November 20, 1968

The Palazzi Corporation Box 717 Hooksett, New Hampshire

Attention: Frederick E. Drew, Jr.

Dear Sirs:-

٢.

**₹**1

At a session of the New Hampshire Water Resources Board held at its offices in Concord, New Hampshire, on November 7, 1968;

WHEREAS, The Palazzi Corporation has filed with this Board on November 4, 1968 a "Statement of Intent" to construct a dam in Springfield, New Hampshire; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered said Intent and finds that if constructed in accordance with plans and if properly maintained, it will not be a menace to public safety;

IT IS ORDERED, that the "Statement of Intent" of said Palazzi Corporation be and is granted with the understanding that the work shall be performed in accordance with plans and that the dam shall be properly maintained at all times.

By order of the New Hampshire Water Resources Board this twentieth day of November, nineteen hundred and sixty eight.

Very truly yours,

George M. McGee, Sr. Chairman

CMM/RWL/jb

# RECEIVED

NOV 4 1968

NEW HAMPE HRE NA TE ELECTION IS BOARD

#### THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

County of Sullivan ss.

<u>October 31. 19 68</u>

STATEMENT OF INTENT TO CONSTRUCT OR

RECONSTRUCT A DAM AT Springfield

TO THE WATER RESOURCES BOARD:

In compliance with the provisions of RSA 482:3.

We, K.

**#**[

THE PALAZZI CORPORATION

(Here state name of person or persons, partnership, association, corporation,

Box 717, Hooksett, New Hampshire 03106 etc.)

hereby state our intent to the Water Resources Board to construct, xexpectexberry, xexpectexpectexberry a dam along, or (cross out portion not applicable) across:

No name, (outlet of Cranberry Pond) (Here state name of stream or body of water)

At a point about 0.30 mile S.E. of Springfield (Here give location, by distance from mouth of stream, county or LAT N  $43^{\circ} - 28' - 10''$ Grantham Town Line, LONG W  $72^{\circ} - 06' - 30''$ 

municipal boundary)

by the Board.

in the town (s) of \_\_\_\_\_\_ Springfield

in accordance with PRELIMINARY PLANS, and SPECIFICATIONS FILED WITH THIS STATEMENT AND MADE A PART HEPEOF.

	(Here briefly state use to
to provide a des	silting basin
hich stored water is	s to be put)
upstream of Stoc	cker Pond, later use as recreation pond anticipa
The construc	ction will consist of earth dam, 18' high
	(Here give brief description of
with emergency	spillway./basic design was by Soil Conservation
ork contemplated inc	cluding height of dam)
Sorvice )	
11 land to be flowed	is is not by applicant.
11 land to be flowed	is owned by applicant.
11 land to be flowed	is stat owned by applicant.
11 land to be flowed	THE PALAZZI CORPORATION
ll land to be flowed	THE PALAZZI CORPORATION
ll land to be flowed	THE PALAZZI CORPORATION
ll land to be flowed	THE PALAZZI CORPORATION
ll land to be flowed	THE PALAZZI CORPORATION
ll land to be flowed	A isotat owned by applicant. THE PALAZZI CORPORATION THE PALAZZI CORPORATION Address P.O. Box 717

•

i i

•

1 1

•

Note: This statement together with plans, specifications and information and data filed in connection herewith will remain on file in the office of the Water Resources Board. This statement is to be filed in duplicate.

### STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

INTER-DEPARTMENT COMMUNICATION

DATE November 6, 1968 AT (OFFICE) Water Resources Board

FROM Robert W. Livingston Civil Engineer

SUBJECT Statement of Intent The Palazzi Corporation

1 7.

1

To Allen I. Lewis, Chief Maintenance, Construction and Engineering Division Fish and Game Department 34 Bridge Street Concord, New Hampshire

> For your consideration and comments we enclose Statement of Intent in connection with the captioned firm and Springfield project.

RWL/jb

Enc.

APPENSIA C PHOTOGRAPHS

EL 7.

.

. .

•

76 **1** 

۲



DPCP INLET

N,A

OVERVIEW PHOTO

-> AFFEND

CTOHES

4. 9

N Normal States of the second Normal States and the second states of the second states of the second states of the second states of the second

'n

ur.T State

## LOCATION AND ORIENTATION OF PHOTOS

BOG BROOK DAM

1

SPRINGFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

400 APPROXIMATE:









### APPENDIX D

A.

4

•

#

•

•

•

•

1 1

### HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS

RESOURCE ANALYSIS

#### BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/16/80

The elevation of Bog Brook Dam given below is based on field notes, dam plans, and USGS topo information.



Stage-Discharge Curve

Principal Spillway

The principal spillway is a four foot diameter circular riser with a circumference of  $4\pi = 12.57$  ft. and a crest elevation of 1039 ft. msl (h = 0). The outlet from the riser is a 30" RCP with a 2 foot drop in 100 ft. There is a second inlet to the riser - a 15" pond drain with an invert at 1029 ft. msl (h = -10). The pond drain will be assumed to be closed for these calculations.

RESOURCE ANALYSIS

•

#### BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/19/80

 $Q_2$  = weir flow = 3.3(12.57)(h)<sup>3/2</sup>  $Q_3$  = pipe flow = C (h+13)<sup>1/2</sup> C = 3.3 for sharp-crested weir.

from page 5 of the SCS calculations,

C = 16.5 so  $Q_3$  = 16.5 (h+13)<sup>1/2</sup>  $Q_1$  = principal spillway outflow = minimum of  $Q_2$  and  $Q_3$ .

### Emergency Spillway

5

SCS Technical Release #39, "Hydraulics of Broad Crested Spillways" allows computation of Q vs.  $H_{pool}$  for the emergency spillway. Figure ES-171 relates  $H_{pool}$  to  $H_{ec}$ , the head at the weir crest for a given spillway shape and L. Figure ES-175 relates  $H_{ec}$  to Q.

```
z = side slopes = 3:1
b = width = 25 ft.
l = length of flow path = 105 ft.
H<sub>pool</sub> = head above spillway crest in pool, ft.
H<sub>ec</sub> = head at spillway control section, ft.
Q = outflow, cfs
```

RESOURCE ANALYSIS • Comp. Dresser & Makee from

D

### BOG BRODK DAM

TCG 5/19/80

<u>(ft.)</u>	Elevation (ft. msl)	H pool (ft. above En. S/W crest)	H ec* (ft)	Q** <u>(cfs)</u>
0.0	1039	-	-	-
1.5	1040.5	0	0	0
2.0	1041	.5	∿.19	~10
2.2	1041.2	.7	.465	25.2
2.5	1041.5	1	.72	49.9
3.0	1042	1.5	1.17	105
3.5	1042.5	2	1.62	<b>1</b> 80
4.0	1043	2.5	2.09	272
4.5	1043.5	3	2.57	383
5.0	1044	3.5	3.03	510
5.5	1044.5	4	3,51	660
6.0	1045	4.5	4.00	880
6.5	1045.5	5	4.49	1010

\*Figure ES-171, Sheet 2 in TR-39.

5

\*\* Figure ES-175, Sheets 2 and 5 in TR-39.

BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/19/80

Top of Dam

D

For  $h \ge 5$ 

 $Q_4 = Q_5 = Q_7 = Q_8 = 0$ 

For  $5 \le h \le 9$ 

 $Q_4 = 2.7 (50) (h - 5) (.5(h - 5))^{3/2}$   $Q_5 = 2.8 (754) (h - 5)^{3/2}$   $Q_7 = Q_4$  $Q_8$  unchanged

Since we are not going to deal with h > 9, this is sufficient.

The BASIC program which follows calculates a stage-discharge curve for Bog Brook  $\text{Dam}_{\cdot}$ 

DAM" : TOP OF RELATIONSHIP FOR BOG BROOK DAM 0,0,10,25.2,49.9,105,180,272,383,510,660,820,1010,1220 H DATA RISER CREST THE D1 ARRAY CONTAINS EMERGENCY SPILLWAY O VS. N1 IS THE # OF O VS. H POINTS EMERGENCY S/W DATA 0,1.5,2,2.2,2.5,3,3.5,4,4.5,5,5,6,6.5,7 FOR I=1 TO N1 REM - D2 IS THE FLOW WHICH CANN PASS DVER THE D2=3.3\*12.57\*H11.5 STAGE/DISCHARCE CURVE FOR BOG BROOK DAM STORED ON TAPE B-1 FILE 10 30T "DI SCHARGE " S/W) "32T" (CFS) " S/W **DISCHARGE PRINCIPAL** 0.25 I DT"STAGE VS. IT" (FT. ABOVE STEP 1 6T"HEAD" JSING 320. USING 280. JSING 300-USING 260 "TOTAL ດ 2 FOR I=1 TO NI FOR I=1 TO N READ D1(1,1) DIM DI (2, N1) READ D1 (2, 1) FOR H=0 TO 191 į., IMAGE I PRINT IMAGE IMAGE IMAGE I **PRINT** PRINT PRINT N | = | 4 DATA PRINT PRINT 02=0 03=0 04 = 005=0 0=90 PAGE 07=0 NEXT NEXT REM REM REA ົພິ 30 50 50 70 06 290 300 20 40 83 200 210 220 230 240 250 270 280 390 400 410 430 440

i j

6

REM - DI IS THE PRINCIPAL SPILLWAY OUTFLOW DI=O2 REM - O3 IS THE FLOW WHICH CAN PASS THROUGH THE OUTLET PIPE D3=16.5*(H+13)10.5 IF 02<03 THEN 510	<pre>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII</pre>	
500 RE 500 RE 500 RE 500 RE 500 RE		

1 5

(

TOP OF DAM	- 0 M 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
EMERGENCY S/W	
DISCHARGE (CFS) PRINCIPAL S/W	-045066666666666666666666666666666666666
TOTAL	-0040000000000000000000000000000000000
HEAD FT. ABOVE S/W)	000000000004444000000 0000000000000

•••

DISCHARGE RELATIONSHIP FOR BOG BROOK DAM STACE VS.

.

•

I 3

5

•

k

STACE-DISCHARGE CURVE FOR BOG BROOK DAM

1 5

ľ

•

K



RESOURCE ANALYSIS

### BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/21/80

### Stage-Storage Curve

ົ້

4

The storage at the spillway crest (h = 0, 1039 ft msl) is 40 ac-ft. The pond area at 1040 ft msl is about 16 acres. Assuming this surface area, and no spreading as the pond rises,

Surcharge storage = 16h Total Storage = 40 + 16h

For the drainage area of 500 acres

1" of runoff =  $\frac{500 \text{ acre } (1")}{12"/\text{ft.}}$  = 41.7 ac-ft.

 $1 \text{ ac-ft.} = \frac{1}{41.7} = 0.24^{\circ} \text{ of runoff}$ 

Surcharge storage to the dam crest = 5(16) = 80 ac-ft. = 1.92" of runoff.

At the dam crest, total storage = 40 + 80 = 120 ac-ft.

The stage-storage curve is given on the next page.

STAGE-STORAGE CURVE FOR BOG BROOK DAM

7

!..

₹[



SHORAGE -Z AORE-LEE

### BOG BROOK DAM

### TCG 5/21/80

### Dam Failure Analysis

5

Assume failure when the water overtops the dam crest at h = 5, 1044 ft msl.

Normal outflow = 580 cfs Breach outflow =  $Q_{pl} = 8/27 W_b \sqrt{g} (Y_0)^{3/2}$ 

 $Y_0$  is the difference between the water surface elevation behind the dam at failure and the tailwater elevation. This depends on the cross section downstream of the dam, which is shown below (established from field notes):

5 lope = .007	channel n = .04	
10,15) & = 1000 FE	overbankn= .1	· lin or un
(57 ¢)	(45.6) (245.3)	(1000, 6)
	(*10,0) (*30,0)	

NOT TO SCALE

A stage-normal flow relationship for this reach is given on the next page.

D

k

ſ

4

€

•

1

C Cf 8	0.0	20.2	66.0	134.3	224.8	337.8	474.7	673.7	942.9	1309.0	1794.0	2417.7	3198.2	4207.2	5816.5	7705.7	9854.D	12246.4	14871.2	17718.9	20781.9	24053.5	27528.1	31200.7	35067.0	39123.1	43365.5	47791.1	52397.1
AR2/3	0.0	6.5	21.2	43.1	72.1	108.4	152.3	135.0	217.8	375.3	619.5	965.2	1426.5	1916.5	3071.1	4435.1	5994.4	7738.3	9658.1	11747.2	13999.5	16410.3	18975.3	21690.6	24553.1	27559.8	30708.0	33995.4	37419.8
H X D - R f 1		0.5	0.0	1.2	1.6	6.1	2.2	0.1	1.0	1.2		1.5	1.8	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.9	4.4	4.8	5.4	5,8	6.3	6.7	7.2	7.7	8.1	8.6
STEM ==== WPER f1	0.0	23.5	27.0	30.4	33.9	37.4	40.9	125.9	210.9	295.9	380.9	465.9	550.9	956.6	962.2	967.9	973.5	979.1	<u>9</u> 84 8	990.4	966 1	1001.7	1007.4	1013.0	1018.7	1024.3	1029.9	1035.6	1041.2
OMBINED SY Area fit2	0.0	10.8	23.3	37.5	53.3	70.8	00°0	131.3	215.0	341.3	510.0	721.3	975.0	1451.4	1930.6	2412.5	2897.2	3384 7	3875.0	4368.1	4863.9	5362.5	5863.9	6368.1	6875.0	7384.7	7897.2	8412.5	8930.6
FOR THE CI ELEV f1.		20.0	6		0	2.2	С П М	5.0	4	4 0	5.0	5 2 2	6.0	6 <sup>.</sup> 5	7.0	7.5	8	9 9 9	0.6	0	0	0			12.0	12 2	13.0	13.5	14.0
==== DATA DEPTH f1.	000	9 9 9 9 9 9	00.1	201 201 201	200	2.50	ч. 90 90	20. K	4 00	4.50	5.00	5.50	6.00	6.50	7.00	7.50	8.00	8.50	90.00	9.50	10.00	020	11.03	1 53	12.03	12.50	13.00	13.50	14.00

RESOURCE ANALYSIS

### BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/22/80

The pre-failure outflow of 580 cfs would yield a stage of 3.3 ft. downstream of the dam.

 $Y_o$  = height-tailwater = 18' - 3.3' = 14.7'  $W_b$  = breach width = 40% of dam width at half-height = .4(630) = 250 ft. Qp = 8/27 250,  $\overline{g}$  (14.7)<sup>3/2</sup> = 23,700 cfs Total outflow = 23,700 + 580 = 24,300 cfs Storage at failure = 120 ac-ft.

Downstream of the dam Bog Brook runs about 1000 ft, before reaching the first developed area, which consists of 3 houses - a trailer about 7 ft. above the brook, a house 8 ft. above the brook, and a house 10 ft. up.

To calculate the attenuation in the brook downstream of the dambefore dam failure flow reaches these houses, we will use two 500 ft. reaches. The cross-section given previously is typical of the entire 1000 ft., in which the brook is marshy, with standing pools and an extensive flood plain.

The attenuation of dam failure flow due to storage in the first 500 ft. reach downstream of the dam is calculated on p. D-15.



0-11

RESOURCE ANALYSIS a Camp Dresse: & Mokee Inter

#### BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/22/80

The attenuated peak failure flow 500 ft. downstream of the dam is 15,500 cfs, with a peak stage of 9.1 ft.

The attenuation in the next 500 ft. down to the houses described above is determined on p. D-17.

The peak failure flow from the dam at the three houses 11,100 cfs, which would result in a stage of 8.3 ft. This would cause 1-2 ft. of flooding at the trailer and slight flooding at one of the two houses. This would cause damage to the houses but would present only a small threat of loss of life.

About 1500 ft. downstream of the three houses there is a small dirt road crossing Bog Brook with 2-60" culverts. This embankment would probably be damaged or destroyed by dam failure flows.

Downstream of this road, Bog Brook flows about 1000 ft. further to Stocker Pond. The large floodplain in this reach would continue rapid attenuation of the failure flood wave from Bog Brook Dam. Stocker Pond has a surface area of about 85 acres, so if the entire 120 ac-ft. released by the failure of Bog Brook Dam were to enter Stocker Pond with no outflow, the pond elevation would rise only  $\frac{120 \text{ ac-ft.}}{85 \text{ ac.}} = 1.4 \text{ ft.}$  Thus, the dam failure flow would probably not cause damage to any property near Stocker Pond, and this large pond would further attenuate failure flows, rendering downstream effects negligible.


NDIVESLEDS

1 d V c

D-17

0

RESOURCE ANALYSIS a Camp Dresse & Morrey 1 m

b.

## BOG BROOK DAM

TCG 5/22/80

The table on the next page summarizes the downstream effects of the failure of Bog Brook Dam.

## Test Flood Analysis

 $\mathbf{\hat{L}}$ 

Size classification: SMALL (storage between 50 and 1000 ac-ft; height less than 40 ft)

<u>Hazard Classification</u>: SIGNIFICANT based on the small chance of loss of life and significant economic damages at the three houses 1000 ft. downstream of the dam.

According to the Corps "Recommended Guidelines" the hazard classification and dam size indicate a test flood between the 100-year and 1/2 PMF. Since the hazard classification is on the low side of significant, we will use 100-year flood.

According to sheet 2 of the SCS "Summary of Hydrologic Data and Spillway Information," the 100-year peak inflow is 153 cfs.

The attenuation of the test flood due to storage in the reservoir **is calculated** on p. D-20.

•	Comments		Some damage to house and trailer. Little danger of loss of life.	Probably washed out.	1.4 ft. or less rise in pond elevation. Pond attenuates flow.
-	Stage After Failure	15,500 cfs 9.1 ft.	11,100 cfs 8.3 ft.	۱	i
I	Flow & S Before Fallure	580 cfs 3.3 ft.	580 cfs 3.3 ft.	ı	ĩ
	Level Above Stream (ft)		10	~7	ı
9	# of Structures	ı	l house l house l trailer	road	١
)	Distance Downstream of Dam (ft)	500	1000	2500	3500
•	Location No. (see map)	•	1	2	3 Stocker Pond
					-

D-19



D-20

E-LOEN CORPORATION

P C R

JIETI URA

RESOURCE ANALYSIS a Camp Dresse: & McKee 1 ~

## BOG BROOK DAM

ft 7.

.

(

\*(

TCG 5/22/80

The peak test flood outflow is 120 cfs, with a peak stage of 1041.5 ft ms1, 2.5 ft above the spillway crest, 1.0 ft above the emergency spillway crest, and 2.5 ft <u>below</u> the dam crest.

The peak test flood outflow is  $\frac{120}{580} = 20.7\%$  of the spillway capacity with the water surface at the dam crest.



APPENDIX E

ŀ.

•

41

INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS



. | 1

1.

\*1

8-85