

AD-A070 715


GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY AND CARPENTER INC HARRISBURG PA F/G 13/2
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM. MAPLE LAKE DAM (NDI-PA-00294) --ETC(U)
JAN 79

DACW31-79-C-0015

NL


UNCLASSIFIED

1 OF 2
ADA
070715



1 OF 2

AD A
070715



LEVEL

B.S.

C

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY

PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID NO. PA-00294

DER ID NO. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

Distribution Unlimited
Approved for Public Release
Contract No. DACW31-79-C-0015 ✓

DDC
PAPERS
JUN 29 1979
ALLEN
[Handwritten signature]

ADA 070715



Prepared by
GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY AND CARPENTER, INC.
Consulting Engineers
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

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

JANUARY 1979

DDC FILE COPY

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

79 06 28 048

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

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

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY

PENNSYLVANIA

⑥ National Dam Inspection Program, Maple Lake Dam (NDI-PA-00294) (DER-35-42), Susquehanna River Basin, Rattlesnake Creek, Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company.

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

DDC
RECEIVED
JUN 29 1979
C

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

⑮ DACW31-79-C-0015

Prepared by

GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY AND CARPENTER, INC.
Consulting Engineers
P.O. Box 1963
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

For

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

⑪ JAN 1979

⑫ 92p.

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

411004

B

79 06 28 048

PREFACE

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

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 frequent inspections can unsafe conditions be detected and only through continued care and maintenance can these conditions be prevented or corrected.

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

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Special	
List	2307

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

CONTENTS

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Brief Assessment of General Condition and Recommended Action	a-1
Overview Photograph.	
SECTION 1 - Project Information.	1
SECTION 2 - Engineering Data	6
SECTION 3 - Visual Inspection.	8
SECTION 4 - Operational Procedures	10
SECTION 5 - Hydrology and Hydraulics	12
SECTION 6 - Structural Stability	16
SECTION 7 - Assessment, Recommendations and Remedial Measures.	18

PLATES

<u>Plate</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Location Map.
2	Embankment - Plan and Section

APPENDICES

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Title</u>
A	Checklist - Engineering Data.
B	Checklist - Visual Inspection.
C	Hydrology and Hydraulics.
D	Photographs
E	Geology.

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

BRIEF ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL CONDITION

AND

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Name of dam: Maple Lake
NDI ID No. PA-00294/DER ID No. 35-42

Owner: Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company

State Located: Pennsylvania

County Located: Lackawanna

Stream: Rattlesnake Creek

Date of Inspection: 9 November 1978

Inspection Team: Gannett Fleming Corddry and Carpenter, Inc.
Consulting Engineers
P.O. Box 1963
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Based on visual inspection, available records, calculations and past operational performance and according to criteria established for these studies, Maple Lake Dam is rated as unsafe because the spillway capacity is seriously inadequate. The dam is in poor condition and the spillway can pass only 42 percent of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) without overtopping of the dam. If the dam should fail, the resulting floodflows would significantly increase tailwater and cause loss of life downstream.

Movement has occurred in the embankment. The downstream toe is bulged and a dry masonry wall at the top of the upstream slope has collapsed with a slide occurring behind it. The embankment cannot be considered to have more than a marginal factor of safety for structural stability.

In view of the concern for the safety of Maple Lake Dam, it is recommended that the Owner immediately perform a hydraulic and hydrologic study to determine the measures necessary to make the spillway hydraulically adequate and perform a structural study to determine the factors of safety for the embankment. It is also recommended that the Owner perform other measures, such as: removing trees and brush from the embankment; monitoring wet areas; installing observation wells; providing a valve pit for the outlet works valve; and ensuring that a plug is available for upstream closure.

In addition, it is recommended that the Owner modify his operational procedures, such as: developing a detailed emergency warning and operation system; providing round-the-clock surveillance of the dam during periods of unusually heavy rains; and activating the emergency operation and warning system when warnings of a storm of major proportions are given.


Submitted by:

GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.

A. C. Hooke

A. C. HOOKE
Head, Dam Section

Date: 9 February 1979



Approved by:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

G. K. Withers

G. K. WITHERS
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

Date: 4 Mar 79

MAPLE LAKE DAM



Overview

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY
PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

SECTION 1

PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 General.

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

b. Purpose. The purpose of the inspection is to determine if the dam constitutes a hazard to human life or property.

1.2 Description of Project.

a. Dam and Appurtenances. ✓ Maple Lake Dam consists of a homogeneous earthfill embankment. The embankment is 490 feet long and 23 feet high at the maximum section. *over*

↙ The spillway is an irregular excavated channel at the right abutment of the dam. An outlet works with a 24-inch diameter cast-iron pipe and a valve at the downstream toe is located near the middle of the embankment. A dike is located about 500 feet right of the embankment. It is 284 feet long and 3 feet high at maximum section. The various features of the dam are shown on the Plates at the end of the report and on the photographs in Appendix D.

b. Location. ↗ The dam is located on Rattlesnake Creek approximately 3.4 miles west of Moscow, Pennsylvania. Maple Lake Dam is shown on USGS Quadrangle, Moscow, Pennsylvania, with coordinates N41°19'35" and W75°35'00" ↖ in Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania. Nesbitt Dam is located downstream of Maple Lake Dam on Spring Brook 2.9 miles west of Maple Lake Reservoir. Rattlesnake Creek flows into Nesbitt Reservoir. A location map is shown on Plate 1.

c. Size Classification. Intermediate (23 feet high, 1,151 acre-feet).

d. Hazard Classification. High hazard. Downstream conditions indicate that a high hazard classification is warranted for Maple Lake Dam (Paragraph 5.1c.).

e. Ownership. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

f. Purpose of Dam. Water supply for the communities of Avoca, Duryea, Kingston, Moosic, Old Forge, Pittston, West Pittston, and Wyoming, Pennsylvania.

g. Design and Construction History. Maple Lake Dam was built in 1893 by the Spring Brook Water Company under the general direction of G.F. Anthony, the company superintendent. The dry masonry wall at the top of the upstream embankment slope was constructed between 1893 and 1914. It was reportedly built to reduce wave erosion on the embankment. The dike was constructed in 1923. Between 1927 and 1953, the Owner was repeatedly requested by the Pennsylvania Water Power Commission to increase the spillway capacity and repair the embankment. The owner delayed the work repeatedly, and it was never accomplished.

h. Normal Operational Procedure. The pool is maintained at spillway crest with excess inflow discharging over the spillway. Releases from the outlet works, as well as spillway discharges, flow downstream to Nesbitt Dam.

1.3 Pertinent Data.

a. Drainage Area. 1.0 square miles. (1)

b. Discharge at Damsite. (cfs.)

Maximum known flood at damsite - unknown

Outlet works at maximum pool elevation -
70 (approximate).

Spillway capacity at maximum pool elevation -
500 (existing conditions)

c. Elevation. (2) (Feet above msl.)

Top of dam (design) - 1619.4

Top of dam (Existing) - 1617.4

Top of dike (design) - 1616.3 (approximate)

Top of dike (existing) - 1615.9

Maximum pool - 1617.4

Normal pool - 1613.0

(1) PennDER records show 1.1 square miles. GFCC computed the drainage area and found it to be 1.0 square miles.

(2) An approximate datum for elevations was taken from the reservoir level on the USGS Quadrangle. The datum used on the Owner's drawings is Elevation 100.0. The equivalence is Elevation 1613.0 (USGS) equals Elevation 95.8 (Drawings).

c. Elevation. (cont'd).

Upstream invert outlet works - Not Available

Downstream invert outlet works -
1596.2 (Approximate)

Streambed at centerline of dam - 1596.2

d. Reservoir Length. (Miles.)

Normal pool - 0.50

Maximum pool - 0.55

e. Storage. (Acre-feet.)

Natural Pond - 3

Normal pool (spillway crest) - 657

Maximum pool (top of dam) - 1,151 (existing
conditions - excluding dike).

f. Reservoir Surface. (Acres.)

Natural Pond - 3

Normal pool (spillway crest) - 99

Maximum pool (top of dam) - 126
(Existing Conditions - excluding dike).

g. Dam.

Type - Earthfill

Length - Embankment - 490 feet
Dike - 284 feet

Height - Embankment - 23 feet
Dike - 3 feet

Top Width - Embankment - 15 feet. (design)
Dike - 10 feet.

Side Slopes - Upstream - Embankment - 1V on 2H
Dike - 1V on 3H
Downstream - Embankment - 1V on 2H
Dike - 1V on 3H

Zoning - Homogeneous earthfill.

Cutoff - Unknown.

Grout Curtain - None.

h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel. None.

i. Spillway.

Type - Excavated channel with control section.

Length of Weir - None.

Crest Elevation - 1613.0 (Approximate)

Upstream Channel - Reservoir.

Downstream Channel - Variable bottom width
channel which deflects left to stream
about 70 feet downstream of the outlet
works.

j. Regulating Outlets.

Type - Cast-iron-pipe - 24-inch diameter.

Length - 70 feet (approximate)

Closure - Gate valve at downstream toe.

Access - To valve stem only.

SECTION 2

ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design.

a. Data Available. No engineering data was available for review for the structure as originally designed. In a study performed in 1914 by the Pennsylvania Water Supply Commission, an account of design concepts, geology, construction materials and methods, and design features was prepared for the components of the dam from interviews with the Owner, visual inspection, and other sources. The data in the report is limited. The 1914 study also included analyses for hydrology and hydraulics. A summary of the results of the analyses is on file. No engineering data for the construction of the dike was available for review.

b. Design Features. The project is described in Paragraph 1.2g. The various features of the dam are shown on Plate 2 and on the Photographs in Appendix D. Plate 2 was drawn from a survey apparently performed in 1953. It cannot be considered a design drawing. The Owner did not have any drawings for the dike. Survey data acquired for this inspection is presented in Appendix B. An attempt was made to duplicate the datum shown on Plate 2. As no permanent benchmarks could be located, it is uncertain that the same datum was used.

c. Design Considerations. In one of the periodic inspections by the Commonwealth, the inspector expressed the belief that a core wall was constructed in the embankment. No other data was available to confirm this.

2.2 Construction.

a. Data Available. Construction data for the original structure that is available for review, consists of the information contained in the 1914 report prepared by the Pennsylvania Water Supply Commission. Information in the 1914 report is limited; it consists solely of the statement that "The embankments are said to have been constructed of selected clay material

resting upon foundations from which loose rock and vegetable matter were removed." No data was available pertinent to construction of the dike.

b. Construction Considerations. Since the available construction data is limited, construction methods cannot be assessed.

2.3 Operation. No formal records of operation were reviewed. The Owner did not report any problems having occurred over the operational history of the dam.

2.4 Evaluation.

a. Availability. Engineering data was provided by the Division of Dams and Encroachments, Bureau of Water Quality Management, Department of Environmental Resources, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and by the Owner, Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company. The Owner made available an engineer for information during the visual inspection. The Owner also researched his files for additional information at the request of the inspection team.

b. Adequacy. The type and amount of design data and other engineering data are very limited, and the assessment must be based on the combination of available data, visual inspection, performance history, hydrologic assumptions, and hydraulic assumptions.

c. Validity. There is no reason to question the validity of the available data.

SECTION 3
VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Findings

a. General. The overall appearance of the dam is poor. Deficiencies were observed as noted below. A sketch of the dam with the location of some deficiencies is presented in Appendix B on Plate B-1. Survey information acquired for this report is summarized in Appendix B. On the day of the inspection, the pool was 1.4 feet below spillway crest.

b. Embankment. The embankment is in poor condition. Heavy brush and small trees cover the top of the embankment and the downstream slope. Newly fallen leaves covered this area on the day of the inspection. Details of the embankment were obscured. The downstream slope was 1V on 1.8H, as noted in the survey information in Appendix B. Bulges that are about 1 foot high extend along part of the downstream toe. As noted in paragraph 1.2g, a vertical dry masonry wall was constructed at the top of the upstream slope. This wall is bulged severely and collapsed in many areas. The soil behind this wall has slid. The combination of wall movement and earth movement extends over at least 50 percent of the length of the embankment. There is evidence of recent movement; some areas of soil at the top of the slide area have bare soil, with no grass growing therein. Because of the movement, the existing topwidth of the dam is about 4 feet. A sketch of the section where movement has occurred is presented in Appendix B. A profile along the top of the embankment is also presented in Appendix B. The profile is uneven. No design data was available concerning the design top elevation. A discussion of the design top elevation is presented in Section 5. Wet areas and standing water were observed downstream of the toe. All these areas have poor natural drainage.

The dike is covered with trees and brush. The downstream toe of the dike terminates at a swamp. On the day of the inspection, the elevation of the standing

water in the swamp was higher than the pool elevation. The elevation of the top of the dike is about 1 foot below the elevation of the top of the embankment. A profile and a section are shown in Appendix B. A positive drainage path from the swamp to Rattlesnake Creek was not observed, as the swamp is heavily overgrown.

c. Appurtenant Structures. The spillway is in poor condition. The spillway control section is poorly defined. The timber spillway weir is rotted and collapsed. The spillway outlet channel is severely eroded, especially along the right bank. There is also some debris in the channel. The outlet works is in good condition; however, most of the outlet works could not be viewed. The operating platform was constructed with dry masonry, which abut the embankment on 3 sides. On the day of the inspection, the outlet works valve was partially open; water was being released into Rattlesnake Creek. The end of the pipe is beneath the dry masonry operating floor ledge. The end of the pipe could not be inspected or measured. The valve stem protrudes through the operating floor. There did not appear to be any means of access to the valve without removing the dry masonry operating floor.

d. Reservoir Area. About 50 percent of the watershed is very flat, swampy, and wooded. This portion is owned and controlled by the Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company. The other 50 percent is rolling hills, with farm fields and sparse suburban development. The access road to the dam extends along the left shore of the reservoir.

e. Downstream Conditions. Immediately downstream of the dam, the stream has steep wooded banks. There is a minor amount of small debris in the channel. The stream flows for 4.0 miles in a steep channel to Nesbitt Reservoir. In the above reach, there are two homes that would definitely be flooded by failure flows from Maple Lake Dam. There are other homes that would probably be flooded in the above reach.

SECTION 4

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Procedure. The reservoir is maintained at spillway crest, Elevation 1613.0, with excess inflow discharging over the spillway and into Rattlesnake Creek. Rattlesnake Creek flows into Spring Brook, at Nesbitt Reservoir 4.0 stream miles downstream. A 24-inch diameter cast-iron water supply line discharges into Rattlesnake Creek, which flows into Spring Brook at Nesbitt Reservoir. Since streamflow is usually augmented only when Nesbitt Reservoir is below spillway crest elevation, the valve on the Maple Lake water supply line is usually closed.

4.2 Maintenance of Dam. The dam is visited daily by two caretakers who record the reservoir elevation. Weekly reports are mailed to the Owner's Engineering Department. This information is used by the Owner's Engineering Department for regulating flows in the distribution system. The caretakers are also responsible for observing the general condition of the dam and appurtenant structures and reporting any changes or deficiencies to the Owner's Engineering Department. A Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company engineer makes a formal inspection of the dam each year, and the records are filed and used for determining priority of repairs. Informal inspections are also made when the engineer is on the site for other reasons.

4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities. Access to the valve, other than the valve stem, appeared impossible. Apparently, there is no regular maintenance schedule, but maintenance of items is performed when deemed necessary. In response to the dam inspection program of the previous year, the Owner is in the process of modifying his maintenance procedures. Details of the program have not been fully formulated.

4.4 Warning Systems in Effect. The Owner furnished the inspection team with a verbal description of the chain of command diagram for Maple Lake Dam and of a generalized emergency notification list that is applicable

for all of the Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company dams. The Owner said that during periods of heavy rainfall, available personnel are dispatched to the dams to observe conditions. All company vehicles are equipped with radios, and the personnel can communicate with each other and with a central control facility. Evaluation of risk is made by the Owner's Engineering Department. The Owner's Engineering Department is also responsible for notification of emergency conditions to the local authorities. Detailed emergency operational procedures have not been formally established for Maple Lake Dam, but are as directed by the Owner's Engineering Department.

4.5 Evaluation Of Operational Adequacy. The operational procedures appear satisfactory. However, in order to ensure proper operation, the valve on the outlet pipe should be fully opened and closed at least once a year. The maintenance of the embankment and dike is poor. The procedures used by the Owner for inspecting the dam are adequate, but needed repairs have not been made. In general, the warning system is adequate, but it would be more effective if it were more detailed.

SECTION 5

HYDRAULICS AND HYDROLOGY

5.1 Evaluation of Features

a. Design Data. No design data was available for review. During 1914, a report on the dam was prepared by the Pennsylvania Water Supply Commission. The report estimated the maximum spillway capacity at 330 cfs. This was determined with a 5-foot head and a top width of 60 feet at the control section of the spillway. The estimate of discharge capacity was qualified as being difficult to determine. The discharge capacity used in the Report is not entirely compatible with the above-noted 5-foot head and 60-foot top width. A discharge capacity of 500 cfs, with the embankment at its existing elevation as discussed hereafter, was estimated (Appendix C). The 1914 Report notes the existence of the low area where the dike is presently located. The Report states that the area is 2.5 feet below the top of embankment and that the area would act as an auxiliary spillway. No discharge capacity was estimated for this area in the Report.

b. Experience Data. No hydraulic or hydrologic problems were reported by the Owner. He stated that no records of maximum pool levels were available.

c. Visual Observations

(1) General. The visual inspection of Maple Lake Dam, which is described in Section 3, resulted in a number of observations relevant to hydraulics and hydrology. These observations are evaluated herein for the various features.

(2) Embankment. The design elevation of the top of the embankment was selected by estimating the design elevation from the existing profile (Appendix B). Most of the embankment is lower than the design elevation. At the right end of the embankment, the top elevation is substantially lower. In this area, the top slopes downward towards the spillway. The existing top elevation of

the embankment was selected as that elevation where it was estimated that discharges in the spillway would overtop the spillway channel and start flowing along the toe of the embankment. This would create an erosion hazard. Due to the nature of the topography, this elevation is difficult to estimate.

The top of the dike is more than 1 foot lower than the existing top of the embankment. The dike would act as an emergency spillway. However, the brush and trees on the dike would retard discharges over it. Since the outlet of the swamp at the downstream toe could not be observed, it is not known if a backwater effect from the swamp would reduce discharges over the dike.

(3) Appurtenant Structures. Conditions at the spillway make its discharge capacity difficult to estimate. The discharge capacity is limited by the erosion potential along the toe of the embankment, as noted herein. The erosion observed at the right bank of the spillway channel does not threaten the embankment and is not considered a deficiency. The erosion along the left bank could eventually threaten the embankment. The debris observed in the channel could cause overtopping of the banks and allow water to flow along the toe of the embankment.

The outlet works pipe extends under pressure through the embankment. The Owner stated that various size plugs and an in-house diving capability are available to plug the line upstream. However, the Owner did not know if the correct size plug was available. If it is available, then the closure facilities are deemed adequate.

(4) Reservoir Area. No conditions were observed in the reservoir area that might present significant hazard to the dam. The assessment of the dam is based on existing conditions and the effects of future development are not considered. Access to the dam is adequate.

(5) Downstream Conditions. No conditions were observed downstream from the dam that might present significant hazard to the dam. A Phase I Report for the

National Dam Inspection Program was previously prepared for Nesbitt Dam. In that report, the spillway of Nesbitt Dam was rated as seriously inadequate. Because failure of Maple Lake Dam could cause failure of Nesbitt Dam during certain conditions and because there are residences downstream of Maple Lake Dam that would be flooded by its failure, a high hazard classification is warranted for Maple Lake Dam.

d. Overtopping Potential

(1) Spillway Design Flood. According to the criteria established by the Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE), the spillway design flood (SDF) for the size (Intermediate) and hazard potential (High) of Maple Lake Dam is the probable maximum flood (PMF).

(2) Description of Model. The watershed was modelled with the HEC-IDB computer program. The HEC-IDB computer program computes a PMF runoff hydrograph and routes the flows through both reservoirs and stream sections. In addition, it has the capability to simulate an overtopping dam failure. The PMF inflow to Maple Lake was routed through the dam. The outflow from the dam was routed downstream to Nesbitt Reservoir and through Nesbitt Dam. It was assumed that no runoff occurred downstream of Maple Lake Dam. Identical methods were used for various percentages of the PMF.

(3) Summary of Results. The following table summarizes the results. Selected parts of the program output are in Appendix C. The total PMF rainfall is 24.9 inches.

	<u>PMF</u>	<u>1/2 PMF</u>
Total Runoff (inches)	22.8	11.4
Inflow to Maple Lake Dam (cfs)	3656	1828
Outflow from Maple Lake Dam (cfs)	2411	578
Depth of Overtopping Maple Lake Dam (feet)	1.69	0.44
Inflow to Nesbitt Dam (cfs)	2351	566
Outflow from Nesbitt Dam (cfs)	1822	387

Nesbitt Dam would not be overtopped by the PMF occurring over the Maple Lake watershed. The existing spillway can pass 42 percent of the PMF without the overtopping of the dike.

(4) Spillway Adequacy. The criteria for rating a spillway is presented in Appendix C. The dike at Maple Lake Dam would be overtopped by 0.44 foot during the 1/2 PMF. The dike was assumed to fail over a 70-foot long breach 0.1 hour after it would be overtopped by 0.2 foot. The breach was only assumed to extend down 3.4 feet. A breach of this size will raise the stream depth by 2.8 feet at a dwelling located near the stream. This would significantly increase the hazard to loss of life downstream from the dam. Nesbitt Dam would not be overtopped by the failure of Maple Lake Dam, considering that no other inflow occurs to Nesbitt Dam. The spillway capacity of Maple Lake Dam is rated as seriously inadequate.

SECTION 6

STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability.

a. Visual Observations.

(1) General. The visual inspection of Maple Lake Dam, which is described in Section 3, resulted in a number of observations relevant to structural stability. These observations are evaluated herein for the various features.

(2) Embankment. Brush and trees on the embankment slopes or at the toe are undesirable. The failure of the dry masonry wall and the accompanied embankment slide at the top of the dam along the upstream slope is of major concern. The embankment sliding behind the wall indicates that the failure of the wall was a shear type failure. The slide surface is relatively fresh in some areas indicating that movement was relatively recent. It was not possible to determine if the failure was a shallow shear failure or a deep-seated shear failure, however, the failure appeared to be a shallow shear failure. Because of the slide in some areas, the top width of the embankment is only about 4 feet wide. Where the dry masonry wall failed, there is no upstream slope protection at the top of the dam. A review of photographs in the PennDER files shows that the top of dam was approximately level in 1914. Subsequent photographs and Plate 2 show that failure of the dry masonry wall and accompanied embankment failure has been occurring over an extended period. The downstream slope is steeper than the design slope listed in the Pennsylvania Water Supply Commission Report of 1914. The steep downstream slope may be related to the bulges observed at the toe. It was not possible to determine if the wet areas and seepage at the downstream toe of the slope were related to seepage from the embankment or to poor surface drainage.

Brush and trees on the dike are undesirable. The uneven top elevations on the dike are probably caused by poor construction practice.

(3) Appurtenant Structures. No conditions relevant to structural stability were observed at the spillway.

Access to the pipe and valve of the outlet works is impossible without removing the dry masonry operating floor.

b. Design and Construction Data. No record of design data or stability analysis was available for review. Furthermore, almost nothing is known about the embankment or its foundation. Analysis of the embankment stability is beyond the scope of this study. Also, sufficient data on the engineering properties of the embankment material would have to be acquired before the analysis could be performed.

The embankment cannot be considered to have more than a marginal factor or safety for structural stability due to the observed deficiencies and the uncertain nature and condition of its interior composition.

c. Operating Records. No formal records of operation were reviewed. Evidence of some instability on the embankment was noted in the periodic inspections performed by the Commonwealth.

d. Postconstruction Changes. As noted herein, there is sufficient information available on all modifications made to Maple Lake Dam, such that its stability can be assessed.

e. Seismic Stability. Maple Lake Dam is located in Seismic Zone 1. Normally it can be considered that if a dam in this zone has adequate factors of safety under static loading conditions, it can be assumed safe for any expected earthquake loading. However, since there are no formal static stability analyses, the theoretical seismic stability of Maple Lake Dam cannot be assessed.

SECTION 7
ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND
PROPOSED REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 Dam Assessment

a. Safety.

(1) Based on the visual inspection, available records, calculations, and past operational performance, Maple Lake Dam is judged to be in poor condition. The existing spillway will pass only 42 percent of the PMF without overtopping of the dam. The failure of the dam will cause a significant increase in tailwater downstream. The spillway is rated as seriously inadequate. According to criteria established for these studies by OCE, the dam must be classified as unsafe because the spillway capacity is seriously inadequate.

(2) There is no formal stability analysis available for Maple Lake Dam. There is evidence of problems such as failure of the dry masonry wall and its retained fill at the top of dam and bulges at the toe. The embankment cannot be considered to have more than a marginal factor of safety for structural stability.

(3) The visual inspection resulted in some deficiencies, which are summarized below for the various features.

<u>Feature and Location</u>	<u>Observed Deficiencies</u>
<u>Embankment:</u>	
Slopes	Trees and brush
Upstream slope	Wall failure and resultant slide
Top	Below design elevation
Downstream toe	Bulges, wet areas, and brush

<u>Feature and Location</u>	<u>Observed Deficiencies</u>
<u>Dike</u>	Trees and brush
<u>Spillway:</u> Outlet channel	Brush and trees, poorly defined section, and erosion hazard
<u>Outlet Works:</u> Closure facilities	Uncertain availability
Valve	No access to valve

b. Adequacy of Information. The information available is such that an assessment of the condition of the dam can be inferred from the combination of visual inspection, past performance, and computations performed prior to and as part of this study.

c. Urgency. The recommendations in Paragraph 7.2 should be implemented immediately.

d. Necessity for Further Investigations. In order to accomplish some of the remedial measures outlined in Paragraph 7.2, further investigations by the Owner will be required.

7.2 Recommendations and Remedial Measures.

a. In view of the concern for safety of Maple Lake Dam, the following measures are recommended to be undertaken by the Owner, in approximate order of priority, immediately:

(1) Perform additional studies to determine the extent of movement of the embankment and to ascertain the structural factors of safety for the embankment. In this regard, additional investigations will be necessary to determine the engineering soil properties of the embankment and the foundation, as well as the location of the water level in the embankment. The latter may be accomplished with the observation wells recommended below. Take remedial measures as required to restore the embankment to either its original template or a more suitable template.

(2) Perform additional studies to more accurately ascertain the spillway capacity required for Maple Lake Dam as well as the nature and extent of mitigation measures required to make the spillway hydraulically adequate and to remove the erosion hazard. Designing the dike to be overtopped may be a suitable approach, but the spillway should be provided with a weir and the spillway channel should be protected against erosion.

(3) Remove brush and trees that are in the spillway outlet channel and that are on or near the embankment and dike. When the brush and trees are removed, the embankment should be inspected on a regular basis to check for wet areas or seepage.

(4) Provide a valve pit for the outlet works valve.

(5) Install six or more observation wells, or other instrumentation, downstream of the axis of the embankment. One well, or other instrumentation, should be located in the vicinity of each of both the two wet areas and the seepage area. The others should be at appropriate locations to determine general water levels in the downstream embankment. Data collected from observation wells or other instrumentation should be utilized in evaluating the stability of the structures and assessing piping potential. The area along the downstream toe should be graded to provide positive drainage. Continue to observe wet areas and seepage downstream of the embankment. If conditions worsen, appropriate action should be taken to control apparent seepage with properly designed drains.

(6) Ensure that proper plugs are available for upstream closure facilities on the outlet works pipe.

b. In addition, it is recommended that the Owner modify his operational procedures as follows:

(1) Develop a detailed emergency operation and warning system for Maple Lake Dam.

(2) Provide round-the-clock surveillance of Maple Lake Dam during periods of unusually heavy rains.

(3) When warnings of a storm of major proportions are given by the National Weather Service, the Owner should activate his emergency operation and warning system procedures.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM


NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

PLATES



NOTE - WATER STARTS SPILLING AT ELEV. 95.8
DUE TO SECTION OF 2" SHEATHING BROKEN OFF

0-40 Iron Pin
Elev 101.02

0-01 Iron Pin
Elev 100.97

95.8 SPILLWAY ELEV. 96.5
2" TFG VERTICAL SHEATHING

1+00

100

0+00

99

98

97

100

BM
Elev 100


BASE


99

98


BASE
LINE


97





imate Location Of 24"-16" C.I.
Off Pipe





Stone Wall Broken Down
in Many Places
SPILLWAY Elev. 96.50

6490 Iron Pin
Elev. 108.07

BASE LINE

RIP RAP SLOPE

DATUM 80.0

OVERFLOW CHANNEL

SECTION A-A

SCALE 1"=10'


NOTE - BM ELEV. 100 ESTABLISHED ON BASE OF 14" PINE TREE
13.5' RT. OF STA 0+56.5
FOR FIELD NOTES - SEE LOOSE LEAF FILE No. 647
FOR LARGE SCALE PLAN - SEE DWG. D-717-2

SCRANTON

M

PLAN OF
SPRING

DRAWN BY
TRACED BY
CHECKED BY



RECORD DRAWING

SCRANTON-SPRING BROOK WATER SERVICE CO
WILKES BARRE, PA
MAPLE LAKE RESERVOIR
PLAN OF DAM AND SPILLWAY CHANNEL
SPRING BROOK TWP., LACKAWANNA Co., PA.

DRAWN BY J.H.
 TRACED BY J.H.
 CHECKED BY

DATE 7-13-53
 SCALE 1"=20'
 APP'D BY

D-717-72

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
 NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
 MAPLE LAKE DAM
 PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY
 EMBANKMENT
 PLAN AND SECTION
 JANUARY 1979

6

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

APPENDIX A
CHECKLIST - ENGINEERING DATA

CHECKLIST

ENGINEERING DATA

DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND OPERATION
PHASE I

NAME OF DAM: MAPLE LAKE
 PA - 00294
 NDS ID NO.: I DER ID NO.: 35-42

Sheet 1 of 4

ITEM	REMARKS
AS-BUILT DRAWINGS	NONE PLATE 2 IS FROM 1953
REGIONAL VICINITY MAP	SEE PLATE 4
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	BUILT 1893 NO MODIFICATIONS
TYPICAL SECTIONS OF DAM	NONE
OUTLETS: Plan Details Constraints Discharge Ratings	PLAN - PLATE 2 NO OTHER DETAILS

ENGINEERING DATA

ITEM	REMARKS
RAINFALL/RESERVOIR RECORDS	NONE
DESIGN REPORTS	1914 PENNSYLVANIA WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION REPORT
GEOLOGY REPORTS	NONE
DESIGN COMPUTATIONS: Hydrology and Hydraulics Dam Stability Seepage Studies	Some data in 1914 PENNSYLVANIA WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION REPORT
MATERIALS INVESTIGATIONS: Boring Records Laboratory Field	NONE
POSTCONSTRUCTION SURVEYS OF DAM	PLATE 2

ENGINEERING DATA

ITEM	REMARKS
BORROW SOURCES	NOT AVAILABLE
MONITORING SYSTEMS	NONE
MODIFICATIONS	DIKE CONSTRUCTED IN 1923.
HIGH POOL RECORDS	NONE
POSTCONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING STUDIES AND REPORTS	NONE
PRIOR ACCIDENTS OR FAILURE OF DAM: Description Reports	NONE

ENGINEERING DATA

ITEM	REMARKS
<p>MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION RECORDS</p>	<p>NONE</p>
<p>SPILLWAY: Plan Sections Details</p>	<p>PLATE 2</p>
<p>OPERATING EQUIPMENT: Plans Details</p>	<p>NONE</p>
<p>PREVIOUS INSPECTIONS Dates Deficiencies</p>	<p>1919 - LACK OF MAINTENANCE. 1925 - TOP OF DAM UNEVEN SMALL FLOW AT ORIGINAL STREAM. SPILLWAY NOT WELL DEFINED - SHOULD BE 6000'S NOTED DIKE BUILT IN 1923. 1927 - TOP OF DAM UNEVEN SEEPAGE. APPEARANCE POOR. 1929 - R.P.M.P. UNEVEN. INSPECTOR BELIEVES THERE IS A CORE WALL. SETTLEMENT ON UPSTREAM SLOPE. SEEPAGE. BRAUSH. POOR APPEARANCE. 1930 - UPSTREAM SLOPE SETTLED. ROCKS AND BRAUSH IN SPILLWAY. POOR APPEARANCE. 1931 - TOP OF DAM UNEVEN. SPILLWAY - POOR. 1932 - AS 1931.</p>
<p>(CONTINUED)</p>	

ENGINEERING DATA

ITEM	REMARKS
PREVIOUS INSPECTIONS (CONTINUED)	<p>1933 - LEAKAGE AT OUTLET WORKS PIPE. BRUSH AND SWAMPY AT TOE. SPILLWAY - POOR.</p> <p>1934 - SEEPAGE AT TOE ALONG RIGHT END. MAINTENANCE - POOR.</p>
	<p>1941 - POOR MAINTENANCE. TOP OF DAM UNEVEN. STONES IN DRY MASONRY WALL DISPLACED. BRUSH. TOE WET AND SWAMPY NEAR LEFT END.</p>
	<p>1942 - AS 1941, EXCEPT MAINTENANCE IS FAIR.</p> <p>1953 - TOP OF DAM UNEVEN, HEAVY BRUSH ON DOWNSTREAM SLOPE. GENERAL APPEARANCE FAIR.</p> <p>1957 - IN GENERAL, POOR.</p>
	<p>1965 - GENERAL APPEARANCE, POOR.</p>

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

APPENDIX B
CHECKLIST - VISUAL INSPECTION

CHECKLIST
VISUAL INSPECTION
PHASE I

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE County: LACKAWANNA State: PENNSYLVANIA
I
ND# ID No.: PA-00294 DER ID No.: 35-42
Type of Dam: EARTH FILL Hazard Category: HIGH Temperature: 40°F+
Date(s) Inspection: 9 NOVEMBER 1978 Weather: CLEAR
Soil Conditions: MOIST
GROUND COVERED WITH NEWLY FALLEN LEAVES
Pool Elevation at Time of Inspection: 1611.6 msl/Tailwater at Time of Inspection: 1597.2 msl

W. F.

Inspection Personnel:

- J. CRAUSE (GFCC)
- G. SMITH (GFCC)
- D. KAUFMAN (PGW)

A. WHITMAN (GFCC) Recorder


EMBANKMENT

Sheet 1 of 2

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
SURFACE CRACKS	SEE DETAIL ON SHEETS FOLLOWING INSPECTION FORM. THERE IS EVIDENCE OF RECENT MOVEMENT ON THE UPSTREAM SLOPE.	
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR BEYOND THE TOE	DOWNSTREAM TOE IS BULGED FROM 90' RIGHT OF OUTLET WORKS TO OUTLET WORKS. MINOR BULGING LEFT OF OUTLET WORKS.	MAJOR BULGES ARE 1 1/2 HIGH.
SLOUGHING OR EROSION: Embankment Slopes Abutment Slopes	APPARENT SLIDING HAS OCCURRED ON UPSTREAM SLOPE OVER 50% OF THE LENGTH	
CREST ALIGNMENT: Vertical Horizontal	VERTICAL - SEE SURVEY DATA FOLLOWING INSPECTION FORMS. HORIZONTAL ALONG Q - NO DEFECTS.	
RIPRAP FAILURES	WHAT USED TO BE A VERTICAL DRY MASONRY WALL IS BULGED AND OFFSET SEVERELY. THIS IS RELATED TO THE APPARENT SLIDING.	RIPRAP BELOW TOE OF WALL - NO DEFECTS

EMBANKMENT

Sheet 2 of 2


VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
JUNCTION OF EMBANKMENT WITH: Abutment Spillway Other Features	NONE	
ANY NOTICEABLE SEEPAGE		AREA AT DOWNSTREAM TOE HAS POOR DRAINAGE
STAFF GAGE AND RECORDER	NONE	
DRAINS	NONE	
BRUSH	MATURE TREES AT TOE. YOUNGER TREES AND BRUSH ON ENTIRE DOWNSTREAM SLOPE. TOP HAS MUCH BRUSH.	

DIKE
SHEET 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT, SLOUGHING, & JUNCTION WITH ABUTMENT	NONE	
CREST ALIGNMENT	HORIZONTAL ALONG & -NO DEFECTS VERTICAL - SEE SURVEY DATA ON SHEETS FOLLOWING INSPECTION FORMS	
RIPRAP FAILURES	RIPRAP BARELY VISIBLE BECAUSE OF BRUSH.	
INSTRUMENTATION & DRAINS	NONE	
NOTICE ABLE SEEPAGE	DOWNSTREAM TOE IS AT EDGE OF SWAMP. WATER IN SWAMP IS HIGHER THAN POOL ON DAY OF INSPECTION.	
BRUSH	FAIRLY LARGE TREES AND MUCH BRUSH COVERS EMBANKMENT.	


OUTLET WORKS

Sheet 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CRACKING AND SPALLING OF CONCRETE SURFACES IN OUTLET CONDUIT		GATE PARTIALLY OPEN ON DAY OF INSPECTION. OUTLET NOT VISIBLE.
INTAKE STRUCTURE	SUBMERGED	
OUTLET STRUCTURE	SEE SKETCH ABOVE	
OUTLET CHANNEL	DRY MASONRY WALLS SURROUNDING STILLING POOL	
EMERGENCY GATE	NONE	

UNGATED SPILLWAY

Sheet 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CONCRETE WEIR	USED TO BE LOGS ACROSS SPILLWAY. LOGS ARE ROTTEN, TOP LOG IS DISPLACED.	AS EXISTS, IT IS A NATURAL CHANNEL WITH POORLY DEFINED CONTROL SECTION.
APPROACH CHANNEL	SHORT UNEVEN CHANNEL TO RESERVOIR. SEE SURVEY DATA ON SHEETS FOLLOWING INSPECTION FORM.	
DISCHARGE CHANNEL	SEVERE EROSION ON LEFT BANK. LESSER EROSION ON RIGHT BANK. DEBRIS IN CHANNEL.	
BRIDGE AND PIERS	NONE	

RESERVOIR AND WATERSHED

Sheet 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
SLOPES	ABOUT 50% - VERY FLAT OTHER 50% - ROLLING HILLS	
SEDIMENTATION	NO REPORTED OR APPARENT PROBLEMS	
WATERSHED DESCRIPTION	MOSTLY WOODED SOME CONTROLLED BY PGW SOME SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT & FARM FIELDS.	

INSTRUMENTATION

Sheet 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
MONUMENTATION/SURVEYS	NONE	
OBSERVATION WELLS	NONE	
WEIRS	NONE	
PIEZOMETERS	NONE	
OTHER	NONE	

DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL

Sheet 1 of 1

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CONDITION: Obstructions Debris Other	MINOR DEBRIS	NOT A DEFICIENCY
SLOPES	STEEP	
APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF HOMES AND POPULATION	AT LEAST TWO DWELLINGS WOULD BE FLOODED BY FAILURE. TWO OTHERS WOULD MOST PROBABLY BE FLOODED.	NESBITT RESERVOIR IS DOWNSTREAM.

GANNETT FLEMING CORDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT _____ FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHEET
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

SURVEY DATA ACQUIRED FOR THIS INSPECTION
CONVERSION OF DAM DATUM TO
USGS DATUM



(FROM BM AT 100.0)
Spillway elev = 95.5 APPROXIMATE OWNER DATUM
= 1613 APPROXIMATE USGS DATUM
Δ = 1517.5

∴ ADD 1517.5 TO OWNER DATUM OR
SUBTRACT 1517.5 FROM USGS DATUM

USGS DATUM OBTAINED FROM
POOL ELEVATION ON USGS TOPO
SHEET

**GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.**
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT MAPLE LAKE DAM FILE NO. _____
SURVEY DATA SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHE
 FOR _____
 COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____




PROFILE


B-11

GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT MAPLE LAKE DAM FILE NO. _____
SURVEY DATA SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHE
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____





CROSS SECTION STATION 2+50
SCALE 1" = 10'



Spillway Section Along Line "A"-B" (see figure B-1)

DATUM = EL 90.0



B-13




GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT MAPLE LAKE DAM FILE NO. _____
SURVEY DATA SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHE
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

DIKE



SECTION AT STATION 1+35 (DIKE)
SCALE 1" = 5'
B-14



PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
 NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
 MAPLE LAKE DAM
 PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY
 RESULTS OF VISUAL INSPECTION
 JANUARY 1979
 PLATE B-1

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

APPENDIX C
HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS

APPENDIX C

HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS

In the recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE), established criteria for rating the capacity of spillways. The recommended Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for the size (small, intermediate, or large) and hazard potential (low, significant, or high) classification of a dam is selected in accordance with the criteria. The SDF for those dams in the high hazard category varies between one-half of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and the PMF. If the dam and spillway are not capable of passing the SDF without overtopping failure, the spillway capacity is rated as inadequate. If the dam and spillway are capable of passing one-half of the PMF without overtopping failure, or if the dam is not in the high hazard category, the spillway capacity is not rated as seriously inadequate. A spillway capacity is rated as seriously inadequate if all of the following conditions exist:

- (a) There is a high hazard to loss of life from large flows downstream of the dam.
- (b) Dam failure resulting from overtopping would significantly increase the hazard to loss of life downstream from the dam from that which would exist just before overtopping failure.
- (c) The dam and spillway are not capable of passing one-half of the PMF without overtopping failure.

APPENDIX C

SUSQUEHANNA River Basin
 Name of Stream: RATTLE SNAKE CREEK
 Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE
 NDI ID No.: PA-00294
 DER ID No.: 35-42

Latitude: N 41° 19' 35" Longitude: W 75° 35' 00"
 Top of Dam (low spot) Elevation: 1617.4
 Streambed Elevation: 1596.2 Height of Dam: 23* ft
 Reservoir Storage at Top of Dam Elevation: 1151** acre-ft
 Size Category: INTERMEDIATE
 Hazard Category: HIGH (see Section 5)
 Spillway Design Flood: PMF

* BASED ON TOP ELEVATION OF 1619.4
 ** EXISTING TOP OF DAM
UPSTREAM DAMS

Name	Distance from Dam (miles)	Height (ft)	Storage at top of Dam Elevation (acre-ft)	Remarks
NONE				

DOWNSTREAM DAMS

NESBITT	5.5	101	5,034	LARGE-HIGH HAZARD,
	(stream miles)			SERIOUSLY INADEQUATE
				SPILLWAY

SUSQUEHANNA River Basin

Name of Stream: RATTLE SNAKE CREEK

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE

NDS^I ID No.: PA-00294

DER ID No.: 35-42

Latitude: N 41° 20' Longitude: W 75° 35'

DETERMINATION OF PMF RAINFALL

For Area A

which consists of Subareas A1 of 0.96 sq. mile

Total Drainage Area 0.96 sq. mile

PMF Rainfall Index = 22.15 in., 24 hr., 200 sq. mile

	Hydromet. 40 (Susquehanna Basin)	Hydromet. 33 (Other Basins)
Zone	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Geographic Adjustment Factor	<u>97%</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Revised Index Rainfall	<u>21.5</u>	<u>N/A</u>


RAINFALL DISTRIBUTION (percent)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Percent</u>
6 hours	<u>118</u>
12 hours	<u>127</u>
24 hours	<u>136</u>
48 hours	<u>142</u>
72 hours	<u>145</u>
96 hours	<u>N/A</u>

GANNETT FLEMING CORDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT _____ FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHEETS
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

SKETCH OF SYSTEM



C-4

Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A1
 (see Sketch on Sheet C-4)

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE Sheet 1 of

Height: 23 (existing)

Spillway Data:	Existing Conditions	Design Conditions
Top of Dam Elevation	<u>1617.4</u>	<u>1619.4</u>
Spillway Crest Elevation	<u>1613.0</u>	<u>1613.0</u>
Spillway Head Available (ft)	<u>4.4</u>	<u>6.4</u>
Type Spillway	<u>EXCAVATE CHANNEL WITH CONTROL SECTION</u>	
"C" Value - Spillway	<u>2.7</u>	<u>2.7</u>
Crest Length - Spillway (ft)	<u>VARIES</u>	<u>VARIES</u>
Spillway Peak Discharge (cfs)	<u>504 x 500</u>	<u>1310</u>
Auxiliary Spillway Crest Elevation	<u>NONE</u>	<u>NONE</u>
Auxiliary Spillway Head Available (ft)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Type Auxiliary Spillway	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
"C" Value - Auxiliary Spillway	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Crest Length - Auxiliary Spillway (ft)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Auxiliary Spillway Peak Discharge (cfs)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Combined Spillway Discharge (cfs)	<u>500</u>	<u>1310</u>


Spillway Rating Curve:

Elevation	O Spillway (cfs)	O Auxiliary Spillway (cfs)	Combined (cfs)
<u>1613.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>NONE</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>1614.0</u>	<u>23</u>		<u>23</u>
<u>1615.0</u>	<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>
<u>1616.0</u>	<u>240</u>		<u>240</u>
<u>1617.0</u>	<u>380</u>		<u>380</u>
<u>1618.0</u>	<u>690</u>		<u>690</u>
<u>1619.0</u>	<u>1150</u>		<u>1150</u>
<u>1620.0</u>	<u>1550</u>		<u>1550</u>

GANNETT FLEMING CORDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT MAIN Spillway FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHEET
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

SECTION AT ♀ EMBANKMENT
REF SHEET B-13




W.S ELEV	Top width FT	AREA FT ²	$Q = \sqrt{\frac{A^3 g}{T}}$ CFS	$hw = \frac{Q^2}{2gA^3}$ FT	EGL = POOL ELEV
1611.7	0	0	0	0	0
1613.0	8.64	5.61	25.68	.33	1613.3
1614.9	15.39	28.44	219	.92	1615.8
1615.3	17.56	35.03	281	1.00	1616.3
1617.4	53.28	109.41	890	1.03	1618.4
1618.6	58	176.2	1,743	1.52	1620.1
1619.0	58	199.4	2,097	1.72	1620.7
1620.0	58	257.4	3,076	2.22	1622.2
1625.0	58	547.4	9,540	4.72	1629.7

**GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.**
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT MAIN Spillway FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SH
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

REFERENCE SHEET B-13

Spillway SECTION OFFSET FROM LINE A-B




W.S. ELEV	Topwidth FT	AREA FT ²	$Q = \sqrt{\frac{A^3}{T}}$ CFS	$h_v = \frac{Q^2}{20A^2}$ FT	EGL = POOL ELEV
1613.0	0	0	0	0	1613.0
1613.4	7.333	1.467	3.7	.10	1613.5
1614.2	19.5	12.2	54.7	.31	1614.5
1615.6	42.1	55.3	360	.66	1616.3
1617.4	66.5	163.8	1,459	1.23	1618.6
1618.0	66.5	203.7	2,022	1.53	1619.5
1619.0	66.5	270.2	3,090	1.31	1620.3
1620.0	66.5	336.7	4,298	2.53	1622.5
1625.0	66.5	669.2	12,042	5.03	1630.0

**GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.**
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT Spillway Rating Curve FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHI
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

COMPOSITE W.S. ELEV.	RATING CURVE Q (CFS)
1613	0
1614	23
1615	100
1616	240
1617	380
1618	690
1619	1,150
1620	1,550
1625	5,250



Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A1

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE Sheet 2 of


Outlet Works Rating:	<u>Outlet 1</u>	<u>Outlet 2</u>	<u>Outlet 3</u>
Invert of Outlet (APPROXIMATE)	<u>1596.2</u>	<u>NONE</u>	<u>NONE</u>
Invert of Inlet	<u>NOT AVAILABLE</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Type	<u>24" CIP</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Diameter (ft) = D	<u>2.0</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Length (ft) = L	<u>70±</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Area (sq. ft) = A	<u>3.14</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
N	<u>.014</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
K Entrance	<u>0.5</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
K Exit	<u>1.0</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
K Friction* = $29.1N^2L/R^{4/3}$	<u>1.01</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Sum of K	<u>2.51</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
$(1/K)^{0.5} = C$	<u>.631</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Maximum Head (ft) = HM	<u>21.2</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
$Q = C A \sqrt{2g(HM)}$ (cfs)	<u>73</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Q Combined (cfs)	<u>≈ 70</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

* R = Hydraulic Radius = (Area/Wetted Perimeter) = D/4 for Circular Conduits.


Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A1

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE Sheet 4 of

Breach Data:

Sketch of Dam Profile (not to scale): Dike


Sketch of Top of Dam (not to scale):



Soil Type from Visual Inspection: SANDY SILT

Maximum Permissible Velocity (Plate 28, EM 1110-2-1601) 2 fps
(from $Q = CLH^{3/2} = V \cdot A$ and depth = $(2/3) \times H$) $A = L \cdot d$

$$H_{MAX} = (4/9 V^2 / C^2) = \underline{0.2} \text{ ft.}, C = \underline{2.7}$$

$H_{MAX} + \overset{1616.40}{\text{Top of Dam Elev.}} = \underline{1616.6} = \text{FAILEL}$
(Above is elevation at which failure would start)

Dam Breach Data:

BRWID = 70 ft (width of bottom of breach)

$Z = \underline{1}$ (side slopes of breach)

ELBM = 1613.0 (bottom of breach elevation,
minimum of zero storage elevation)

WSEL = 1613.0 (normal pool elevation)

T FAIL = 6 mins

= 0.1 hrs (time for breach to develop) USING 0.1 HOURS FOR EVERY 25 FT OF HEIGHT.

SUSQUEHANNA River Basin

Name of Stream: RATTLESNAKE CREEK

Name of Dam: MAPLE LAKE

ND^I ID No.: PA-00294

DER ID No.: 35-42

Latitude: N 41° 19' 35" Longitude: W 75° 35' 00"

Drainage Area: 0.96 sq. mile

Data for Subarea: A-1 (see Sketch on Sheet C-4)

Name of Dam at Outlet of Subarea: MAPLE LAKE

Drainage Area of Subarea: 0.96 sq. mile

Subarea Characteristics:

Assumed Losses: 1.0-inch initial abstraction + 0.05 in/hr

The following are measured from outlet of subarea to the point noted:

L = Length of Main Watercourse extended to the divide = 1.1 miles

LCA = Length of Main Watercourse to the centroid = 0.5 mile

From NAB Data: AREA 11, PLATE E

CP = 0.62 L' = DISTANCE FROM RESERVOIR TO DIVIDE = 0.44 mi.

CT = 1.5 Tp = CT x (L')^{0.6} = 0.91

Tp = CT x (L x LCA)^{0.3} = 1.25 (hrs) ← NOT USED

Flow at Start of Storm = 1.5 cfs/sq. mile x Subarea D.A = 1.5 cfs

Computer Data:

QRCSN = -0.05 (5% of peak flow)

RTIOR = 2.0

Remarks: _____

Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A2
(see Sketch on Sheet C-4)

Name of Dam: NESBITT Sheet 1 of

Height: 101 FT. (existing)

Spillway Data: FROM PHASE 1 ^{REPORT} Existing Conditions Design Conditions

Top of Dam Elevation 1166.0 SAME

Spillway Crest Elevation 1156.0

Spillway Head Available (ft) 10.0

Type Spillway BROAD CRESTED WEIR

"C" Value - Spillway 3.09

Crest Length - Spillway (ft) 200.0

Spillway Peak Discharge (cfs) 19,540

Auxiliary Spillway Crest Elevation NONE

Auxiliary Spillway Head Available (ft)

Type Auxiliary Spillway

"C" Value - Auxiliary Spillway

Crest Length - Auxiliary Spillway (ft)

Auxiliary Spillway Peak Discharge (cfs)

Combined Spillway Discharge (cfs) 19,540

Spillway Rating Curve:

Elevation Q Spillway (cfs) Q Auxiliary Spillway (cfs) Combined (cfs)

NOT REQUIRED

Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A2

Name of Dam: NESBITT Sheet 2 of

Outlet Works Rating:	<u>Outlet 1</u>	<u>Outlet 2</u>	<u>Outlet 3</u>
Invert of Outlet	_____	_____	_____
Invert of Inlet	_____	_____	_____
Type	_____	_____	_____
Diameter (ft) = D	_____	_____	_____
Length (ft) = L	FROM <u>PHASE 1 REPORT</u>		
Area (sq. ft) = A	_____	_____	_____
N	_____	_____	_____
K Entrance	_____	_____	_____
K Exit	_____	_____	_____
K Friction* = $29.1N^2L/R^{4/3}$	_____	_____	_____
Sum of K	_____	_____	_____
$(1/K)^{0.5} = C$	_____	_____	_____
Maximum Head (ft) = HM	_____	_____	_____
$Q = C A \sqrt{2g(HM)}$ (cfs)	_____	_____	_____
Q Combined (cfs)	<u>550</u>	<u>(TOTAL)</u>	_____

* R = Hydraulic Radius = (Area/Wetted Perimeter) = D/4 for Circular Conduits.

Data for Dam at Outlet of Subarea A2

Name of Dam: NESBITT Sheet 3 of

Storage Data:

Elevation	Area (acres)	Storage		Remarks
		million gals	acre-ft	
<u>1056.7 = ELEVO*</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u> </u>
<u>1156.0 = ELEV1</u>	<u>116 = A1</u>	<u>1250</u>	<u>3837 = S1</u>	<u> </u>
<u>1166.0</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>1640</u>	<u>5034</u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

* $ELEVO = ELEV1 - (3S_1/A_1)$

~~Planimetered contour at least 10 feet above top of dam~~

Reservoir Area at Top of Dam is N/A percent of watershed.

Remarks:

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY

	<u>A1</u> <u>Subarea</u>	<u>A2</u> <u>Subarea</u>	<u>Subarea</u>	<u>Subarea</u>	<u>Total</u>
Drainage Area (sq. mile)	0.96	N/A			
<u>PMF:</u>					
Peak Outflow (cfs)	2411	1822			
Total Runoff (Inches)	-	-			
Dam at Outlet?	YES	YES			
Is Dam Overtopped?	YES	NO			
Depth of Overtopping (ft)	1.69	-			
<u>One-Half PMF:</u>					
	MAPLE LAKE		NOBBITT		
Peak Outflow (cfs)	578	387			
Total Runoff (Inches)	-	-			
Dam at Outlet?	YES	YES			
Is Dam Overtopped?	YES	NO (EVEN IF UPSIDE DOWN DAM FAILS)			
Depth of Overtopping (ft)	-	-			
Does Dam Fail?	YES	NO			
Peak Failure Outflow (cfs)	1870	-			
At time (hrs)	-	-			
Spillway (percent of PMF)	42	N/A			

DOWNSTREAM SUMMARY

	<u>1/2 PMF</u> <u>Peak Water Surface Elevation</u>		<u>Remarks</u>
	<u>Before Failure</u>	<u>After Failure</u>	
Cross Section <u>3</u>	1501.2	1504.0	<u>Δ = 2.8'</u> <u>SIGNIFICANT</u>
Cross Section <u>5</u>	1320.2	1320.7	
Cross Section _____			
Cross Section _____			
Cross Section _____			

GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY
AND CARPENTER, INC.
HARRISBURG, PA.

SUBJECT _____ FILE NO. _____
SHEET NO. _____ OF _____ SHEET
FOR _____
COMPUTED BY _____ DATE _____ CHECKED BY _____ DATE _____

SELECTED COMPUTER OUTPUT

<u>ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. MAPLE LAKE DAM, ASSUMING NO FAILURES:	
INPUT	C-18 TO C-19
SYSTEM PEAK FLOWS	C-20
MAPLE LAKE DAM AND DOWNSTREAM SECTIONS	C-21
DOWNSTREAM SECTIONS	C-22
NESBITT DAM	C-23
2. ASSUMING MAPLE LAKE DAM FAILS*	
INPUT	C-24 TO C-25
SYSTEM PEAK FLOWS	C-26
MAPLE LAKE DAM AND DOWNSTREAM SECTIONS	C-27
DOWNSTREAM SECTIONS	C-28
NESBITT DAM	C-29

* NOTE: ONLY PLAN 1 USED

 FLOOD HYDROGRAPH PACKAGE (HEC-1)
 DAM SAFETY VERSION JULY 1978
 LAST MODIFICATION 17 OCT 78

STATION	DATE	TIME	FLOW (CFS)	RESERVOIR (AC)	LAKE (AC)	LAKE ELEV (FT)	LAKE ELEV (FT)	LAKE ELEV (FT)	LAKE ELEV (FT)
A1									
A2									
A3									
B	170	0	15						
B1	5								
J	1	6	1						
J1	1	08	07						
K	0	1							
K1									
M	1	1	0.96						
P	1	21.5	118						
U	0.01	0.62							
X	1.5	-0.05	2.0						
K	1	1							
K1									
Y	1	1							
Y1	144								
V4	1613	1614	1615						
V5	0	28	100						
SA	01	2.08	99						
SE	1593	1596.2	1613						
SS	1613								
SD	1616.4	2.7	1.5						
K	1	1							
K1									
Y	1	1							
Y1	1								
V6	09	03	09						
V7	0	16.0	1350						
V7	1720	15.85	2150						
K	1	3							
K1									
Y	1	1							
V1	1								
V6	07	05	07						
V7	0	15.0	500						
V7	570	15.00	900						
K	1	6							
Y	1	1							
V1	1								
V6	06	04	06						
V7	0	14.60	250						
V7	420	14.05	610						
K	1	6							
Y	1	1							
V1	1								
V6	06	04	06						
V7	0	14.00	200						
V7	750	13.60	1000						
V7	0	14.00	200						
V7	750	13.60	1000						

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

OPERATION	STATION	AREA	PLAN	RATIO 1	RATIOS APPLIED TO FLOWS					
					RATIO 2	RATIO 3	RATIO 4	RATIO 5	RATIO 6	
				1.00	.80	.70	.60	.50	.40	
HYDROGRAPH AT	1	.96 (2.49)	1	365.6 (103.52)	2925. (828.22)	2559. (726.47)	2194. (628.11)	1929. (51.76)	1462. (41.41)	
ROUTED TO	1	.96 (2.49)	1	2411. (682.26)	1666. (471.93)	1308. (374.03)	948. (269.55)	578. (16.38)	284. (8.04)	
ROUTED TO	2	.96 (2.49)	1	2403. (680.05)	1668. (472.33)	1308. (374.04)	948. (269.64)	580. (16.42)	284. (8.04)	
ROUTED TO	3	.96 (2.49)	1	2404. (680.08)	1670. (472.29)	1310. (374.09)	945. (269.76)	579. (16.40)	284. (8.04)	
ROUTED TO	4	.96 (2.49)	1	2391. (676.69)	1657. (469.95)	1300. (36.81)	942. (26.67)	574. (16.25)	283. (8.02)	
ROUTED TO	5	.96 (2.49)	1	2353. (666.64)	1638. (463.37)	1286. (36.36)	928. (26.29)	566. (16.02)	282. (7.99)	
ROUTED TO	6	.96 (2.49)	1	2353. (665.57)	1639. (464.11)	1285. (36.59)	929. (26.30)	566. (16.03)	282. (7.99)	
ROUTED TO	7	.96 (2.49)	1	1922. (51.60)	1722. (34.59)	927. (26.25)	641. (18.15)	387. (10.97)	232. (6.57)	

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

PLAN 1

RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR STORAGE	ELFVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM
			1413.00	1613.00	1616.60
			67.7	66.7	10.9
			0.	0.	2.9%

RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM DEPTH OVER DAM	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	TIME OF MAY OUTFLOW HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
1.00	1.69	1250.	2411.	7.50	41.50	0.00
.80	1.26	1104.	1660.	6.50	42.00	0.00
.70	1.03	1165.	1309.	6.00	42.25	0.00
.60	.77	1132.	948.	5.50	42.50	0.00
.50	.64	1091.	578.	4.25	43.00	0.00
.40	0.00	1028.	286.	0.00	43.25	0.00

PLAN 1 STATION 2

RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
1.00	2403.	1586.7	41.50
.80	1668.	1585.8	42.00
.70	1308.	1585.0	42.25
.60	948.	1584.2	42.50
.50	580.	1583.4	43.00
.40	286.	1581.8	43.50

PLAN 1 STATION 3

RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
1.00	2404.	1504.6	41.75
.80	1670.	1503.6	42.00
.70	1310.	1502.7	42.25
.60	945.	1501.9	42.50
.50	579.	1501.2	43.00
.40	286.	1500.6	43.50

PLAN 1 STATION 4

RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
1.00	2391.	1406.9	41.75
.80	1657.	1406.1	42.25
.70	1300.	1405.3	42.50
.60	947.	1404.5	42.75
.50	576.	1403.6	43.00
.40	281.	1402.3	43.75

PLAN 1 STATION 5

RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW, CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME HOURS
1.00	2353.	1121.0	42.00
.80	1638.	1120.7	42.50
.70	1284.	1120.6	42.75
.60	928.	1120.6	43.00
.50	566.	1120.62	43.25
.40	282.	1120.61	44.00

PLAN 1 STATION 6

RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW, CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE, FT	TIME HOURS
1.00	2351.	1159.2	42.00
.80	1639.	1158.6	42.50
.70	1285.	1158.2	42.75
.60	929.	1157.9	43.00
.50	566.	1157.5	43.50
.40	282.	1157.3	44.00

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

PLAN 1

RATIO OF PMF	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	DURATION OVER TOP	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW	MAXIMUM STOPAGE	MAXIMUM DEPTH OVER DAM	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S. FLEV	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW	TIME OF FAILURE
					HOURS	CFS	AC-FT			HOURS	HOURS
1.00		1156.00	1156.00	1166.00	0.00	1822.	437.6	0.00	1159.06	43.25	0.00
.80		605.6	609.6	5221.	0.00	1222.	477.9	0.00	1157.58	41.75	0.00
.70		"	0.	19243.	0.00	977.	424.8	0.00	1157.31	44.00	0.00
.60					0.00	641.	421.5	0.00	1157.02	44.50	0.00
.50					0.00	387.	418.1	0.00	1156.73	45.00	0.00
.40					0.00	232.	415.6	0.00	1156.52	47.25	0.00

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

RATIOS APPLIED TO FLOWS

PLAN RATIO 1
 .50

OPERATION	STATION	AREA	PLAN RATIO 1
HYDROGRAPH AT	1	.96 (2.69)	1 1828. (51.76)(
	2		2 1828. (51.76)(
ROUTED TO	1	.96 (2.69)	1 1874. (53.06)(
	2		2 1518. (42.99)(
ROUTED TO	2	.96 (2.69)	1 1913. (56.16)(
	2		2 1562. (46.22)(
ROUTED TO	3	.96 (2.69)	1 1972. (55.86)(
	2		2 1603. (45.39)(
ROUTED TO	4	.96 (2.69)	1 1741. (49.30)(
	2		2 1436. (40.60)(
ROUTED TO	5	.96 (2.69)	1 1590. (45.01)(
	2		2 1320. (37.37)(
ROUTED TO	6	.96 (2.69)	1 1594. (45.16)(
	2		2 1322. (37.64)(
ROUTED TO	7	.96 (2.69)	1 968. (27.41)(
	2		2 843. (23.87)(

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

PLAN 1	RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR V.S. FLEV	ELEVATION STORAGE	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	DURATION OVER TOP	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW	TIME OF FAILURE
PLAN 2	RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR V.S. FLEV	ELEVATION STORAGE	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	DURATION OVER TOP	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW	TIME OF FAILURE
PLAN 1	0.50	1616.68	1613.00 667. 0.	1613.00 667. 0.	1613.00 667. 0.	1616.40 1019. 296.	1.00	42.10	42.00
PLAN 2	0.50	1616.68	1613.00 667. 0.	1613.00 667. 0.	1613.00 667. 0.	1616.40 1019. 296.	1.25	42.10	42.00
PLAN 1	0.50	1913.	1586.3	1586.3	1586.3	42.50	42.50	42.50	42.50
PLAN 2	0.50	1562.	1585.5	1585.5	1585.5	42.50	42.50	42.50	42.50
PLAN 1	0.50	1972.	1504.0	1504.0	1504.0	42.50	42.50	42.50	42.50
PLAN 2	0.50	1603.	1503.3	1503.3	1503.3	42.50	42.50	42.50	42.50

PLAN 1		STATION 4	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1741.	1406.3	42.75

PLAN 2		STATION 4	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1436.	1405.6	42.75

PLAN 1		STATION 5	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1590.	1320.7	43.00

PLAN 2		STATION 5	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1320.	1320.6	43.00

PLAN 1		STATION 6	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1594.	1158.5	43.00

PLAN 2		STATION 6	
RATIO	MAXIMUM FLOW,CFS	MAXIMUM STAGE,FT	TIME HOURS
.50	1322.	1158.3	43.00

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

PLAN 1	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
		1156.00	1156.00	1166.00	
		4096.0	4096.0	5291.0	
		0.0	0.0	1954.3	
RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR STORAGE W.S.ELEV	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
0.50	1157.35	4753.0	962.0	0.00	0.00
PLAN 2	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
		1156.00	1156.00	1166.00	
		4096.0	4096.0	5291.0	
		0.0	0.0	1954.3	
RATIO OF PMF	MAXIMUM RESERVOIR STORAGE W.S.ELEV	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
0.50	1157.23	4739.0	843.0	0.00	0.00

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

APPENDIX D
PHOTOGRAPHS

MAPLE LAKE DAM



A. Embankment - View from Left Abutment.



B. Embankment - View from Right Abutment.

MAPLE LAKE DAM



C. Upstream Slope of Embankment.



D. Downstream Toe.

MAPLE LAKE DAM



E. Outlet Works



F. Spillway - Looking Upstream.

MAPLE LAKE DAM



G. Spillway Outlet Channel - Looking Downstream.



H. Dike - View from Left Abutment.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
RATTLESNAKE CREEK, LACKAWANNA COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA

MAPLE LAKE DAM

NDI ID No. PA-00294
DER ID No. 35-42

PENNSYLVANIA GAS AND WATER COMPANY

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

JANUARY 1979

APPENDIX E

GEOLOGY

AD-A070 715

GANNETT FLEMING CORDDRY AND CARPENTER INC HARRISBURG PA F/G 13/2
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM. MAPLE LAKE DAM (NDI-PA-00294) --ETC(U)
JAN 79 DACW31-79-C-0015


NL

UNCLASSIFIED

2 OF 2
ADA
070715



END
DATE
FILMED
8-79
DDC



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

MAPLE LAKE DAM

APPENDIX E

GEOLOGY

1. General Geology. The damsite and reservoir are located in Lackawanna County. Lackawanna County was completely covered with ice during the last continental glaciation of Pleistocene time. The general direction of ice movement was S 35°-40° W. Glacial drift covers the entire County, except where subsequent erosion has removed it. Thick deposits of glacial outwash occur in many places along the Lackawanna River, and are 50 to 100 feet thick near Dickson, Scranton, and Moosic.

The only important structural feature in Lackawanna County is the Lackawanna Syncline, which traverses the County in a southwesterly direction. The syncline enters the County at the northeast corner as a narrow shallow trough, gradually deepens and broadens toward the southwest, and reaches its maximum development in Luzerne County. The rock formations exposed range from the post-Pottsville formations (youngest) through the Pottsville, Mauch Chunk shale, Pocono sandstone to the Damascus formation of the Catskill group (oldest). The rim rocks, the Pottsville formation and Pocono sandstone, have dips that rarely exceed 10° to 20° and form a rather simple syncline. The core rocks, the post-Pottsville formations, are folded into a series of minor anticlines and synclines which trend about N 70° E. The rocks in the northwestern and southeastern parts of the County, outside of the limits of the Lackawanna Syncline, are generally horizontally stratified.

The Lackawanna River, in general, follows the axis of the Lackawanna Syncline. Southeast of the Lackawanna River, the rise in terrain is quite gradual and the crests of the high mountains are several miles

from the Lackawanna River. Streams, such as Roaring Brook, Stafford Meadow Brook, and Spring Brook, have cut deep canyons through the mountains and follow a tortuous course to their confluence with the Lackawanna River near Scranton, Pennsylvania. Northwest of Lackawanna River, the mountains rise abruptly to a sharp ridge which in most places is somewhat higher than the country to the northwest. Consequently, most of the drainage in this part of the County flows westward by way of Tunkhannock Creek. A few small tributary streams, however, such as Leggetts Creek, flow eastward from this area into Lackawanna River. In the area of interest, the Lackawanna River streambed is founded in post-Pottsville formations. Proceeding uphill from the river, the older Pottsville formation, Mauch Chunk shale, Pocono sandstone, and Catskill continental group are encountered in turn. The tributary streams, in flowing down the mountains, have generally cut through or around the hard sandstone and conglomerate members, and have eroded their streambed into the softer shales and glacial till. The Catskill continental group of rocks underlies the greater part of Lackawanna County.

2. Site Geology. Maple Lake Dam is founded in an area that is underlain by the sandstones and shales of the Catskill group to the southeast of the Lackawanna Syncline and the Lackawanna River. The dam was constructed across the outlet of an existing natural lake in 1893, in order to raise the water surface and increase the storage capacity of the lake. The natural lake was created in a depression upon a small plateau which has a higher elevation than the surrounding terrain. The natural pond, originally called Rattlesnake Pond, was the headwaters of Rattlesnake Creek which flowed from it. The rock underlying the plateau area is apparently hard resistant sandstone: whereas, the surface upon which the lake and dam are situated is a relatively deep strata of decomposed red shale, or red clay. There are no rock outcrops in the vicinity of the dam. In the 1914 Inspection Report, made by engineers of the Water Supply Commission of Pennsylvania after discussions with the owners and designers, it is reported that the embankment was constructed of selected clay material resting upon a clay foundation from which loose rock and vegetable matter had been removed.

SCALE: 1" = 6 MILES



