



NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS MICROGOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART AD-A156 493

PISCATAQUA RIVER BASIN WAKEFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

LOVELL LAKE DAM NH 00223

STATE NO 241.06

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM





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

AUGUST 1978

Lypeword for public release Distribution Unlimited

85 06 14 127

OTTE FILE COPY

ECURIT : LLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When		READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT DOCUMENTAT		BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESS	AOUT CACATINT'S CATALOG NUMBER
NH 00223	ΠΙΘΟ	0110
TITLE (and Subilita)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Lovell Lake Dam		INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION	OF NON-FEDERAL	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(s)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADD	DRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
	·	
DEPT. OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGL		12. REPORT DATE August 1978
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED	•	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
424 TRAPELO ROAD, WALTHAM, MA. (02254	36
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESSII d	illerant from Cantrolling Offic	co) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		UNCLASSIFIED
		INCLINESTICATION/DOWNGRADING
APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIS	STRIBUTION UNLIMIT	ED
APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DIS		
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed of Cover program reads: Phase I Ins however, the official title of t Non-Federal Dams; use cover dat	spection Report, N the program is: Na te for date of rep	lational Dam Inspection Program; tional Program for Inspection of
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed) of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Cover program reads: Phase I Ins however, the official title of t	spection Report, N the program is: Na te for date of rep	lational Dam Inspection Program; tional Program for Inspection of
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed of Cover program reads: Phase I Ins however, the official title of t Non-Federal Dams; use cover dat Mer words (Continue on reverse effect) necess DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Piscataqua River Basin	spection Report, N the program is: Na te for date of rep	lational Dam Inspection Program; tional Program for Inspection of
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed of Cover program reads: Phase I Ins however, the official title of t Non-Federal Dams; use cover dat Mey words (Continue on reverse of the II necess DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY,	spection Report, N the program is: Na te for date of rep	lational Dam Inspection Program; tional Program for Inspection of
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observed of Cover program reads: Phase I Ins however, the official title of t Non-Federal Dams; use cover dat MEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necess DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Piscataqua River Basin Wakefield, New Hampshire Branch River	spection Report, N the program is: Na te for date of rep	Name Report) National Dam Inspection Program: tional Program for Inspection of Nort.

DD 1 JAN 73 1473

•

..

.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

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





Ŋ

PISCATAQUA RIVER BASIN WAKEFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE



PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

Identification No.: Name of Dam: Town: County and State: Stream: Date of Inspection: NH00223 Lovell Lake Dam Wakefield Carroll County, New Hampshire Branch River 19 June 1978

BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Lovell Lake Dam is 10 feet high, averages about 15 feet wide and is 240 feet long. It is an earthen embankment contained within a vertical dry stone masonry downstream wall and a concrete upstream wall (concave upstream). The dam spans the headwaters of the Branch River in east central New Hampshire. A 20'x36' three-sided box spillway has been built integrally with the concrete upstream wall. The 20' width contains an uncontrolled weir, the two 36' legs contain 7 bays of stoplogs, one of which has its sill at the elevation of the spillway apron. Water flows from the box into a 80' long conduit under State Route 109. Lovell Lake is now used for recreational purposes. The lake is 2.4 miles long and has a surface area of more than 500 acres. Maximum storage is 2,400 acre-feet.

The dam is in fair condition. Major concerns are: inadequate outlet discharge capacity, seepages at the downstream toe, and its small freeboard. Additional concerns include: erosion of the embankment on both sides of the spillway, a stump and several trees near the downstream wall, cracks in the upstream concrete wall, and large boulders thrown or pushed onto the spillway apron.

Based on size and hazard classifications in accordance with Corps guidelines, the test flood is the Probable Maximum Flood. With stoplogs in place a PMF outflow of 3050 cfs (622 csm) would overtop the dam by 1.6 feet; therefore the spillway is considered inadequate. With stoplogs, the spillway will pass 63 cfs, or 2 percent of the PMF. With stoplogs removed the spillway will pass 1329 cfs. A major breach at maximum pool would probably result in the loss of less than 10 lives and appreciable property damage.

The owner, New Hampshire Water Resources Board, should implement the results of the recommendations given in Section 7.2. within two years after receipt of this Phase I Report. The operating and maintenance measures recommended in Subsection 7.3.b. should be implemented within one year after receipt of this Phase I Report.

aren a. Xunan Warren A. Guinan

Warren A. Guinan Project Manager N.H. P.E. No. 2339

ii

This Phase I Inspection Report on Lovell 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</u> <u>Safety Inspection of Dams</u>, and with good engineering judgment and practice, and is hereby submitted for approval.

CHARLES G. TIERSCH, Chairman Chief, Foundation and Materials Branch Engineering Division

FRED J. RAVENS, Jr., Member Chief, Design Branch Engineering Division

ī

.

r

SAUL COOPER, Member Chief, Water Control Branch Engineering Division

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

JOE B. FRYAR Chief, Engineering Division

iii

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 (OCE), 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 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.

iv

CONTENTS

TitlePageLETTER OF TRANSMITTALiBRIEF ASSESSMENT.iiREVIEW BOARD PAGE.iiiPREFACE.ivCONTENTS.vOVERVIEW PHOTO.viLOCATION MAP.vii

REPORT

SECTION

i.

.

r

PROJ	ECT INFORMATION	1
1.1	General	1
1.2		1
1.3	Pertinent Data	3
ENGI	NEERING DATA	6
2.1	Design	6
2.2	Construction	6
2.3	Operation	6
2.4	Evaluation	6
VISU	AL INSPECTION	7
3.1	Findings	7
3.2	Evaluation	9
OPER	ATIONAL PROCEDURES	10
4.1	Procedures	10
4.2	Maintenance of Dam	10
4.3	Maintenance of Operating Facilities	10
4.4	Description of Any Warning System in Effect	10
4.5	Evaluation	10
HYDR	OLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS	11
5.1	Evaluation of Features	11
STRU	CTURAL STABILITY	13
6.1	Evaluation of Structural Stability	13
ASSE	SSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, & REMEDIAL MEASURES	15
7.1	Dam Assessment	15
		10
7.2	Recommendations	16
	1.1 1.2 1.3 ENGI 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 VISU 3.1 3.2 OPER 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 HYDR 5.1 STRU 6.1 ASSE 7.1	<pre>1.2 Description of Project. 1.3 Pertinent Data. ENGINEERING DATA. 2.1 Design. 2.2 Construction. 2.3 Operation. 2.4 Evaluation. VISUAL INSPECTION. 3.1 Findings. 3.2 Evaluation. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES. 4.1 Procedures. 4.2 Maintenance of Dam. 4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities. 4.4 Description of Any Warning System in Effect. 4.5 Evaluation. HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS. 5.1 Evaluation of Features. STRUCTURAL STABILITY. 6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability. ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, & REMEDIAL MEASURES. 7.1 Dam Assessment.</pre>

APPENDICES

Designation

CHECK LIST - VISUAL INSPECTION	А
INSPECTION REPORTS/SKETCHES	В
PHOTOGRAPHS (Figures 2 - 14)	С
HYDROLOGY/HYDRAULICS	D
INVENTORY DATA	E

v



C

r

Figure 1 - Overview of Lovell Lake Dam.



. 6

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT LOVELL LAKE DAM

SECTION 1 PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 General

a. <u>Authority</u>. Public Law 92-367, August 8, 1978, 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. Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc. 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 Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc. under a letter of May 3, 1978 from Ralph T. Garver, Colonel, Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW33-78-C-0329 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

b. Purpose

(1) To 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) To encourage and prepare the states to initiate quickly effective dam safety programs for non-Federal dams.

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

1.2 Description of Project

a. Location. Lovell Lake is located in the Town of Wakefield, New Hampshire. The dam impounding the lake spans the headwaters of the Branch River. Below the dam the Branch River flows about 9 miles to its confluence with the Salmon Falls River in Milton Three Ponds about 3 miles above the Milton Three Ponds Dam. The Salmon Falls River in turn joins the Cocheco River 25 miles below the Milton Three Ponds Dam to form the Piscataqua River. Lovell Lake Dam is shown on the U.S.C.S. Quadrangle, Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, with coordinates approximately at N 43^o 33' 11", W 71^o 01' 32", Carroll County, New Hampshire. (See Location Map page vii.)

b. Description of Dam and Appurtenances.

Lovell Lake Dam is an earthen embankment with a vertical upstream concrete wall and a vertical downstream dry masonry (stone) wall. The concrete wall is convex downstream. The dam is about 240 feet long and 10 feet high. The crest width ranges from 10 to 19 feet. A box stoplog and uncontrolled overflow spillway is located at the center of the upstream wall. The box is 36 feet long by 20 feet wide. Four bays each of stoplogs are located on either side at right angles to the uncontrolled overflow spillway. These stoplogs must be manually removed. The concrete sill of 7 bays of the stoplogs is 4 feet below and the sill of the eighth bay is 8.8 feet below the crest of the uncontrolled spillway. Discharge from the spillways flows across the apron through an old stoplog spillway and into a conduit about 80 feet long that passes under State Route 109 and discharges into an open channel west of the road. The inlet consists of a reinforced concrete box culvert 4.25'H x 8'W. About 25 feet from the upstream end the opening is restricted to 4'Hx4'W.

c. Size Classification. Intermediate (Hydraulic height-10 feet, Storage - 2,400 acre-feet) based on storage (\geq 1,000 to <50,000 acre-feet) as given in the OCE Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams.

d. <u>Hazard Classification</u>. Significant hazard. A breach would probably result in the loss of less than 10 lives and appreciable property damage.

e. <u>Ownership</u>. Lovell Lake Dam is reported to have been built sometime before 1820 by the Great Falls Manufacturing Company for use in their milling operations. Ownership passed on to the Public Service Company of New Hampshire sometime between 1925 and 1931. The New Hampshire Water Resources Board (NUWRB) acquired the dam and water rights in December of 1963.

f. Operator. Mr. Vernon K. Knowlton, Chief Engineer, New Hampshire Water Resources Board, 37 Pleasant Street, Concord, New Hampshire 03301, is responsible for the operation of Lovell Lake Dam. Phone (603) 271-3406.

g. <u>Purpose of Dam</u>. The original structure impounding Lovell Lake was constructed to provide greater industrial water storage for the Great Falls Manufacturing Company. Under the ownership of the Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Lovell Lake was utilized primarily as conservation storage for the generation of hydroelectricity for the region, with some recreational usage. Lovell Lake is presently used for recreational purposes only.

h. Design and Construction History. Little information was disclosed concerning the original design and construction of the dam. It is reported that the first structure was basically a stone wall reinforced by an earthen embankment. The Great Falls Manufacturing Company rebuilt the dam in 1918. The upstream side was refaced with reinforced concrete, 15 inches thick. Work also included reconstruction of the sluiceway and gate.

Lovell Lake Dam was rehabilitated by the NHWRB in 1965. The outlet facilities were replaced with the present rectangular box stoplog spillway.

i. Normal Operational Procedures. No formal operational procedures were disclosed. Normal pool elevation during the summer months is about 570' MSL. This level is maintained by setting the stoplogs approximately 3 inches below the ungated overflow spillway crest. After the recreational season the lake is drawn down approximately 3 feet by removing stoplogs. The dam is visited on a weekly basis by the NHWRB.

1.3 Pertinent Data

a. Drainage Area. The drainage area consists of 4.9 square miles (3,136 acres) of gently to steeply-sloping wooded terrain. The normal recreation level has a surface area of 538 acres, which is equivalent to 17 percent of the watershed.

b. Discharge at Damsite

(1) Outlet works (conduit under State Route 109) - total capacity - 116 cfs

(2) Maximum known discharge at damsite - unknown. No information regarding past overtopping was disclosed.

(3) Ungated overflow spillway capacity at maximum pool elevation - 9 cfs @ 570.6' MSL

(4) Gated (stoplog) spillway capacity at recreational pool elevation (stoplogs removed) - 1,100 cfs & 570.0' MSL

(5) Stoplog spillway capacity at maximum pool elevation - 1,320 cfs @ 570.6' MSL

(6) Total spillway capacity at maximum pool elevation - 1,329 cfs @ 570.6' MSL

c. <u>Elevation</u> (ft. above MSL)

(1) Top of dam - the crest varies from 570.6 to 572.3

- (2) Test Flood pool 572.9
- (3) Full flood control pool not applicable
- (4) Recreation pool 570
- (5) Spillway crest 561.5 (assuming stoplogs removed)
- (6) Upstream portal invert low level conduit none

(7) Streambed at centerline of dam - 560.7 (downstream invert of stilling basin measured 8/2/78)

- (8) Maximum tailwater unknown
- (9) Design surcharge (original design) unknown
- d. <u>Reservoir</u> (miles)
- (1) Length of maximum pool 2.4
- (2) Length of recreational pool 2.4
- (3) Length of flood-control pool not applicable
- e. <u>Storage</u> (acre-feet)
- (1) Recreational pool 2,000
- (2) Flood control pool not applicable
- (3) Test Flood pool 3,790
- (4) Top of dam 2,400
- f. Reservoir Surface (acres)
- (1) Top of dam (embankment) 550
- (2) Test Flood pool 630
- (3) Flood-control pool not applicable
- (4) Recreation pool 538
- (5) Spillway crest 453

g. Dam

(1) Type - earthen embankment with a vertical concrete wall on the upstream side and a vertical dry masonry wall on the downstream side.

(2) Length - 240'(measured), 260'(from past inspection reports)

(3) Height - 12'(structural height)

(4) Top Width - ranges from 10'-19' (earth crest)

(5) Side Slopes - vertical

(6) Zoning - unknown

(7) Impervious Core - unknown

(8) Cutoff - unknown

(9) Grout curtain - unknown

h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel - not applicable

i. Spillway

(1) Type - ungated concrete overflow weir and stoplog box

(2) Length of weir - 20' (ungated); 40' (stoplog)

(3) Crest elevation - 570.3' MSL(ungated); 561.5' (all stoplogs removed) (See (7) below.)

(4) Gates - not applicable

(5) U/S Channel - Lovell Lake

(6) D/S Channel - Discharge flows into a culvert that passes under State Route 109 for a distance of approximately 80 feet. Downstream of the culvert the channel is about 20 feet wide, consists of a gravel bottom, and has trees and brush growing on the banks.

(7) General - The stoplog spillway is comprised of eight bays separated by 2' wide concrete piers. Seven bays are at invert elevation 566.3' MSL; the eighth bay is at invert elevation 561.5' MSL. There is a 4' wide reinforced concrete service bridge over the stoplog spillway. This access bridge is 0.5 foot thick. The top of the service bridge is at elevation 572.3' MSL.

SECTION 2 ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design

A search of the files of the New Hampshire Resources Board disclosed a limited amount of recorded information concerning only the design of the present outlet structures at Lovell Lake. Plans of the spillway reconstruction in 1964 were found and used in the hydraulic computations.

2.2 Construction

No pertinent information regarding the actual construction of the present outlet facilities at Lovell Lake was disclosed.

2.3 Operation

No formal operational procedures were disclosed. However, correspondence reflecting past operational practice were discovered and validated.

2.4 Evaluation

a. <u>Availability</u>. Only a limited amount of data on the actual design and construction of the spillway at Lovell Lake Dam was disclosed.

b. <u>Adequacy</u>. The information obtained from extensive data collection efforts was not adequate to determine the hydraulic characteristics of Lovell Lake Dam. Supplemental data established by field investigation was needed to complete the engineering analysis. Because of the limited amount of detailed data available, the final assessments and recommendations of this investigation are based on the visual inspection and the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.

c. <u>Validity</u>. The visual inspection is generally consistent with the 1964 spillway reconstruction plans.

SECTION 3 VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Findings

a. <u>General</u>. Lovell Lake Dam is a small dam which impounds an intermediate-size reservoir. The watershed above the reservoir is gently to steeply sloping and heavily wooded. Cottages and homes have been built around the perimeter of the reservoir.

Dam. Lovell Lake Dam is an earthen embankment with b. a vertical upstream concrete wall and a vertical downstream dry masonry wall. The dam is convex downstream. (See Appendix C - Figures 2,3, and 4.) The dam is about 240 feet long and 10 feet high. The crest width ranges from 10 to 19 feet. Fill has been placed against the reservoir side of the upstream concrete wall and the water depth at the upstream concrete wall varies from 0 to 4 feet. The minimum freeboard at the time of the inspection was 1.1 feet. The crest of the dam is covered with grass. Grass cover along the south embankment is thin, with some bare patches of ground. Erosion along the south embankment, probably due to wave action, was noted. (See Appendix C - Figure 5.)

The Town of Wakefield has a public bathing beach on the south abutment of the dam. (See Appendix C - Figure 6.)

There are two seepages downstream of the dam. One of the seepages discharges at the east edge of the pavement on State Route 109 downstream from the downstream dry masonry wall. (See Appendix C - Figure 7.) The pavement is broken and the shoulder is soft at the location of this seepage. The water being discharged was clear at the time of the inspection. The second seepage is taking place about 13 feet from the downstream toe near the bathing beach at the south abutment. (See Appendix C - Figure 8.) The elevation at which the seepage was discharging was only 1.4 feet below lake level at the time of the inspection. The water being discharged was clear.

There is one stump at the top of the downstream dry masonry wall, and several trees are growing at the base of the downstream dry masonry wall.

At the time of the inspection, the freeboard in the vicinity of the south abutment was only 1.2 feet.

There are several cracks in the upstream concrete wall (see Appendix C - Figure 9); no leakage was observed at the downstream side of the dam in the vicinity of these cracks.

c. <u>Appurtenant Structures</u>. A three-sided overflow spillway is located near the center of the dam. The box spillway structure is approximately 36 feet long by 28 feet wide (outside dimension.) Each 36-foot long side contains four stoplog sections. (See Appendix C - Figure 10.) The end of the box spillway section has a 20 foot wide concrete overflow weir. (See Appendix C - Figure 11.) The Lake level is primarily maintained by the stoplogs. There is no low-level outlet gate on the dam. One stoplog section extends to the bottom of the spillway discharge channel and can be used to drain the lake if all stoplogs were removed.

The box spillway is constructed upstream of the original dam and abuts the old stoplog spillway section and outlet channel. Design drawings indicate the box spillway was constructed subsequent to 1964.

The concrete walls and floor of the spillway are in good condition with only loss of surface laitance eroded away due to contact with discharge water. Numerous rocks and boulders (3-15"size) have been thrown into the discharge channel by vandals.

The concrete service bridge and railings are in good condition. The steel angle stoplog supports are showing only minor evidence of corrosion. The wood stoplogs are in good condition with some leakage noted between the stoplogs and around their ends.

The original concrete stoplog spillway section is still in place, immediately downstream of the newer concrete box spillway. (See Appendix C - Figure 12.) It was constructed integrally with the dam embankment, and has considerable surface erosion. The concrete surface has eroded exposing the course aggregate to a maximum depth of 1 inch.

The wooden shed that has been constructed over the discharge conduit is showing signs of deterioration. The inside of the shed could not be inspected to determine the function of the building in relation to the operation of the dam. Serious erosion, probably due to trespassing, is occurring on the downstream side of the embankment on both sides of the shed. (See Appendix C - Figure 13.)

d. <u>Reservoir Area</u>. The reservoir slopes are gentle to steep and are covered with trees and brush. (See Appendix C - Figure 6.) Numerous cottages and homes have been built

along the southeast portion of the perimeter of the reservoir. Little sedimentation was observed in the reservoir.

e. <u>Downstream Channel</u>. The downstream channel for approximately 80 feet below the dam is enclosed in a conduit, of varying cross sections, under State Route 109. The entrance to the conduit is concrete lined; below the exiting end the channel consists of sand, stones, and boulders. Brush and trees overhang the channel. (See Appendix C - Figure 14.)

3.2 Evaluation

Based on the visual inspection, the condition of Lovell Lake Dam is considered to be fair.

The principal conditions which are of concern with respect to the long-term stability of the dam are:

(1) Small freeboard between summer pool level and top of dam;

(2) Use of the sandy south abutment as a bathing beach with the attendant problems of trespassing on the south embankment and potential for serious erosion;

(3) Erosion of the embankment at the shed;

(4) Seepage at two locations downstream of the south embankment;

(5) Presence of at least one stump and several trees near the downstream dry masonry wall and the possibility that piping could start when the tree roots rot;

(6) Cracks in the upstream concrete wall through which leakage could occur, which could cause piping through the embankment; and

(7) The rocks that have been dumped into the spillway structure could be carried into the discharge conduit and could partially plug the conduit.

SECTION 4 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Procedures

No formal operational procedures were round. The dam has been owned and operated in the telebric becember of 1963. During the summer months the take level is maintained by setting the stoplogs - increastelow the undated spillway crest. After the recreational season the lake is drawn down approximately 3 feet by removing stoplogs.

4.2 Maintenance of Dar

The NHWRB is responsible for caintaining the dam at Lovell Lake. No formal caintenance procedures were disclosed. The dam is visited on a weeksy basis by the NHWRB.

4.3 Maintenance of genating facilities

There are no sates in specialize rechanisms at Lovell Lake Dam.

4.4 Description of Angewernin System in Effect

No description of all warment system was disclosed.

4.5 Caluation

The desired descented ended processor for novell take addition for the transformer descentered can be remedied a final and a state of the contered can be remedied a final and a state of the contered can be remedied a final and a state of the transformer descentered can be a final and a state of the state of the NHWKB should also a final conterest of the state of the System to follow in the conterest of the state of the System to follow in

 $, \alpha$

SECTION 5 HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

5.1 Evaluation of Features

a. <u>Design Data</u>. No original hydrologic and hydraulic design data (circa 1820) were found for Lovell Lake Dam. However, hydrologic and hydraulic information, dating from the ownership of the structure by the Public Service Company of New Hampshire to the present ownership by the New Hampshire Water Resrouces Board, were found and assessed to determine their acceptability in evaluating the overtopping potential of Lovell Lake Dam.

b. Experience Data. No information regarding past overtopping of Lovell Lake Dam was found.

c. <u>Visual Observations</u>. No visual evidence was found of damage to the structure caused by overtopping at the time of the inspection. However, erosion of the upstream face, apparently caused by wave action, was noted.

d. <u>Overtopping Potential</u>. Lovell Lake Dam is classified as being intermediate in size having a maximum storage of 2,400 acre-feet. The normal recreation level has a surface area of 538 acres, which is equivalent to 17 percent of the watershed.

To determine the hazard classification for Lovell Lake Dam, the impact of failure of the dam at maximum pool was assessed using Guidance for Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs issued by the Corps of Engineers. The analysis covered the reach extending from the dam to Route 109, immediately downstream of the dam. Failure of Lovell Lake Dam at maximum pool would probably result in an increase in stage of approximately 1 foot over Route 109. An increase in water depth of this magnitude would 1 obably result in the loss of less than 10 lives and cause appreciable property damage.

As a result of the analysis described above, Lovell Lake Dam was classified - <u>Significant Hazard</u>. Using OCE Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the recommended test flood is the Probable Maximum Flood. The test flood inflow for Lovell Lake Dam, having a drainage area of 4.9 square miles, was determined to be 3920 cfs (800 csm). The test flood discharge after routing was determined to be 3050 cfs (622 csm).

The inadequacy of the outlet works makes overtopping potential great during periods of high runoff. Lovell Lake Dam is unable to pass the test flood without overtopping. The water depth over the dam embankment was calculated to be 1.6 feet. The spillway capacity, with all stoplogs removed, is less than 44 percent of the test flood. The capacity of the conduit downstream of the spillway is only 4 percent of the test flood.

12

į

SECTION 6 STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability

a. Visual Observations

The visual observation revealed the following conditions that may affect the long-term integrity of the dam:

(1) Seepages along the toe of the left embankment. The seepages occurring under the current low head indicate that areas within the embankment are permeable.

(2) Erosion of the embankment near the storage shed caused by trespassing, and general potential for erosion of the dam embankment initiated by uncontrolled trespassing on the dam.

(3) Low freeboard and inadequate outlet discharge capacity which may cause the dam to be overtopped and eroded during periods of high inflow or wave activity.

(4) Numerous cracks in the curved upstream wall. These cracks are sources of flow of water into the embankment which may eventually lead to piping and erosion.

(5) Trees growing from the downstream face. The tree roots could lead to piping when the roots decay.

(6) Lack of sufficient vegetation and erosion protection along the south embankment.

b. Design and Construction Data. No information was disclosed indicating the as-built conditions of the original dam, foundation material, or character of the earthfill. Design drawings dated November 9, 1964, by the NHWRB are available for the three sided concrete box spillway. Visual inspection indicated the physical conditions are similar to the information provided on the design drawings.

c. <u>Operating Records</u>. No records pertinent to the structural stability of the dam were disclosed.

d. Post-Construction Changes. In 1918, the upstream side was refaced with reinforced concrete, 15 inches thick, and the sluiceway and gate were reconstructed. The box spillway was added by the NHWRB in 1965.

e. <u>Seisaic Stability</u>. This dam is in Seismic Zone 2, and hence does not have to be evaluated for seismic stability according to the OCE Recommended Guidelines.



SECTION 7 ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS & REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 Dam Assessment

a. <u>Condition</u>. The visual inspection indicates that the dam is in fair condition. The principle concerns with respect to the condition of the dam are:

(1) The spillway and the conduit that extends from the spillway to the west side of Route 109, downstream of the dam, are not adequate to carry the test flood;

(2) Small freeboard between summer pool level and top of dam;

(3) Seepage at two locations downstream of the south embankment;

(4) Use of the sandy south abutment, which has no vegetation, as a bathing beach, with the attendant problems of trespassing and erosion;

(5) Erosion of the embankment on both sides of the storage shed;

(6) Presence of at least one stump and several trees near the downstream dry masonry wall, and the possibility that piping could start along channels formed when the tree roots rot;

(7) Cracks in the upstream concrete wall through which leakage could occur and cause piping through the embankment; and

(8) Rocks that have been dumped into the spillway structure which could be carried into the discharge conduit and could partially plug the conduit.

b. Adequacy of Information. The information available is such that the assessment of the dam must be based primarily on the visual inspection.

c. Urgency. Recommendations in 7.2 below should be implemented by the owner within 2 years after receipt of this Phase I report. The operating and maintenance procedures in 7.3.b. below should be implemented by the owner within 1 year after receipt of this Phase I report.

d. <u>Need for Additional Investigation</u>. The information available from the visual inspection is adequate to identify

the potential problems which are: overtopping, scepace, and leakage into the control shaft of the dates. These problems require the attention of a competent engineer who will have to make adartional engineering studies to design or specify remedial measures to rectify the problems. If left unattended, the problems could lead to instability of the structure.

7.2 <u>Recommendations</u>. It is recommended that the NHWEB should accomplish the remedial measures resulting from the following:

a. Evaluate further the hydrology and hydraulics of the reservoir, dam, splliway, and discharge conduit, and design such changes as are necessary.

b. Remedy the seepage conditions at the two locations downstream of the south half of the dam.

c. Modify the beach area near the south abutment in such a way as to permit the use of the beach and at the same time ensure against trespassing and erosion.

7.3 Remedial Measures

a. Alternatives. The NHWRB should, as a practical alternative pending implementation of the above recommendations, operate the summer lake level at least six inches lower so as to provide more storage and freeboard, thereby minimizing the potential for overtopping during any major flood event.

b. Operating and Maintenance Procedures.

(1) Repair the erosion next to the storage shed.

(2) Monitor the seepage downstream of the dam on a weekly basis.

(3) Control trespassing on the dam which could lead to erosion and further vandalism.

(4) Remove the rocks that have been dusped in the spillway structure by vandals and control treasures.

(5) Remove trees, stumps, dat mote in bittering, dat backfill the root excavations with a suitable serie indepoted direction of a competent engineer.

(6) Repair the cracks in the statement upstream side of the dam.

(7) Establish a round the clock surveillance during periods of unusually heavy rainfalls, and develop a formal warning system for alerting residents in case of emergency. The warning system should be included also in the written procedures of "Project Linkup", a disaster plan involving Civil Defense (as coordinator), state agencies, and town officials. "Project Linkup", at this time, is in draft form awaiting the Governor's approval.

(8) Continue periodic inspection systems on a biannual frequency.

APPENDIX A

CHECK LIST - VISUAL INSPECTION

VISUAL	INSPECTION	CHECK	LIST	
--------	------------	-------	------	--

D

G I

PARTY ORGANIZATION

e 19, 1978
00 A.M.
ny,warm
570.1 U.S. 560.7DN.S.
REMARKS
<u> </u>

PROJECT LOVELL Lake Dam, NH	DATE June 19, 1978	· · · ·
PROJECT FEATURE Dam Embankment		
DISCIPLINE		•
AREA EVALUATED	CUNDITIONS	
AM EMBANKNENT		-) •
Crest Elevation	568.9	•
Current Pool Elevation	570.1	
Maximum Impoundment to Date	Unknown	•
Surface Cracks	None observed	· · ·
Pavement Condition	Not paved	•
Movement or Settlement of Crest	None observed	
Lateral Movement	None observed	
Yertical Alignment	Good	
Horizontal Alignment	Good	D
Condition at Abutment and at Concrete Structures	Erosion of embankment next to gatehouse	
Indications of Movement of Structural Items on Slopes	None observed	
Trespassing on Slopes	Town beach is partly on south end of dam	
Sloughing or Erosion of Slopes or Aputments	See "Condition at Abutment and at Concrete Structures"	
Rock Slope Protection - Riprap Failures	None	•
Unusual Movement or Cracking at or pear Toes	None observed	_
Unusual Embankment or Downstraam Seepage	Seepage at two locations downstream of Ham	
Piping or Boils	None observed	
Foundation Draimage Features	None observed	
Toe Drains	None observed	-
Instrumentation System	None observed	

.

FERIODIC INSI	PECTION CHECK LIST	-
PROJECT LOVELL Lake Dan, NH	DATE June 19, 1978	
PROJECT FEATURE Spillway outlet and o	onduit NAME	
DISCIPLINE	NAME	
ABEA EVALIATED	CONDITION	
OUNTET WORLD - DUIL AND CHARLEND INTARE STRUCTURE		י ו
a. Approach Channel	Lovell Lake forms the approach	
Slope Conditions	Vertical slopes	
Bottom Conditions	Not visible	-
Rock Slides or Falls	None	
Log Boom	None	۰.
Debris	None	1. N
Condition of Concrete Lining	Not applicable	
Drains or Weep Holes	None visible	
. Intake Structure		.1
Condition of Concrete	Good	
Stop Logs and Slots	Good condition. Considerable leakage through stoplog joints	
		•
		•
an na han na han na han na han na han na han an a	A-3	

FCT Lovell Lake Dam, NH	DATE June 19, 1978
ECT FEATURE Spillway Weir	NAM9:
IP). DVE	
ARD EVALUATED	CONDITION
ET NORKS - GPILLMAY WEIR, ALERCACH D DISCHARGE CHANNELE	
Approach Channel	See previous page
General Condition	
Loose Rock Overhanging Channel	
Trees Overhanging Channel	
Floor of Approach Channel	
Veir and Training Walls	
General Condition of Concrete	Good
Rust or Staining	Only at embedded angles at stop logs
Spalling	None
Any Visible Reinforcing	None
Any Seepage or Efflorescence	None
Drain Holes	None
ischarge Channel	
General Condition	Good
Loose Rock Overnanging Channel	None
Trees Overhanging Chammel	Several trees overhang channel
Floor of Channel	Sand, gravel and boulders
Other Obstructions	None observed

	CTION CHECK LIST	
ROJECT LOVELL Lake Dam, NH	IATE June 19, 1978	
ROJECT FRATURE Service Bridge	NAME:	-
ISC IPL IN:		-
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION	
JTLET WORKS - SERVICE BRIDGE	To stoplogs and spillway	
, Super Structure	to suprogs and spillway	
Bearings	Concrete to concrete	
Anchor Bolts	None	
Bridge Seat	None	
Longitudinal Members	Good	
Under Side of Deck	Good	
Secondary Bracing	None	
Deck	Good	
Drainage System	None	
Railings	Good Condition	
Expansion Joints	None	
Paint	Railings good	
Abutment & Piers		
General Condition of Concrete	Good	
Alignment of Abutment	No visible movement	
Approach to Bridge	N/A	
Condition of Seat & Backwall	Concrete - Good	

Ĺ

A-5

PROJECT LOVELL Lake Dam, NH	DATE June 19, 1978	
PROJECT FEATURE Conduit Entrance	NA ME	
	NAME	
DT2CITTIME	10.n.m	
AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION	
UTIET WORKS - TRANSTIION AND CONDUCT		2 °
General Condition of Concrete	Surface eroded due to years of	
Rust or Staining on Concrete	submergence. Visual observation indicates that an average of k inch	
Spalling	has eroded away from surface with a maximum of 2 inches on right wing wall	
Erosion or Cavitation	No reinforcing was visible.	
Cracking		
Alignment of Monoliths		•
Alignment of Joints		
Numbering of Monoliths		
		•
	· ·	
A	-6	
PROJECT LOVELL Lake Dam, NH	DATE June 19, 1978	
--	--------------------------------	
PROJECT FEATURE Reservoir	NAME R. Langen	
AREA EVALUATED	REMARKS	
Stability of Shoreline	Good	
Sedimentation	No visible problems	
Changes in Watershed	Minor	
Runoff Potential	Several homes; lowest is about	
Upstream Hazards Downstream Hazards	6' above lake	
	Road, culvert, garage	
Alert Facilities	None observed	
Hydrometeorological Gages	None	
Operational & Maintenance Regulations	None observed	
· · ·		

Ĩ

.

'n

•••

ſ

1



INSPECTION REPORTS/SKETCHES

August 12, 1975

Board of Selectmen Wakefield New Hampshire 03838

Gentlemen:

A recent inspection of the dam at the outlet of Lovell Lake indicates that this sres, which is adjacent to the town's beach area, under lease from the Water Resources Board, is being abused.

At the time of the inspection parties using the bathing facilities were swimming in the area adjacent to the dam, which is in violation of the lease agreement; were pulling stone off the bottom of the pend and depositing them below the spiliway; the stone retaining wall downstream of the dam is being torn apart; i.e., individual atomes are being rolled into the area below the embankment; stones are being dropped into the culvert entrance below the gatehouse; and a fence on the dam has been dismantled, therefore opening up access to the dam from the beach area.

This office requests that the town of Wakefield more properly supervise this area and maintain it from damage. Dam operators from the Water Resources Board's office have been told that no one is allowed on the dam; however, it appears that the other, conditions, existing above are not being supervised.

Could we suggest that the energy used to place the stones within the spillway be again used to remove them from this area so that during times of high flow they do not impede the flow under the highway and become deposited downstream. During the fall while our construction crew is in the immediate area we hope to make other changes to the structure which will help eliminate some of this problem.

Our staff is always available to assist you in accomplishing the above

Respectfully yours,

George M. McGee, Sr. Chairsau

GiOI/VAK/pd

NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER CONTROL COMMISSION DATA ON DAMS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

LOCATION			STATE NO. 241.06	<i>ب</i>
Town	Wakefield	: County	Carroll -	
			Salmon Falls R.	
•				
OFNED LL DAS	T 4			
GENERAL DAT	IA a: Controlled	Sa Mi / Uncontrolled	Sq. Mi : Total 4.53	Sa Mi
Overall longt	h of dom 260 ft .	Data of Construction		oq. m.
			cture	
Cost-Dam .	Boulacis 4.	art //	······································	······ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Devision		•	
Waste Gates				
			5.417 f	
			a	
				-
				•••••
Waste Gates		37 - 4 - 5 - 3		
	-	ft.: Area		sq. ft.
Embankment			-	
.,			•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
4				
			am on	
Length-R	light of Spillway	: Left of S	pillway	·····
Spillway				
Height of	permanent section-M	laxft.: Min		ft.
Flashboar	dsType		:: Height	ft.
Elevation-	-Permanent Crest	·····	: Top of Flashboard	
Flood Cap	bacity	cfs.:	cfs/sq. mi.	
Abutments				
Materials	• •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	······································		•••••••
Freeboard	l: Max	ft.: Min		ft.
Headworks	to Power Devel(See	e "Data on Power Devel	lopment'')	
OWNER PI	ublic Service Co.	of MH.Hanchester	NH	••••••
REMARKS			ted to a 3ft.drawdown by	
	and the second	فللمحمد المحمد والمحمد و	ieu to a ji t. drawdown by	Debr T
	y an informal agr Use-Conservation,			
Tabulation D.	, RLT		/20/39	
abulation by	,	B-2		•
••	• • •			

NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER CONTROL COMMISSION DATA ON RESERVOIRS & PONDS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

LOCATION	ат DAM NO. <u>241.06</u>
Town	Carroll
Stream Lovella Lake	
Basin-Primary	Salmon Falls
Local Name	

DRAINAGE AREA

ELEVATION vs. WATER SURFACE AREA vs. VOLUME

	Point	Head Feet	Surface Area Acres	Volume Acre FL
(1)	Max. Flood Height	•••••		•••••••
(2) '	Top of Flashboards		•••••	•••••••••••••••••••
(3)	Permanent Crest		•••••	
(4)	Normal Drawdown		5.36	13SOWRB
(5)	Max. Drawdown	• - • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••	••••••
(6)	Original Pond		••••••	***************
		Total Volume	Useable Volum	
Drawo	lown	ft.		
Drawo Volum		ft. ac, ft.		ft.
Volum			·····	ft. ac. ft.
Volum Acre f	e	ac. ft.		ft. ac. ft.
Volum Acre f Inches	ie it. per sq. mi. 9 per sq. mi.	ac. ft.	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	ft. ac. ft.
Volum Acre f Inches OF W	ie 't. persą. mi. : per są. mi. 'ATFR	ac.ft. Conservat		ft. ac. ft.
Volum Acre f Inches OF W	ie it. per sq. mi. g per sq. mi. (ATER	ac. ft.		ft. ac. ft.

MEN HAMPSHIRE WATER RESOURCES BOARD INVENDORY OF DAMS AND WALLER POWER DEVELOPMENTS -<u>781</u> Ocean Lorell's Lake Wakefield I Ju Gravity - Bouklars Earth Concrete on Earth 5 PSco. * 2180 2560 ALL APER ELEVIUS G.S. LOCAL GAGE SPILLIAT LENGTHS-FT. *Mag* FREEBOARD-FT. TACHEGAR D-OVFE, INFORT ABOVE ONDOT MACHEGAR D-OVFE, INFORT ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE MACHEGAR D-OVFE, INFORT ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE ABOVE BEIMARS (Candition Good) Bapth sill gate telow crest from inspectors 75 Into Branch R. Salmon Falls Piscotaque price. says 157 cfs weeks at 5" useful draft FOWER DEVELOPMENT AND C.F.S. ¥779 MATE ich Partic 1 filien NC Utility Mender + here Lorell's Lake is limiter to 0 3 ft draft y Sant 15th by an informal agreement: PSCo 10/2/35 13 - 4

TOWN WAL	KEFIELD			TOWN 6			ATE	584	7.1.
RIVER		· · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u>NO.</u>		<u> NC</u>	<u>).</u>		dy.
STREAM	vells Pornt La fu	4]/ * 							
DRAINAGE	4.69 St. M1.			POND					
				FOUNDATION		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·	
TYPE	avit,			NATURE OF	Earth				·····
MATERIAL OF BO	alders, Earth, C	oncrete			5				-
CONSTRUCTION		···· · ·			······································				
PURPOSE OF DAM	POWER -CONSERVA	TION -BOMESTIC-	RECHEAT	TION-TRANSPOR	TATION-PUEL		-		-
HEIGHTS TOP OF				TOP OF DAM T	0	· · · ·	·····	·	••••
DAM TO PED OF ST	11			SPILLWAY CRE	SIS			• • •	
SPILLWAYS LENGT	· or pair Ga	te opening	51 51.0	h 51.51 wid		LEI		Approx.	260'
FLASHBOARDS	- <u>or bar</u> -46		ur migi	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	e		<u>UAM</u>		
-	E GRES (· ·		·	•
OPERATING HEAD				TOP OF FLASH	BOARDS		• • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3
CREST TO N T W				1 TO N. T. W.					
WHEELS NUMBER							e - Ne		1 .m
SENERATORS NUM	ÐF8						<u></u>		•••••
KINDS & K W									•
H P 93 P C TIME				H. P. 75 P. C. 1	TIME				
100 P.C. EFF		·····		100 P. C. EFF.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·		·
REFERENCES, CASE PLANS INSPECTION							• •		· · ·
REMARKS		ndition f	air						
	00	THE AREA TON T	1. A al al						
				•					
	Service Co. of			CONTRACTOR			. NO	».	218
	Service Co. of anthester, N. H. Received			CONTRACTOR	$\mathbf{}$, NO		216
DWNER	anchester, N. H.				^				211.
	anchester, N. H.				·				211.
DWNER	anchester, N. H.				· ·				21 <i>I</i> .
PPLICATION	an hester, N. H.		11	NVESTIGATED BY	•	SAFETY			211.
DAM IMPROVEDUC	An hoster, N. H.	ú		NVESTIGATED BY	•	SAFETY			217
DAM IMPROVEDUC	an hester, N. H.	ú		NVESTIGATED BY	•	SAFETY			211.
DAM IMPROVEDUC	An hoster, N. H.	ú	11	NVESTIGATED BY	•	SAFETY			211.
DAM IMPROVEGUE O	An hoster, N. H. RECEIVED	ú	11	NVESTIGATED BY BE A MENACE TO YES	•	SAFETY	DAT		211.
DAM IMPROVESULE C	An hoster, N. H. RECEIVED	ú	11	NVESTIGATED BY BE A MENACE TO YES	•	SAFETY	DAT		211.
DAM IMPROVEGUE O	An hoster, N. H. RECEIVED	ن 218, SECTS 15-2	11 267	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC		DAT		211.
DAM IMPROVESULE C	An hoster, N. H. RECEIVED	ن 218, SECTS 15-2	11 267	NVESTIGATED BY BE A MENACE TO YES	THE PUBLIC		DAT		211.
DAM IMPROVESULE C	An hoster, N. H. RECEIVED	ن 218, SECTS 15-2	11 267	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC		DAT	TE.	211
DAM IMPROVESULE C	AR HOLTED IT FOR	ن 218, SECTS 15-2	11 2 6 7	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC		DAT		211.
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AREALISTER H. H. RECEIVED	й 218, SECTS 15-2	11 2 6 7	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC		DAT	TE.	211.
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLTED IT FOR	Ú 218. SECTS 15.2 SSOCH	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC		DAT	TE.	211.
DAM IMPROVESULE C DAM IMPROVESULE C DAM SUBJELTION LAND & PECIFICATIONS	AREALISTER H. H. RECEIVED	Ú 218. SECTS 15.2 SSOCH	11	NVESTIGATED BY BE A MENACE TO YES CHECKED BY COMMISSION CO CHARGES	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AREALISTER H. H. RECEIVED	Ú 218. SECTS 15.2 SSOCH	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC			TE.	
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			
DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM IMPROMENCE OF DAM SUBJECTION CAM SUBJECTIONS	AR HOLE N H. H.	С 218, SECTS 15-2 55-СМ У US DAM	11	NVESTIGATED BY	THE PUBLIC	NSPECTOR			

		CALCULATION SHEET	Date Mude By	
。 1 2 2	Sz.ad		····	
		2222 20000		
La Cristin L	10-21	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
		1100070000 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		•
	• •			

$\mathrm{Tow}_{B}(\mathbb{N})=\hat{O}$. Town . Wekefield	No
Data by	U.D.Q.C.	File
Owner - Airea	at Halls Lanufacturing	Company
River of Stream	Lovells Pond Outlet	(
Public Utility In	Part Drainage area	
Wheel Capacity H. I	P { Primary H. { 90% time	P. (
Type of Construction	n	nrete
Height 10	ft. Operating Head	Storageft.
Length 120 ft	. Spalevay Length (No. 1)	ft. (No. 2)
Would Failure of D.	am do Harm?Yes	········
Present Condition 1875 1875	Good Good	. Date 1922 1925

B**-**7

SURVEYS. PLANS AND ESTIMATES MADE FOR DAMS. PULP AND PAPER MILLS. ELECTRIC POWER PLANTS. ETC.

I W. JONES, PRESIDENT TREASURER AND GENERAL MGR

I. W. JONES & CO.

ENGINEERS AND DESIGNERS OF WATER POWER PLANTS

MILTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE December 16, 1920.

TELEPHONE CONNECT

Public Service Commission, Atten. John F. Storrs, C.E. Concord, N.H.

Gentlemen:-

Yesterday I visited the outlet of Lovell Lake in Sambornville, which was the first opporturity I have had since writing you on December 9th., and made a careful examination of the conditions existing there.

I found that there is no spillway in connection with the dam and the only means of drawing off the water is through a waste gate opening 5'0" X 5'0". The distance from the bottom of the discharge flume to the top of the concrete work is approximately 11'0"; therefore, the center of the gate opening is 3'6" below the top of the concrete wall. The iron pins cast into the sides of the intake walls, presumably limiting the legal height to which the water may be carried, is approximately 16" from the top of the concrete walls, resulting in a depth from the iron pins to center of gate opening of approximately 7'2". I found the water surface today to be 2" above the iron pins, and the gate was then raised about one ft. which appeared to be taking care of the present flow, which must be far above the

I am enclosing a blue print of sketch which I have prepared. which fairly shows the conditions at the outlet, on a scale of 3/32 inch. to a foot. This sketch doesenot hold true to scale in all respects as the width of pond was simply estimated. On this print at the point marked "low", I found the surface of the water to be within S^a of the top of the embankment. This condition, however. extends only for a short distance, possibly 20°, beyond which the banks are fully as high as the surface of the concrete walls shown. I find by computing the drainage area tributary to Loyell Lake, from the best map which I possess, to be 5.6 sq. miles, and have computed the discharge of the mastemate, assuming the surface of the labe to be 4" below the top of the concrete walls, to be approximately The control of this gate 65 cubic feet per second. is in charge of Mr. James Young, who is employed by the Great Falls Manufacturing Company. Mr. Young has a garage located adjacent to the dam, and it is presumed that he has a telephone connection with his company, and acts upon their orders. I have no doubt that in case of Mr. Young's disability the Great Falls Manufacturing Company would arrange for a substitute. Λ similar condition exists here at the main dam in Milton, where flashboards are maintained to the extreme legal height to which the water may rise and the control of the flashboards is dependent upon the care of the operator.

In the case of Lovell Lake, my judgment is that if the pond should over-flow by neglect of the operator that no great damage would be done, although there might be some inconvenience to the

B-9

÷2

public by reason of over-flowing the road.

I trust that the sketch submitted, and the above description will give you the information which you desire. If this is not so, and you desire further information, I shall be glad to serve you upon request.

Very truly yours,

B-10

Copy: Office.







*

.

.



APPENDIX C

PHOTOGRAPHS

5

•

; :

. 1,

I

•

I

.





N.

Figure 4 - Looking at the downstream face of the dam.



Figure 5 - Looking at the low point in the south exbankment. Note the erosion near the water's edge and the bare patches of ground along the crest.

····?

REPRODUCED AT COVERNMENT EXPENSE



Figure 2 - Looking northwest at the upstream face of the dam.



Figure 3 - Looking southwest at the upstream face of the dam.

REPRODUCED AT COVERNMENT EXPLOSE

٠.

.

٠. .



Figure 6 - Looking upstream at the reservoir and the beach near the south ibuttent.



Figure 7 - Looking north along Route 199. The downstream face of the during misible at the extreme right edge of the photonote the respace in the volume to the nearest telephone pole.

HERODICED VI COAFHAWERS



Figure 8 - Seepage just downstream of the south embankment.



Figure 9 - Crack in the upstream concrete furite. There are similar cracks every 4 to 6 tect.

c = 4

Полиника тизиния та сулиниения



Figure 10 - North end of south stoplog spillway. Note the rocks at the base of the spillway.



Figure 1 - Looking upstream at the concrete overflow spillway.

(-5

----- REPHONNERS ------



Figure 12 - Looking downstream at the entrance to the outlet channel.



.

Figure 13 - Looking upstream at the base of the storage shed. Note the erosion along both sides of the shed.

C-6



Figure 14 - Looking from the storage shed at the channel downstream of Route 109.

APPENDIX D HYDROLOGY/HYDRAULICS

E

1

6



	_	
H H LOVELL LAKE	1/14	
HYDLOUGY	6/29/78 Bo	
LOVELL LAKE	× ×	
STEP 1: PROBABLE MAXIMUM FLOOD DETERMINATION	(PMF)	
RE: PRELIMINARY GUIDANCE FOR ELTIM MAXIMUM PROBABLE DISCHARGES IN DAM SAFETY INVESTIGATIONS, NED MARCH 1978	V PANSE	I. • •
USING FLAT & COASTAL CURVE TO DETE PMF PEAK INFLOW	RMINE	• •
DA = 4.7 sq miles CWRB G DA = 4.7 sq miles CWRB G DA = 4.4 sq miles CWRB G DA = 4.58 sq miles CWRB G DA = 4.58 sq miles CWRB	0) 4) 52) 58) 39) 35) 74) 78)	
USING DA= 4,9 sq miles		
PMF= 800 cfs/sq mike		-
PMF = 800 cfs/sq mile × 4,9 sq mile	es	
PMF = 3920 cfs		
D-2		

$$(14)$$
LOVELL LAKE
HYDROLOGY & HYDRAULICS
$$(14)$$
DHF = 3920 cfs = PP_1
STAGE = 573.3 MSL (See RAVING CURVE)
$$(20)$$
 (20) 573.3 SUDR = 4050 AF { SEE STORAGE CURVE}
 (20) 570.0 SUDR = 2000 AF { SEE STORAGE CURVE}
 (20) 570.0 SUDR = 2000 AF { SEE STORAGE CURVE}
 (20) 570.0 SUDR = 2000 AF { SEE STORAGE CURVE}
 (20) 60.654 $\times 1/4.9$ sq miles $\times 1/(40) = 0.654$
 $O(664) = 7.8$ OF CHARGE = SUDE, = 2050 AF
 $O(664) = 7.8$ OF CHARGE OF SUBCHARGE CURVE DUER BASIN
 (20) $OP_2 = OP_1 \times (1 - \frac{500}{19}) = 3920 \times (1 - \frac{7.8}{19})$
 $OP_2 = 2310$ cfs
 (20) FROM EATHING CURVE ; STAGE (20) 2310 cfs = 572.5
 $PP_2 = 2310$ cfs
 (20) 572.5 STOR = 3550 AF { PROM SUDRAGE CURVE
 (20) 570.0 STOR = 2000 AF { CHARGE SUBCHARGE CURVE
 (20) 570.0 STOR = 2000 AF { CHARGE SUBCHARGE CURVE
 (20) 500 AF $\times 1/4.9$ sq miles $\times \frac{1}{640} = 0.4914$
 $O.4944 = 5.9$ OF RUNDEF OVER BASIN
 (3) STOR = 7.8^H { AVE STOR = 6.85^H}
 (30) STOR = 7.8^H { AVE STOR = 6.85^H}
 (30) STOR = 1790 + 2000 $\times 7190$ AF

ł Į

FROM STORAGE CURVE: STAGE @ 3790AF = 572,9

3/12

FROM RATING CURVE: $Q \otimes 572.9 = 3050 \text{ cfs}$

9P3 = PMF = 3050 ds @ 572.9

Which AGRINET 1/2 PMF = 1525 cfs

SINGE @ 1525 cfs = 572.16 2 572.2



. **....**

•

5/4
INVALUE LAKE
INVALUE COMPUTATIONS
(NO B)[78
3141-01
RATING CURLE DHITH
I'll = 3920 cfs
Accompations: soplags @ ELEV 570,0 HSL = FULL POND
RICHAG CURVE DATA
GUING SUPPLOS = CLH^{3/2}

$$C = 2.9$$
 FOR STOPLOSS
 $L = 9XS = 40'$
 $H = 0.3$
 $Q = (2.9)(40)(0.3)^{3/2} = [P] ccs$
 $Q = LOWL FRINT ALONG EFACH VO LEFT OF STRULTURE
 $Q_{VRELVINY} = CLH^{3/2}$
 $C = 2.8$ FOR SUPLOWAY
 $L = 20$
 $H = 0.3$
 $G_{SVIL} = (2.8)(20)(0.3)^{3/2} = 9 ccs$
 $101RL = 54 : 9 = [0.5 cci]$$

.

.

...

6/14

$$f(z, z) = (36) (0.11)^{1/2} = 85$$

$$(z, z) = (23) (0.3)^{1/2} = 2 = 12$$

$$(z, z) = (25) (0.1)^{1/2} = 2 = 10$$

$$(z, z) = (25) (0.4)^{1/2} = 10$$

$$(z, z) = (25) (0.3)^{1/2} = 7$$

$$(z, z) = (79) (0.1)^{3/2} = 7$$

$$(z, z) = (79) (0.1)^{3/2} = 7$$

$$(z, z) = (79) (0.1)^{3/2} = 7$$

$$(z, z) = (23) (23)^{1/2} = 94$$

$$280 + 103 + 171 + 100 + 27 + 94 = (775 cs)$$

$$(26) = 20 H CRETE = WALWAY$$

$$H BHC ELEBATION, SIDELOS BAY CHTING ACE LIFE
HAREL UTRELK PREPORT FLOW
$$Urre = CA \sqrt{2gh} \quad K = \frac{1}{2} \quad K_{p} = \frac{(29,1)(x^{2})(L)}{p^{4/3}}$$

$$M = (2.8)(20)(2.0)^{3/2} \quad R = \frac{1/2}{0^{2} (3 - 0)^{2}}$$

$$= 158 cs \quad K_{p} = \frac{(24,1)(0.05)^{2}(0.23)}{(0.6x)^{4/2}}$$

$$K_{p} = 0.003$$

$$contack = 0xT = 1.1$$

$$VOTALK = 1.1 \pm 1$$

$$K = \frac{1}{c^{2}} = 1.1$$

$$VOTALK = 1.1 \pm 1$$

$$K = \frac{1}{c^{2}} = 1.1$$$$

 $\Phi_{\text{Fight}} = (2.7)(61)(1.5)^{3/2} + (2.7)(55)(1.2)^{3/2} = 498$ $\Pi Q_{LEFT} = 100$ $Q_{uerv_2} = (81)(2.7)(0.2)^{3/2} + 20 = 40$ $P_{\text{LHE}} = (2,7)(215)(0.5)^{3/2} + (2,7)(224)(0.3)^{3/2} = 305$ $Q_{U11_{4}} = (2.7)(109)(0.4)^{3/2} = 74$ YOYAL \$ 9572,3 = 716+158+498+100+40+305+74 = 1891 cfs '**®** €€V = 572,6 $Q_{\text{Stop}} = (0,95)(72)(64,4\cdot2.0)^{1/2} = 776$ $\varphi_{SPILL} = 158$ $T_{LEFT} = 100 + 40 + 305 + 74 = 519.$ Quere (2.7)(449)(0.3)3/2 = 199 $Q_{\text{RIGHY}} = (2.7)(70)(1.8)^{3/2} + (2.7)(66)(1.5)^{3/2} = 784$ - 00 - 573.5 $P_{MOP} = (0,05)(72)(64,4\cdot 2.9)^{1/2} = 935$ (PHILLIGHT = 519 + 155 = $(\hat{\varphi}_{+1})_{\text{ER}} = 519 + 155' = 611 [14/16 ...]$ $(\hat{\varphi}_{+1})_{\text{ER}} = 16.7)(458)(1.2)^{3/2} = 1626 [14/16 ...]$ 611 $\frac{7}{2} = \frac{7}{6} + \frac{12}{7} = \frac{7}{6} = \frac{14}{78} = \frac{14}{78}$

a .4 - $(0.95)(72)(64.4 \cdot 2.5)^{1/2} = 868$ - _ EFT = $= (2.7)(453)(0.8)^{3/2} = 875$ 13478 $= 784 + (2.7)(287)(0.5)^{3/2} = 1058$ - . 5,45) (72) (64,4.2,7)^{1/2} = 902 677 4046 - (C)(451)(1.0)^{2/2} = 1218 $(2,7)(294)(0.7)^{3/2} + 784 = 1249$ D-10



CONFLU LAKE CAPACINTES (30 B19/78 Q= CLH ^{-3/2} Q= CLH ^{-3/2} Q= RECREATIONAL POOL = 570.0±

7 BAYS INVERT = 566.25 1 BAY ENVERT = 561.50 $Q = (2.9)(35)(3.75)^{3/2} + (2.9)(5)(8.5)^{3/2}$ $Q = 1096 \text{ cfs} \implies \text{SAY} \quad 1100 \text{ cfs}$ @ MAXIMUM + 100L = 570.6 $Q = (2.9)(35)(4.35)^{3/2} + (2.9)(5)(9.1)^{3/2}$ $Q = 1319 \text{ cfs} \implies \text{SAY} \quad 1320 \text{ cfs}$ 11/14

Sheet Np. 12 Date 8/24/7m 12 or 14 Subject DIS Hazard Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc. Hydroaraph Computed Liwilliams JOBNO. 3141-01 LOVELI LAKE DAM Checked. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 RES 0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 I. SCALE DIS Hazard ANALYSIS - Using maximum pool elevation of 570.6 to determine breach discharge. Storage @ time of failure - 2400 AC-FT D 3+ep Z: Qp1 = 27 Wb 13 43/2 Wb- breach width 7 g= 32.2 ft/sec2 8 To= pool elev. > river bed 9 Q Lovell Lake Dam: 10 W6=130' Yo = 570.6 - 569 = 1.6' 11 From above equation: Q=410 cfs 12 13 Establish rating curve of typical downstream 14 section using road as weir. 15 16 Q-410 cfs - Stage 0.6' 17 18 Hazard Classification based on the above analysis 19 Significant Hozard ⇔∖≲ 20 21 Breach was used along left embonicment. 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 D-13 37 38



LOUGH Lake - D/S Road Culvert Capacity Culvert Data: Reinforced concrete box 1. 65' under road + 15' under gatehouse .. Total length = 80' At inlet: 4.25'H × 8'W -owcuer - 13 through is a restricted opening wated to be 4' × 4' Hiw = Top Rd - low chord = 1.5' Using Hydraulic Charts for the Sclection of Highway Culverts, Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 5, page 5-21. ise 0° wingwolls - assumed due to gradual -ronsition. $H_{W} = 4 + 1.5 = 5.5$ D = 41 $\frac{400}{5} = 1.375$ P/E = 29 cfsQ: = Z9 cfs × 4 = 116 cfs





And the second of the second o

