

AD-A079 004

GAI CONSULTANTS INC MONROEVILLE PA
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM. LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM, (NDS I,--ETC(U)
SEP 79 B M MIHALCIN


F/G 13/13

DACW31-79-C-0013

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

For
AC
ADP/ODA



END
DATE
FILMED

2-80

DOC

ADA079004

**PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM**

ORIGINAL CONTAINS COLOR PLATES; ALL
REPRODUCTIONS WILL BE IN BLACK AND WHITE



Distribution Unlimited
Approved for Public Release
Contract No. DACW31-79-C-0013

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

PREPARED BY
GAI CONSULTANTS, INC.
570 BEATTY ROAD
MONROEVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA 15146
SEPTEMBER 1979

DDC FILE COPY

DDC
RECEIVED
JAN 3
1980

33- 7 1 078

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

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



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.

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.



PHASE I REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

ABSTRACT

Laurel Hill Creek Dam: NDI I.D. No. PA-00235

<u>Owner:</u>	Municipal Authority of the Borough of Somerset
<u>State Located:</u>	Pennsylvania (PennDER I.D. No. 56-85)
<u>County Located:</u>	Somerset
<u>Stream:</u>	Laurel Hill Creek
<u>Inspection Date:</u>	7 August 1979
<u>Inspection Team:</u>	GAI Consultants, Inc. 570 Beatty Road Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146

Based on the visual inspection, operational history, and available engineering data, the dam and its appurtenances are considered to be in good condition.

The size classification for the facility is intermediate and the hazard classification is high. In accordance with the recommended guidelines, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for the facility is the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Results of the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis indicate that the facility is capable of passing and/or storing only 36 percent of the PMF. The analysis also indicates that spillway discharges are controlled by the downstream valley capacity when the flow over the weir exceeds approximately 3 feet (10 feet below the embankment) after which the pool level and tailwater will rise at roughly the same rate. Thus, failure from overtopping is essentially precluded and the spillway is considered inadequate, but not seriously inadequate.

The consequences of embankment inundation by tailwater and subsequent rapid drawdown are uncertain; although, it is noted that portions of the downstream slope are designated as pervious fill and rock toe on the design drawings. This construction is favorable with respect to rapid drawdown response; however, thorough inspection of the embankment should be performed during and after inundation.

Structural deficiencies noted during the inspection included low spots ($\approx$ 1 foot low) along the dam crest, lack of pro-

protective vegetation on portions of the downstream dam face, and swamp-like conditions immediately downstream of the dam toe.

It is recommended that the owner:

a. Develop a formal warning system for the notification of downstream residents should hazardous embankment conditions develop. Included in the plan should be provisions for around-the-clock surveillance of the facility during periods of unusually heavy precipitation and for thorough inspection of the downstream slope during tailwater drawdown.

b. Develop formal manuals of maintenance and operation to ensure continued proper care and maintenance of the facility.

c. Backfill low spots along the embankment crest to restore it to its design elevation.


d. Divert or control excess drainage from the left abutment to prevent ponding at the downstream embankment toe.

e. Seed the bare areas on the downstream embankment slope in order to provide adequate erosion protection.

f. Observe the slide immediately upstream of the left abutment during regular inspection of the facility to confirm that it is a local condition and take necessary remedial measures should it threaten the stability of the embankment.

⑫

Laurel Hill Creek



⑮

DACW31-79-C-0013

⑪

Sep 79

Sep 79

⑥

National Dam Inspection Program,
Laurel Hill Creek Dam, (NDS I.D. Number PA-00235,
Penneder I.D. Number 56-85) Ohio River Basin,
Laurel Hill Creek, Somerset County,
Pennsylvania, Phase I Inspection Report,

⑫

92

417 002

Sh



OVERVIEW PHOTOGRAPH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	i
ABSTRACT.	ii
OVERVIEW PHOTOGRAPH	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
SECTION 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION	1
1.0 Authority	1
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Description of Project.	1
1.3 Pertinent Data.	2
SECTION 2 - ENGINEERING DATA.	5
2.1 Design.	5
2.2 Construction Records.	6
2.3 Operational Records	6
2.4 Other Investigations.	6
2.5 Evaluation.	6
SECTION 3 - VISUAL INSPECTION	7
3.1 Observations.	7
3.2 Evaluation.	7
SECTION 4 - OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES.	9
4.1 Normal Operating Procedure.	9
4.2 Maintenance of Dam.	9
4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities	9
4.4 Warning Systems	9
4.5 Evaluation.	9
SECTION 5 - HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC EVALUATION	10
5.1 Design Data	10
5.2 Experience Data	10
5.3 Visual Observations	10
5.4 Method of Analysis.	10
5.5 Summary of Analysis	10
5.6 Spillway Adequacy	11
SECTION 6 - EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY.	12
6.1 Visual Observations	12
6.2 Design and Construction Techniques.	12
6.3 Past Performance.	13
6.4 Seismic Stability	13
SECTION 7 - ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMEDIAL MEASURES	14
7.1 Dam Assessment.	14
7.2 Recommendations/Remedial Measures	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A - CHECK LIST - ENGINEERING DATA
APPENDIX B - CHECK LIST - VISUAL INSPECTION
APPENDIX C - HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS
APPENDIX D - PHOTOGRAPHS
APPENDIX E - GEOLOGY
APPENDIX F - FIGURES
APPENDIX G - REGIONAL VICINITY AND WATERSHED BOUNDARY MAP

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
NDI# PA-235, PENNDER# 56-85

SECTION 1
GENERAL INFORMATION

1.0 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.

1.1 Purpose.

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

1.2 Description of Project.

a. Dam and Appurtenances. Laurel Hill Creek Dam is a 22-foot high zoned earthfill embankment approximately 575 feet in length. The facility is provided with a 150-foot long concrete spillway, consisting of 15 bays, each containing precast concrete stoplogs (see Photograph 1 and 2).

In addition, the facility is provided with a 16-inch diameter cast iron supply line with the intake located in the right spillway sidewall (see Figure 2). A pumphouse facility located just downstream from the right abutment is used to draw water from the reservoir for treatment and use as potable water.

b. Location. Laurel Hill Creek Dam is located on Laurel Hill Creek, just north of the community of Bakersville, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. The dam, reservoir, and watershed are located on the Bakersville and Seven Springs, Pennsylvania, 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. topographic quadrangles. The coordinates of the dam are N40° 2' 50" and W79° 12' 5".

c. Size Classification. Intermediate (22 feet high, 2113 acre-feet storage capacity at top of dam).

d. Hazard Classification. High (see Section 3.1.e).

e. Ownership. Municipal Authority of the Borough
of Somerset
340 West Union Street
Somerset, Pennsylvania 15501

f. Purpose. Water supply.

g. Historical Data. No data are available in PennDER files concerning the structure's history prior to 1978 when modifications were made to the intake system. At that time, the wooden stoplogs were replaced by precast concrete stoplogs, and a portion of the reservoir area was dredged. Conversations with the owner's representatives revealed that the facility was designed by Gannett, Fleming, Corddry and Carpenter, Inc., of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and that the facility was completed in 1954. No modifications, aside from those mentioned above, were reportedly made to the structure; although, one or two original drawings included provisions for raising the dam by about 18 feet in the future.

1.3 Pertinent Data.

a. Drainage Area (square miles). 26.2

b. Discharge at Dam Site.

Discharge Capacity of the 16-inch Diameter Supply
Line - Not determined.

Discharge Capacity of the Spillway at Maximum
Pool = 12,200 cfs (see Appendix C, Sheet 7).

c. Elevation (feet above mean sea level). The following elevations were obtained from available design drawings and through field measurements that were based on the elevation of the spillway crest at 1982.0 feet.

Top of Dam	1995 (design) 1994.1 (field)
Maximum Design Pool	Not known
Maximum Pool of Record	1987 (9-14-71)
Downstream Embankment Toe	1975
Downstream Spillway Toe	1973
Normal Pool	1982
Spillway Crest	1982
Upstream Outlet Invert	1975 (water supply)
Downstream Outlet Invert	N/A
Streambed at Dam Centerline	1975
Maximum Tailwater	1987 (estimated)

d. Reservoir Length (miles).

Top of Dam	2.5
Normal Pool	0.6

e. Storage (acre-feet).

Top of Dam	2113
Normal Pool	250
Design Surcharge	Not known

f. Reservoir Surface (acres).

Top of Dam	284
Normal Pool	24
Maximum Design Pool	Not known

g. Dam.

Type	Zoned earth.
Length	575 feet (including spillway).
Height	22 feet (field measured, crest to downstream spillway toe).
Top Width	10 feet
Upstream Slope	3H:1V
Downstream Slope	2H:1V
Zoning	Impervious core flanked by pervious shells (see Figure 3).
Impervious Core	Impervious fill comprises the center section of the dam (see Figure 3).
Cutoff	The cutoff trench, as indicated in Figure 3, reportedly is extended to sound rock.

Grout Curtain	None indicated.
h. <u>Diversion Canal and Regulating Tunnels.</u>	None.
i. <u>Spillway.</u>	
Type	Free overfall, concrete stoplog weir structure.
Crest Elevation	1982 feet
Crest Length	150 feet
j. <u>Outlet Works.</u>	
Supply Pipe	16-inch diameter cast iron pipe with intake located in the right sidewall of the spillway. Water must be pumped from the reservoir.
Blowoff Pipe	None. Drawdown controlled via stoplogs in spillway.
Conduit Length	N/A
Closure and/or Regulating Facilities	Supply line regulated in the pumphouse via gate valves and pump. Reservoir level controlled by stoplogs in spillway.
Access	Pumphouse is located just downstream from right abutment at an elevation above the embankment crest elevation.

SECTION 2 ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design.

a. Design Data Availability and Sources. No design reports or calculations are available from the owner, designer, or PennDER concerning any aspect of the facility. Design drawings are available in PennDER files. Correspondence relating to modifications to the water distribution system (undertaken in 1978) are also available from PennDER files.

b. Design Features.

1. Embankment. Information contained on design drawings indicate that the embankment is a rolled earth structure consisting primarily of a thick impervious core bounded by pervious zones both upstream and downstream. A rock toe was incorporated into the design to provide drainage. The upstream slope is mantled with a 2-foot thick durable rock face and is sloped at 3H:1V, whereas, the downstream slope is set at 2H:1V and grass covered.

Little formal information is available concerning the dam foundation. However, discussions with the designer confirmed that the cutoff was extended to sound rock.

2. Appurtenant Structures.

a) Spillway. The spillway is a free over-fall concrete stoplog weir structure located adjacent to the right abutment. The weir crest is 150 feet long and consists of 15 spillway bays containing precast concrete stoplogs. The spillway discharges onto a reinforced concrete slab which extends approximately 13 feet downstream from the weir and into the natural downstream watercourse (see Figure 2).

b) Outlet Works. The outlet works at Laurel Hill Creek Dam consist of a 16-inch diameter cast iron supply line which is controlled from a pumphouse located just downstream of the dam on the right abutment. Discharge is regulated via a system of gates and pumps situated within the pumphouse.

c. Design Data and Procedures.

1. Embankment. No design data or information relative to design procedures are available.

2. Appurtenant Structures. No design data or information relative to design procedures are available.

2.2 Construction Records.

No formal records pertaining to the construction of the facility are available. Verification of cutoff trench construction to sound rock was obtained from discussions with a representative of the designer who was present during construction.

2.3 Operational Records.

No pool level, rainfall, or spillway discharge records are available for the facility; however, two high water levels were recorded with paint marks on the right sidewall of the spillway. The high pool levels were measured at elevation 1986 (corresponding to flood of 8-19-69), and at elevation 1987 (corresponding to flood of 9-14-71).

2.4 Other Investigations.

A survey of the reservoir was conducted in 1974 in order to determine the need for dredging.

2.5 Evaluation.

Specific design calculations and criteria were not available for review; however, information in the form of drawings and correspondence are considered sufficient to make a reasonable Phase I assessment of the facility.

SECTION 3 VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Observations.

a. General. The visual inspection of the facility suggested that the dam and its appurtenances are in good condition.

b. Embankment. No seepage through the face of the dam or indications of embankment instability were noted during the field inspection. Some minor deficiencies were observed which will require the owner's attention. These include:

1. Low spots on the embankment crest at the left abutment and at the left sidewall of the spillway.
2. Standing water and swamp-like conditions at the downstream toe of the dam (see Photograph 4).
3. Exposed, unvegetated portions of the downstream dam face (see Photograph 5).

The swamp-like condition at the dam toe (see Photograph 4) extends to an elevation above the normal pool level, and is probably related to a spring in the left abutment. The condition is not considered serious, but should be rectified as it prevents an accurate assessment of the performance of the dam.

c. Appurtenant Structures.

1. Spillway. The visual inspection of the spillway revealed that the structure is in good condition. Wooden stoplogs were replaced by precast concrete stoplogs in 1978. No signs of significant concrete deterioration were observed at the time of inspection (see Photograph 1 and 2).

2. Outlet Works. The intake to the Borough of Somerset water distribution system consists of a 16-inch diameter cast iron pipe located in the right sidewall of the spillway. The intake was submerged at the time of inspection and, consequently, was not observed. Modifications were made to the system in 1978, and it is reported to be operating as designed.

d. Reservoir Area. The reservoir is bounded by moderately to steeply sloping terrain which is equally composed of forested and agricultural lands. A small slide (see Photograph 6) was observed on the left abutment

just upstream from the dam crest. The slide is apparently centered in colluvial soils and was probably activated during construction of an access road which was used for equipment transport at the time of the dredging operation in 1978.

e. Downstream Channel. The downstream channel area is characterized as a mature valley containing the meandering Laurel Hill Creek. Much of the valley bottom is swampland owing to the frequent flooding and gentle stream gradient. Approximately one mile downstream from the dam, Laurel Hill Creek passes beneath PA Route 31. Just north of this point are a few homes and businesses in the community of Bakersville which are located on the floodplain, and are quite possibly located within the area which could be affected by a dam failure. In addition, there are a few low-lying homes in the community of Jimtown (approximately two miles downstream from the dam) which are in a similar situation. The Laurel Hill Lake Dam at Laurel Hill State Park (owned by PennDER) is located about 5.5 miles downstream from the Laurel Hill Creek Dam (see Photograph 8). Therefore, the Laurel Hill Creek facility is considered to be a high hazard.

3.2 Evaluation.

The overall condition of the facility is considered to be good. Minor deficiencies including low spots on the crest, ponded water at the downstream embankment toe, and lack of protective vegetation on portions of the downstream embankment slope require remedial work, while the slide upstream of the left abutment should be observed periodically to confirm that it is a localized condition.

SECTION 4 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Normal Operating Procedure.

Under normal operating conditions, water is pumped from the reservoir on an as-needed basis to be treated and used as a potable water supply for the Borough of Somerset. Excess inflow is discharged over the stoplogged weir structure.

4.2 Maintenance of the Dam.

No formal maintenance program exists at the facility. Normal maintenance consists primarily of clearing the dam slopes on an unscheduled basis.

4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities.

The valves controlling discharge of water from the reservoir are located in a pumphouse situated downstream on the right abutment. The only maintenance required at the dam site consists of periodically raising and cleaning the trash rack which protects the inlet to the 16-inch diameter cast iron supply pipe.

4.4 Warning System.

No formal warning system is in effect at the facility.

4.5 Evaluation.

No formal operations or maintenance manuals are available and no warning system exists for the facility. Formal manuals are recommended to ensure continued maintenance and to provide notification of downstream residents should an emergency develop.

SECTION 5 HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC EVALUATION

5.1 Design Data.

No design data, calculations, or reports are available. Available data are limited to design drawings and correspondence contained in PennDER files.

5.2 Experience Data.

Daily records of reservoir levels and/or spillway discharges are not available; however, two high water marks were recorded on the right spillway sidewall. The lower mark was measured at about elevation 1986 feet (or about 4 feet above the spillway crest), and corresponded to the flood of 8-19-69. The higher mark was measured at about elevation 1987 feet (or about 5 feet above the spillway crest), and corresponded to the flood of 9-14-71. Photographs indicating high tailwater under small discharges are available from the owner's files.

5.3 Visual Observations.

On the date of inspection, no conditions were observed that would indicate the spillway could not perform adequately during a flood event within the limits of its design.

5.4 Method of Analysis.

The facility has been analyzed in accordance with the procedures and guidelines established by the U. S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, for Phase I hydrologic and hydraulic evaluations. The analysis has been performed utilizing a modified version of the HEC-1 program developed by the U. S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, California. Analytical capabilities of the program are briefly outlined in the preface contained in Appendix C.

5.5 Summary of Analysis.

a. Spillway Design Flood (SDF). In accordance with the procedures and guidelines contained in the National Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams for Phase I Investigations, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for Laurel Hill Creek Dam is the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). That

is, based on its relative size (intermediate) and hazard potential (high), the facility is required to have sufficient spillway and storage capabilities to safely discharge the PMF without overtopping the embankment.

b. Results of Analysis. Laurel Hill Creek Dam was evaluated under normal operating conditions. That is, the reservoir was initially at its normal pool or spillway elevation of 1982 feet, with the spillway discharging freely. The spillway is a free overfall, concrete, stoplog weir structure. Since the weir crest elevation is not very high relative to the outlet channel invert elevation, and since the channel gradient downstream from the dam is very gentle, a tailwater rating curve was computed. All pertinent engineering calculations relative to the evaluation of this facility are provided in Appendix C.

Overtopping analysis (using the Modified HEC-1 Computer Program) indicated that the discharge/storage capacity of Laurel Hill Creek Dam can accommodate only about 36 percent of the PMF (SDF) prior to the overtopping of the embankment (Appendix C, Summary Input/Output Sheets, Sheet K). Under the PMF, the embankment will be overtopped for approximately 12.3 hours with a maximum depth of inundation equal to about 10.5 feet above the low top of dam elevation of 1994.1 feet (Summary Input/Output Sheets, Sheet K).

Actually, the spillway weir does not control reservoir outflows once the reservoir level rises roughly above elevation 1985 feet (or ≈ 3 feet above the spillway crest). The downstream channel and valley are on such a gentle slope (≈ 0.1 percent as measured on the U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle, Bakersville, Pennsylvania) that the capacities of the downstream valley sections control spillway discharges (Appendix C, Sheets 8 and 9). Therefore, above elevation 1985 feet, the reservoir and tailwater levels should rise at about the same rate.

5.6 Spillway Adequacy.

Although Laurel Hill Creek Dam can accommodate only about 36 percent of its SDF (the PMF), breaching of the embankment due to overtopping by large floods is unlikely due to the probable high tailwater conditions on the dam. Thus, the spillway system is considered inadequate, but not seriously inadequate since overtopping cannot increase the potential for loss of life downstream of the facility.

SECTION 6
EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

6.1 Visual Observations.

a. Embankment. Based on visual observations, the embankment appeared to be in good condition. A few minor deficiencies were noted at the time of inspection which will require the owner's attention. They are:

1. The embankment is approximately 1 foot below design elevation just to the left of the spillway and at the left abutment.

2. Swamp-like conditions exist at the downstream dam toe which preclude an accurate evaluation of the dam's performance (particularly under high pool levels).

3. A portion of the downstream face is not adequately protected against erosion.

In addition to the above stated deficiencies, a slide was observed on the left abutment just upstream from the dam crest. The slide, in its present configuration and extent, is not considered deleterious to the integrity of the dam; however, the slide should be observed regularly and provisions made to remedy the problem if the need arises.

b. Appurtenant Structures.

1. Spillway. The spillway was modified in 1978 when concrete stoplogs were substituted for the original wooden stoplogs. Since the spillway was discharging at the time of inspection, it was not possible to observe the spillway foundation or condition of the stoplogs. However, those portions of the spillway which were visible appeared to be in good condition.

2. Outlet Works. The outlet works (supply system) was modified in 1978 to better serve the needs of the Municipal Authority. The system was not observed by the field team, but, reportedly is functioning as designed.

6.2 Design and Construction Techniques.

No design or construction records are available with the exception of a set of construction drawings contained in PennDER files. Discussions with a representative of the designer indicated the cutoff trench was extended to rock.

6.3 Past Performance.

According to Municipal Authority personnel, the facility has functioned as designed since construction. Two high water levels are recorded on the right spillway sidewall, and are dated 8-19-69 and 9-14-71. The elevations of these water marks were measured at approximately 4 and 5 feet above the spillway crest, respectively.

6.4 Seismic Stability.

The dam is located in Seismic Zone No. 1, and is thus subject to minor earthquake induced dynamic forces. As the overall stability of the embankment appears adequate, and the dam is constructed of compacted soils; it is thought that the facility can withstand minor earthquake induced dynamic forces. No calculations and/or investigations were performed to confirm this opinion.

SECTION 7
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 Dam Assessment.

a. Safety. Visual observations indicate that Laurel Hill Creek Dam is in good condition. Hydrologic and hydraulic calculations performed during the investigation indicate that the facility will pass and/or store only 36 percent of the PMF prior to overtopping of the embankment. However, downstream conditions are such that even very low spillway discharges (3 feet over the weir) produce tailwater conditions which essentially preclude the possibility of failure due to embankment overtopping. That is, at low heads the spillway outflows are controlled by the downstream channel and valley capacities. Thus, there will be a rise in reservoir and tailwater pool levels, at roughly the same rate, which will gradually submerge the embankment.

Therefore, although the facility is capable of passing and/or storing only 36 percent of the PMF, overtopping will not lead to embankment failure and a significant increase to the downstream potential for loss of life or damage. Consequently, the spillway is considered inadequate, but not seriously inadequate.

The consequences of embankment inundation by tailwater and subsequent rapid drawdown are uncertain although it is noted that portions of the downstream slope are designated as pervious fill and rock toe on the design drawings. This construction is favorable with respect to rapid drawdown response; however, thorough inspection of the embankment should be performed during and after inundation.

Structural deficiencies noted during the field inspection included low spots (≈ 1 foot low) on the dam crest at the junctions of the embankment-left abutment and embankment left spillway sidewall. In addition, part of the downstream dam face is void of protective vegetation and is subject to erosion. Finally, a spring which discharges from the left abutment, flows along the downstream dam toe and has supported lush vegetation which could preclude an accurate evaluation of the performance of the dam (particularly under raised pool levels).

b. Adequacy of Information. The available information is considered adequate to make a reasonable Phase I assessment of the facility.

c. Urgency. The recommendations listed below should be implemented as soon as possible.

d. Necessity for Additional Investigations. No additional investigations are considered necessary at this time. Provisions for increasing the embankment height by 18 feet are presented on the design drawings. Should the owner consider implementing the modification, a detailed hydraulic and hydrologic study is recommended with tailwater effects considered.

7.2 Recommendations/Remedial Measures.

It is recommended that the owner immediately:

a. Develop a formal warning system for the notification of downstream residents should hazardous embankment conditions develop. Included in the plan should be provisions for around-the-clock surveillance of the facility during periods of unusually heavy precipitation and for thorough inspection of the downstream slope during tailwater drawdown.

b. Develop formal manuals of maintenance and operation to ensure continued proper care and maintenance of the facility.

c. Backfill low spots along the embankment crest to restore it to its design elevation.

d. Divert or control excess drainage from the left abutment to prevent ponding at the downstream embankment toe.

e. Seed the bare areas on the downstream embankment slope in order to provide adequate erosion protection.

f. Observe the slide immediately upstream of the left abutment during regular inspection of the facility to confirm that it is a local condition and take necessary remedial measures should it threaten the stability of the embankment.

APPENDIX A
CHECK LIST - ENGINEERING DATA

CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
PHASE I

NAME OF DAM: Laurel Hill Creek Dam
NDI#: PA-235 PENNDER#: 56-85

PAGE 1 OF 5

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 235
PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND TITLE	Mr. J. Kane - Manager (Somerset Borough); Secretary (Somerset Water Authority) Mr. Eric Critchfield - The Neilan Engineers, Inc., Somerset, Pennsylvania Mr. A. C. Hooke (Head, Dam Section) - Gannett, Fleming, Corddry, and Carpenter, Inc., (via phone)	
REGIONAL VICINITY MAP	See Appendix G (U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle, Bakersville, Pennsylvania).	
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	Designed by Gannett, Fleming, Corddry, and Carpenter. Constructed by Roberts and Schaefer Company, and completed in 1954. No correspondence other than drawings, relative to the original construction are available in PennDER files (see Section 1.2.g).	
AVAILABLE DRAWINGS	Set of 13 design drawings available in PennDER files. Representative drawings are provided in Appendix F.	
TYPICAL DAM SECTIONS	See Appendix F, Figure 3.	
OUTLETS: PLAN DETAILS DISCHARGE RATINGS	See Appendix F, Figures 2, 4, 5, and 6. Not available.	

ENGINEERING DATA (CONTINUED)

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 235
SPIILLWAY: PLAN SECTION DETAILS	See Appendix F, Figures 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.	
OPERATING EQUIPMENT PLANS AND DETAILS	See Appendix F, Figures 2, 4, 5, and 6.	
DESIGN REPORTS	None available.	
GEOLOGY REPORTS	None available.	
DESIGN COMPUTATIONS: HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STABILITY ANALYSES SEEPAGE ANALYSES	None available.	
MATERIAL INVESTIGATIONS: BORING RECORDS LABORATORY TESTING FIELD TESTING	Boring records shown on Figure 3, Appendix F Laboratory and/or field test data are not available.	

ENGINEERING DATA (CONTINUED)

PAGE 3 OF 5

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 235
BORROW SOURCES	Not known.	
POST CONSTRUCTION DAM SURVEYS	Dredging survey in 1973-1974.	
POST CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING STUDIES AND REPORTS	Water system improvement study in 1978. Report not available.	
HIGH POOL RECORDS	High pool levels noted on right sidewall of spillway dated 8-19-69 and 9-14-71. Water levels corresponding to these dates are 4 and 5 feet, respectively, above the spillway crest.	
MONITORING SYSTEMS	None.	
MODIFICATIONS	Drainage ditch constructed in spring 1979 to convey left abutment spring away from toe of dam.	

ENGINEERING DATA (CONTINUED)

PAGE 4 OF 5

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI#	PA - 235
PRIOR ACCIDENTS OR FAILURES	None.		
MAINTENANCE: RECORDS MANUAL	None available.		
OPERATION: RECORDS MANUAL	None available.		
OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Water is pumped as needed from reservoir, is treated, and is used as a possible water source for the Borough of Somerset.		
WARNING SYSTEM AND/OR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES	No formal warning system. However, the treatment facility is located adjacent to the dam and is manned at least 8 hours per day.		
MISCELLANEOUS	Rain gage located near dam site. According to the owner's representatives, the spillway weir is drowned out at low flows (pictures available in owner's files).		

CHECK LIST
HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC
ENGINEERING DATA

NDI ID # PA-235
PENN DER ID # 56-85
PAGE 5 OF 5

SIZE OF DRAINAGE AREA: 26.2 square miles
ELEVATION TOP NORMAL POOL: 1982.0 STORAGE CAPACITY: 250 acre-feet
ELEVATION TOP FLOOD CONTROL POOL: -- STORAGE CAPACITY: --
ELEVATION MAXIMUM DESIGN POOL: -- STORAGE CAPACITY: --
ELEVATION TOP DAM: 1994.1 STORAGE CAPACITY: 2113 acre-feet

SPILLWAY DATA

CREST ELEVATION: 1982.0 feet
TYPE: Free overfall, concrete, stoplog weir structure
CREST LENGTH: 150 feet (15 bays at 10 feet each)
CHANNEL LENGTH: N/A
SPILLOVER LOCATION: Near right abutment
NUMBER AND TYPE OF GATES: None

OUTLET WORKS

TYPE: 16-inch diameter C.I.P. supply line
LOCATION: Right sidewall of spillway
ENTRANCE INVERTS: 1975
EXIT INVERTS: N/A
EMERGENCY DRAWDOWN FACILITIES: Stoplogs in spillway weir

HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL GAGES

TYPE: Raingage
LOCATION: Near treatment facility
RECORDS: Daily records available.

MAXIMUM NON-DAMAGING DISCHARGE: Reportedly the discharge corresponding to a height of about 5 feet above the spillway which occurred 9-14-71.

APPENDIX B
CHECK LIST - VISUAL INSPECTION

CHECK LIST
VISUAL INSPECTION
PHASE 1

PAGE 1 OF 8

NAME OF DAM Laurel Hill Creek Dam STATE Pennsylvania COUNTY Somerset
NDI# PA - 235 PENNDR# 56-85
TYPE OF DAM Zoned earth SIZE Intermediate HAZARD CATEGORY High
DATE(S) INSPECTION 7 August 1979 WEATHER Clear and Hot TEMPERATURE 85° @ 1:00 p.m.
POOL ELEVATION AT TIME OF INSPECTION 1982 M.S.L.
TAILWATER AT TIME OF INSPECTION 1976 M.S.L.

INSPECTION PERSONNEL	OWNER REPRESENTATIVES	OTHERS
<u>J. P. Nairn</u>	<u>Mr. J. Kane - Manager, Borough</u>	
<u>W. J. Veon</u>	<u>of Somerset Municipal Authority</u>	
<u>D. L. Bonk</u>	<u>Mr. Eric Critchfield - Neillan</u>	
	<u>Engineers</u>	

RECORDED BY D. L. Bonk

EMBANKMENT

PAGE 2 OF 8

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDIN PA - 235
SURFACE CRACKS	None observed.	
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR BEYOND THE TOE	None observed.	
SLOUGHING OR EROSION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT SLOPES	Evidence of sliding observed along left abutment approximately 50 feet upstream of the embankment crest.	
VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT OF THE CREST	Horizontal - Good Vertical - Settlements of approximately 1-foot measured along the embankment crest.	
RIPRAP FAILURES	None observed. Upstream embankment face is covered to the crest with a layer of dumped sandstone riprap.	
JUNCTION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT, SPILLWAY AND DAM	Good. Minor settlement noted at junctions of embankment and left abutment and embankment and left sidewall of spillway.	

EMBANKMENT

PAGE 3 OF 8

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDIN PA - 235
DAMP AREAS IRREGULAR VEGETATION (LUSH OR DEAD PLANTS)	Damp area. Located across entire downstream embankment toe between spillway and left abutment, apparently the result of a spring that drains down the left abutment hillside.	
ANY NOTICEABLE SEEPAGE	None through embankment. All wet areas observed at the downstream embankment toe were measured to originate at elevations above normal pool. Thus, all of the observed wet areas are considered to be a result of that water draining from the left abutment.	
STAFF GAGE AND RECORDER	None observed. High pool marks are painted along right wingwall of spillway, upstream of the weir, and are dated 8-19-69 and 9-14-71. Water levels corresponding to these dates were measured at 4 and 5 feet, respectively, above normal pool.	
DRAINS	None observed. Contract drawings indicate rock toe.	

OUTLET WORKS

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDIN PA - 235
INTAKE STRUCTURE	Two intakes are located on the inside face of the right wingwall of the spillway. The lower intake was submerged below normal pool and not observed. The upper intake is protected by a trash rack, and was reportedly constructed as a contingency for the eventual raising of the embankment.	
OUTLET CONDUIT (CRACKING AND SPALL- ING OF CONCRETE SURFACES)	N/A	
OUTLET STRUCTURE	N/A	
OUTLET CHANNEL	See "Discharge Channel" Page 5 of 8.	
GATE(S) AND OPERA- TIONAL EQUIPMENT	Contained within a pumphouse located on the right abutment.	

EMERGENCY SPILLWAY

PAGE 5 OF 8

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDI# PA - 235
TYPE AND CONDITION	Free overfall, concrete, stoplog weir structure.	
APPROACH CHANNEL	See Appendix F, Figure 4. Submerged, not observed.	
SPILLWAY CHANNEL AND SIDEWALLS	Good condition.	
STILLING BASIN PLUNGE POOL	See Appendix F, Figure 4. Submerged, not observed.	
DISCHARGE CHANNEL	Spillway discharges into the natural Laurel Hill Creek channel which is on a very gentle gradient.	
BRIDGE AND PIERS	None.	
EMERGENCY GATES	15 spillway bays equipped with removable concrete stoplogs.	

SERVICE SPILLWAY

PAGE 6 OF 8

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDIM PA - 235
TYPE AND CONDITION	N/A	
APPROACH CHANNEL	N/A	
OUTLET STRUCTURE	N/A	
DISCHARGE CHANNEL	N/A	

INSTRUMENTATION

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS	NDIM PA - 235
MONUMENTATION SURVEYS	None.	
OBSERVATION WELLS	None.	
WEIRS	None.	
PIEZOMETERS	None.	
OTHERS		

RESERVOIR AREA AND DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL

PAGE 8 OF 8

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS AND/OR REMARKS
SLOPES: RESERVOIR	Moderate to steep and equally divided between agricultural and forested areas.
SEDIMENTATION	Quite a problem at this facility. Portions of reservoir dredged in 1978. Problem reportedly worsened when new portions of Pennsylvania Turnpike were constructed.
DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL (OBSTRUCTIONS, DEBRIS, ETC.)	Pennsylvania Route 31 Bridge is located approximately 1 mile downstream from the dam. Another bridge is located about 2 miles downstream, and the Laurel Hill Lake Dam at Laurel Hill State Park is located about 5.5 miles downstream from the dam.
SLOPES: CHANNEL VALLEY	The channel slope is very gentle (on the order of 0.1 percent) for the entire 5.5 mile distance to the Laurel Hill Lake Dam. The stream valley is broad in sections, with moderate to steep side slopes.
APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF HOMES AND POPULATION	Several residences and businesses are located in the Laurel Hill Creek floodplain at 1 and 2 miles downstream from the dam (estimated population $\approx$ 15 to 20). The structures are low enough such that they could be affected by the outflow produced by failure of the dam. In addition, the Laurel Hill Lake Dam is located 5.5 miles downstream and failure of the Laurel Hill Creek facility could possibly cause the Laurel Hill Lake facility to fail.

NDI# PA - 235

APPENDIX C
HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS

PREFACE

The modified HEC-1 program is capable of performing two basic types of hydrologic analyses: (1) the evaluation of the overtopping potential of the dam; and (2) the estimation of the downstream hydrologic-hydraulic consequences resulting from assumed structural failures of the dam. Briefly, the computational procedures typically used in the dam overtopping analysis are as follows:

- a. Development of an inflow hydrograph(s) to the reservoir.
- b. Routing of the inflow hydrograph(s) through the reservoir to determine if the event(s) analyzed would overtop the dam.
- c. Routing of the outflow hydrograph(s) from the reservoir to desired downstream locations. The results provide the peak discharge(s), time(s) of the peak discharge(s), and the maximum stage(s) of each routed hydrograph at the downstream end of each reach.

The evaluation of the hydrologic-hydraulic consequences resulting from an assumed structural failure (breach) of the dam is typically performed as outlined below.

- a. Development of an inflow hydrograph(s) to the reservoir.
- b. Routing of the inflow hydrograph(s) through the reservoir.
- c. Development of a failure hydrograph(s) based on specific breach criteria and normal reservoir outflow.
- d. Routing of the failure hydrograph(s) to desired downstream locations. The results provide estimates of the peak discharge(s), time(s) to peak, and maximum water surface elevation(s) of the failure hydrograph(s) for each location.

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
BY WJV DATE 8/13/79 PROJ. NO. 79-617-235
CHKD. BY 255 DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 1 OF 15



DAM STATISTICS

HEIGHT OF DAM $\approx$ 22 FT
(MEASURED FROM STREAM CHANNEL
@ DOWNSTREAM SPILLWAY TOE
TO TOP OF EMBANKMENT)

(FIELD MEASURED)

MAXIMUM POOL STORAGE CAPACITY $\approx$ 2113 AC-FT (SEE SHEET 4)
@ LOW TOP OF DAM

NORMAL POOL STORAGE CAPACITY $\approx$ 250 AC-FT (SEE NOTE 1)

DRAINAGE AREA $\approx$ 26.2 SQ MI

PLANIMETERED OFF USGS
7.5 MINUTE QUADS: SEVEN
SPRINGS AND EALERSVILLE, PA

NOTE 1: STORAGE CAPACITY OBTAINED FROM "DAMS,
RESERVOIRS AND NATURAL LAKES", WATER RESOURCE
BULLETIN NO. 5, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTS AND WATER, HARRISBURG, PA.
THE ACTUAL REPORTED VALUE WAS 90 MILLION GALLONS
HOWEVER, FOLLOWING FIELD INSPECTION IT IS
FELT THAT THE EXISTING NORMAL POOL STORAGE
IS MUCH LESS.

DAM CLASSIFICATION

DAM SIZE - INTERMEDIATE

(REF 1, TABLE 1)

HAZARD CLASSIFICATION - HIGH

(FIELD OBSERVATION)

REQUIRED SDF - PMF

(REF 1 TABLE 3)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL RUN DAM
BY WJV DATE 8/13/79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 2 OF 15



HYDROGRAPH PARAMETERS

LENGTH OF LONGEST WATERCOURSE ≈ 8.9 MI.

LCA ≈ 2.0 MI (MEASURED ALONG THE LONGEST WATERCOURSE
FROM THE DAM TO THE CENTROID OF THE BASIN)

NOTE 2 : VALUES OF L AND LCA ARE MEASURED FROM THE
USGS 7.5 MINUTE BAKERSVILLE, PA QUAD. ALL
VARIABLES ARE DEFINED IN REF 2, IN THE
SECTION ENTITLED "SNYDER SYNTHETIC UNIT
HYDROGRAPH"

$C_p \approx 1.0$
 $C_p \approx 0.40$

[SUPPLIED BY COE; ZONE 25]
OHIO RIVER BASIN

$T_p = \text{SNYDER'S STANDARD LAG} \approx 1.0 (L \times LCA)^{0.3}$

$\therefore T_p \approx 1.0 (8.9 \times 2.0)^{0.3} \approx 2.37 \text{ HRS}$

RESERVOIR SURFACE AREAS

SURFACE AREA (SA) @ NORMAL POOL EL 1992 ≈ 24 AC

NOTE 3 : NORMAL POOL ELEVATION OBTAINED FROM APPENDIX F,
FIG 3. NORMAL POOL SA OBTAINED FROM THE
REFERENCE IN NOTE 1, SHEET 1.

SA @ EL 2000 ≈ 411 AC
SA @ EL 2020 ≈ 942 AC

[PLANNIMETERED OFF 7.5 MINUTE
USGS BAKERSVILLE, PA QUAD]

ELEVATION LOW TOP OF DAM ≈ 1974.1 FT (FIELD MEASURED)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 8-14-79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
 CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 3 OF 15



RATE OF RESERVOIR SA INCREASE PER FOOT OF
 RESERVOIR RISE : $\Delta SA / \Delta H \approx (411 - 24) \text{ AC} / (2000 - 1982) \text{ FT} \approx 21.5 \frac{\text{AC}}{\text{FT}}$

$$\therefore SA @ EL 1994.1 \approx 24 \text{ AC} + [(21.5 \text{ AC/FT}) \times (1994.1 - 1982) \text{ FT}] \\ \approx 284 \text{ AC}$$

RESERVOIR ELEVATION @ "O" STORAGE

APPARENT MINIMUM RESERVOIR ELEVATION $\approx 1973.5 \text{ FT}$
 ($\approx$ SPILLWAY FOREBAY ELEVATION AS MEASURED IN THE FIELD)

$$\therefore SA @ EL 1973.5 \approx 0 \text{ AC}$$

RESERVOIR ELEVATION - STORAGE RELATIONSHIP

- ASSUME THAT STORAGE VARIES LINEARLY BETWEEN THE MINIMUM RESERVOIR ELEVATION VALUE OF 0 AC-FT AND THE REPORTED DESIGN NORMAL POOL VALUE OF 250 AC-FT, FOR SIMPLICITY.
- FOR RESERVOIR ELEVATIONS ABOVE NORMAL POOL EL 1982, ASSUME THAT THE MODIFIED PRISMOIDAL RELATIONSHIP IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ACTUAL STORAGE VARIATION. THE RELATIONSHIP IS DEFINED BY

$$\Delta V_{1 \rightarrow 2} = \frac{h}{3} (A_1 + A_2 + \sqrt{A_1 \times A_2}) \quad (\text{REF 14, PG. 10})$$

WHERE $\Delta V_{1 \rightarrow 2}$ = INCREMENTAL VOLUME INCREASE BETWEEN ELEVATIONS 1 AND 2, IN AC-FT;
 h = ELEVATION 2 - ELEVATION 1, IN FT;

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTIONLAUREL HILL CREEK DAMBY WJV DATE 9-14-79 PROJ. NO. 79-617-235CHKD. BY WJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 4 OF 15Engineers • Geologists • Planner
Environmental Specialists $A_1 = SA @ \text{ELEVATION } 1, \text{ IN AC; AND}$ $A_2 = SA @ \text{ELEVATION } 2, \text{ IN AC.}$

SA @ ANY ELEVATION CAN BE DEFINED BY

$$A_L = A_0 + \left[\left(\frac{dSA}{dH} \right) \times (\text{ELEVATION}_L - \text{ELEVATION}_0) \right]$$

WHERE $A_L = SA @ \text{ELEVATION } L, \text{ IN AC;}$ $A_0 = SA @ \text{NORMAL POOL} \approx 24 \text{ AC;}$ $\frac{dSA}{dH} = \text{RATE OF SA INCREASE} \approx 21.5 \text{ AC/FT (BELOW EL 2000);}$ $\text{ELEVATION}_0 = \text{NORMAL POOL EL } 1932.0 \text{ (BELOW EL 2000); AND}$ $\text{ELEVATION}_L = \text{ELEVATION IN QUESTION, IN FT.}$

- ELEVATION - STORAGE COMPUTATIONS

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	A_L (AC)	ΔV_{1-2} (AC-FT)	TOTAL VOLUME (AC-FT)	RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	A_L (AC)	ΔV_{1-2} (AC-FT)	TOTAL VOLUME (AC-FT)
1973.5	0	0	0	1992.0	239	228	1564
* 1982.0	24	250	250	1993.0	261	250	1814
1983.0	46	34	284	1994.0	282	271	2085
1984.0	67	56	340	** 1994.1	284	28	2113
1985.0	89	78	418	1995.0	304	265	2378
1986.0	110	99	517	1996.0	325	314	2692
1987.0	132	121	638	1997.0	347	336	3028
1988.0	153	142	780	1998.0	368	357	3385
1989.0	175	164	944	1999.0	390	379	3764
1990.0	196	185	1129	2000.0	411	400	4164
1991.0	218	207	1336	2005.0	***544	2380	6544
				2010.0	***677	3046	9590

* NORMAL POOL OR SPILLWAY ELEVATION

** LOW TOP OF DAM ELEVATION

*** ABOVE EL 2000 $\Rightarrow A_0 \approx 411 \text{ AC; } \frac{dSA}{dH} \approx \frac{(544-411) \text{ AC}}{(2005-2000) \text{ FT}} \approx 26.6 \text{ AC/FT}$

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 8-14-79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
 CHKD. BY DZS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 5 OF 15



PMP CALCULATIONS

- APPROXIMATE RAINFALL INDEX = 24 IN (REF 3, FIG 1)
 (CORRESPONDING TO A DURATION OF 24
 HOURS AND AN AREA OF 200 SQ MI IN
 SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA)
- DEPTH - AREA - DURATION ZONE #7 (REF 3, FIG 1)
- DRAINAGE AREA $\approx$ 26.2 SQ MI $\Rightarrow$ DEPTH - DURATION
 RELATIONSHIP IS GIVEN AS :

DURATION (HR)	PERCENT OF INDEX RAINFALL (%)
6	92
12	110
24	120
48	130

(REF 3,
FIG 2)

- HOB BROOK FACTOR (ADJUSTMENT FOR BASIN SHAPE AS WELL
 AS FOR THE LESSEK LIKELIHOOD OF A SEVERE STORM
 CENTERING OVER A SMALLER BASIN) CORRESPONDING TO
 A DA $\approx$ 26.2 SQ MI $\Rightarrow$ 0.831 (AS COMPUTED BY HEC-1)


SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 8-14-79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
 CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 6 OF 15

gai
 CONSULTANTS.


Engineers • Geologists • Planner
 Environmental Specialists

SPILLWAY CAPACITY

- PROFILE OF SPILLWAY : (NOT TO SCALE)
 (FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS, AND DESIGN DRAWINGS IN APPEN. F)



- CROSS-SECTION OF SPILLWAY : (NOT TO SCALE)



SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
BY WJV DATE 8-14-79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 7 OF 15



- THE SPILLWAY IS A FREE OVERFALL, CONCRETE, STOPLOG WEIR STRUCTURE. THE WEIR CONSISTS OF 15 BAYS OF 10-FT CENTER TO CENTER LENGTH EACH, SUPPORTED BY CONCRETE PIERS. THE TOP OF PIER IS ESSENTIALLY FLUSH WITH THE TOP OF THE STOP-LOGS. THE BREADTH OF THE WEIR CREST IS ABOUT 1 FT. SINCE THE WEIR CREST IS SO SMALL, IT WILL BE ASSUMED THAT THE WEIR IS APPROXIMATELY SHARP-CRESTED. THE DISCHARGE OVER THE WEIR CAN BE ESTIMATED BY:

$$Q = CLH^{3/2} \quad (\text{REF 5, PG 5-3})$$

WHERE Q = DISCHARGE IN CFS;
 L = LENGTH OF WEIR CREST ≈ 150 FT
 H = HEIGHT OF RESERVOIR ABOVE SPILLWAY CREST
ELEVATION OF 1932.0 $\Rightarrow$ MAXIMUM HEAD (H)
 ≈ 12.1 FT
 C = DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT ≈ 3.33 (FOR SHARP-CRESTED WEIR; REF 5, PG 5-7)

- SPILLWAY CAPACITY (NEGLECTING ANY APPROACH LOSSES):

$$Q \approx (3.33)(150 \text{ FT})(12.1 \text{ FT})^{3/2} \approx 21,020 \text{ CFS}$$

HOWEVER, FOR A FLOW OF 21,020 CFS, THE TAILWATER IN THE DAM WOULD REACH TO ABOUT EL 1944.4 FT. SINCE THE LOW TOP OF DAM ELEVATION IS ONLY 1944.1 FT, THE SPILLWAY CAPACITY IS SOMEWHAT LESS THAN 21,020 CFS, AND IS ACTUALLY CONTROLLED BY THE CAPACITY OF THE DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL VALLEY RATHER THAN BY THE SPILLWAY WEIR (SHEET 9). THEREFORE, THE MAXIMUM FLOW THROUGH THE SPILLWAY @ RESERVOIR ELEVATION 1944.1 FT $\approx 12,200$ CFS (FROM SHEET 11).

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
BY WJV DATE 8-20-79 PROJ. NO. 79-617-235
CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 8 OF 15



SPILLWAY RATING CURVE

SPILLWAY DISCHARGES CAN BE ESTIMATED BY THE EQUATION ON SHEET 7 UNTIL THE TAILWATER ELEVATION CORRESPONDS TO A CERTAIN FLOW IS HIGHER THAN THE RESERVOIR LEVEL NECESSARY TO CAUSE THAT FLOW OVER THE WEIR. ASSUME THAT THE ORIGINAL SPILLWAY DESIGN HEAD ≈ 12.1 FT ($\Rightarrow$ MEASURE LOW TOP OF DAM TO SPILLWAY CREST, FOR SIMPLICITY), AND THAT APPROACH CHANNEL LOSSES ARE NEGLIGIBLE. FURTHER, ASSUME THAT THE ACTUAL DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT (C) CORRECTIONS FOR HEADS OTHER THAN DESIGN, AND FOR SUBMERGENCE CAN BE REPRESENTED BY THE CORRECTION RELATIONSHIPS CORRESPONDING TO AN OGEE-SHAPED WEIR.

THE SPILLWAY RATING TABLE IS GIVEN ON SHEET 9.

EMBANKMENT RATING CURVE

DUE TO THE HIGH TAILWATER ON THE DAM, THE DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL VALLEY CAPACITY WILL CONTROL EMBANKMENT OVERFLOWS. ONCE THE RESERVOIR LEVEL RISES ABOVE ABOUT EL 1935 FT, THE EFFECTS OF WEIR FLOW OVER THE SPILLWAY AND/OR EMBANKMENT BECOMES DROWNED OUT, SUCH THAT THE RESERVOIR LEVEL IS DICTATED BY THE TAILWATER LEVEL. THEREFORE, FLOW OVER THE EMBANKMENT IS INCLUDED IN THE "FINAL Q" VALUES ON SHEET 9 FOR ELEVATIONS ABOVE ABOUT EL 1994.1 FT (LOW TOP OF DAM)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 8-20-79 PROJ. NO. 73-617-235
 CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 9 OF 15



- SPILLWAY RATING CURVE

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	H (FT)	H/H ₀ (F/FT)	C/C ₀	C	INITIAL Q (CFS)	TAILWATER ELEVATION (FT)	H ₀ /H (F/FT)	C _S /C	C _S	FINAL Q (CFS)
1982.0	0	-	-	-	0	1975.0	-	-	-	0
1983.0	1.0	0.08	0.82	2.73	410	1979.8	3.2	1.0	2.73	410
1984.0	2.0	0.17	0.84	2.90	1190	1983.6	0.2	0.86	2.41	1020
1985.0	3.0	0.25	0.86	2.86	2220	1985.0	0	-	-	2230
1986.0	4.0	0.33	0.98	2.93	3520	1986.7	-	-	-	2920
1988.0	6.0	0.50	0.92	3.06	6750	1989.9	-	-	-	4670
1990.0	8.0	0.66	0.95	3.16	10730	1993.0	-	-	-	6920
1992.0	10.0	0.83	0.98	3.26	15460	1996.2	-	-	-	9490
1994.0	12.0	0.99	1.0	3.33	20760	1999.3	-	-	-	12070
1994.1	12.1	1.0	1.0	3.33	21020	1999.4	-	-	-	12200
1995.0	13.0	1.07	1.01	3.36	23620	2000.7	-	-	-	* 13610
1996.9	14.9	1.23	1.03	3.43	24590	2003.4	-	-	-	* 16600
1999.4	17.4	1.44	1.05	3.50	38110	2006.7	-	-	-	* 21000
2001.6	19.6	1.62	1.07	3.56	46340	2009.4	-	-	-	* 25400
2003.5	21.5	1.78	1.08	3.60	53830	2011.6	-	-	-	* 29800
2005.3	23.3	1.93	1.09	3.63	61240	>2012	-	-	-	* 34200
2007.1	27.1	2.24	1.10	3.66	77450	>2012	-	-	-	* 45200

* INCLUDES FLOW OVER EMBANKMENT

H = RESERVOIR ELEV - 1982.0 FT ; ② H₀ ≈ 12.1 FT ; ③ C/C₀ ⇒ REF 4, PG 379, FIG 250 ;
 ④ C ≈ 3.23 × C₀ ; ⑤ Q = C (150 FT) H^{3/2} ; ⑥ INTERPOLATED FROM SHEET 11 ;
 ELEV. IN PARENT SPILLWAY DISCHARGE ONLY ; ⑦ H₀ ≈ RESERVOIR ELEV - TAILWATER ELEV ;
 C_S/C ⇒ REF 4, PG 382, FIG 254 ; ⑧ C_S = C × C_S/C ; ⑨ Q = C_S (150 FT) H^{3/2} UNLESS
 TAILWATER ELEV. IS 0.5 FT OR MORE BELOW RESERVOIR ELEV. TO RESERVOIR ELEV (TOIN FACILITY FLOW)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
BY WJV DATE 8-20-79 PROJ. NO. 78-G17-235
CHKD. BY RTS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 10 OF 15



TAILWATER RATING CURVE

DUE TO THE HEIGHT OF THE SPILLWAY CREST ABOVE THE DISCHARGE CHANNEL (ONLY ≈ 7 FT), AND TO THE VERY FLAT GRADIENT OF THE DISCHARGE CHANNEL AND VALLEY ($\approx 0.1\%$) FOR AT LEAST THE FIRST 4 MILES DOWNSTREAM FROM THE DAM, A BACKWATER CURVE WAS COMPUTED SO AS TO ASCERTAIN THE EFFECTS OF TAILWATER ON SPILLWAY DISCHARGES. THE BACKWATER CURVE WAS CALCULATED VIA THE HEC-2 WATER SURFACE PROFILE COMPUTER PROGRAM*. HEC-2 COMPUTES BACKWATER BY THE STANDARD STEP METHOD (REF 7, PG 274-290), BASED ON VALLEY AND CHANNEL CROSS-SECTION INFORMATION. THE SPECIFIC CROSS-SECTION DATA USED IS GIVEN ON SHEETS 12 THROUGH 15. THE COMPUTATIONS WERE INITIATE AT A SECTION (SECTION 9, SHEET 15) LOCATED ABOUT 4 MILES DOWNSTREAM FROM THE DAM BY THE SLOPE-AREA METHOD (REF 7, PG 146-149). THE CALCULATIONS THEN PROCEEDED UPSTREAM THROUGH 4 "NATURAL SECTIONS" AND 2 BRIDGES, AND FINALLY TO THE VALLEY SECTION @ THE TOE OF THE DAM (SECTION 2, SHEET 12).

THE RATING TABLE GIVEN ON SHEET 11 CORRESPONDS TO THE HEC-2 OUTPUT FOR SECTION 2 (SUMMARY INPUT/OUTPUT SHEETS, SHEET 6).

* HEC-2 WATER SURFACE PROFILES (USER'S MANUAL)
HYDROLOGIC ENGINEERING CENTER, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF
ENGINEERS, DAVIS, CALIFORNIA, NOV. 1976.

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 8-20-79 PROJ. NO. 73-617-235
 CHKD. BY DJS DATE 9-14-79 SHEET NO. 11 OF 15




- TAILWATER RATING CURVE :

ELEVATION (FT)	DISCHARGE (CFS)
1975.0	0
1980.9	500
1983.3	1000
1986.4	3200
1989.9	5500
1990.6	7700
1992.4	10000
1994.1	12200
1996.9	16600
1999.4	21000
2001.6	25400
2003.5	29800
2005.3	34200
2009.1	45200
2012.3	56200


DOWNSTREAM ROUTE SECTIONS

Sheet 12 of 15




DOWNSTREAM REVEALING SECTION

SHEET 14 OF 15



DOWNSTREAM ROUTING SECTIONS

SHEET 15 OF 15



DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE 9-3-79

PROJ. NO. 78-617-235

CHKD. BY DL

DATE 9-4-79

SHEET NO. A OF K



Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

SUMMARY INPUT/OUTPUT SHEETS

NOT A WHOLE NEW SPIN - BUT A NEW SPIN ON THE WHOLE

12. STAKE CALCULATIONS VIA SLOPE-AREA METHOD, MODEL BRIDGES #/ SPECIAL BRIDGE

WATSON, HILL CREEK DELUM LAUREL, HILL CREEK DAM

HEC-2 BACKWATER
CURVE COMPUTATIONS
FOR TAILWATER
ON DAM

J1	LOCUS	LOC	WAVE	ELIM	SIRI	REFRIC	INVIS	Q	WSEL	PU	FOR TAILWATER ON DAM
J2	WPROP	IFREQ	PRFVS	ASECV	ASECH	FN	ALDC	IBW	CHNIM	ITRACE	
	1.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
J3	VARIABLE CUBES FOR SQUARE PRISMATIC										
J5	LPREF	ADDSL					*****REQUESTED SECTION NUMBERS*****				
	-10.000	-10.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
MC	0.120	0.170	0.035		0.200	0.400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
CU	14.000	500.000	1000.000	3200.000	5500.000	5500.000	7700.000	10000.000	12200.000	16600.000	21000.000
GC	1957.000	29800.000	34700.000	45200.000	56200.000	56200.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MC	9.000	10.000	195.000	235.000		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CU	2010.000	0.0	2000.000	50.000	1980.000	1980.000	150.000	1964.000	195.000	1957.000	200.000
GC	1957.000	230.000	1969.000	235.000	1980.000	1980.000	500.000	2000.000	650.000	2010.000	675.000
MC	0.120	0.100	0.040		0.200	0.400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
J1	9.000	10.000	235.000		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CU	2010.000	0.0	2000.000	50.000	1980.000	1980.000	200.000	1971.000	235.000	1964.000	240.000
GC	1957.000	230.000	1973.000	275.000	1980.000	1980.000	300.000	2000.000	500.000	2010.000	900.000
MC	0.110	0.100	0.035		0.200	0.400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
J1	9.000	9.000	250.000	370.000		4940.000	4940.000	4940.000	0.0	0.0	0.0
CU	2010.000	0.0	2000.000	100.000	1980.000	1980.000	250.000	1967.000	250.000	1967.000	320.000
GC	1972.000	320.000	1981.000	400.000	2000.000	2000.000	1000.000	2010.000	1200.000	0.0	0.0
MC	0.110	0.100	0.035		0.200	0.700	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
J1	9.000	0.0	0.0		0.0	100.000	100.000	100.000	0.0	0.0	0.0
A3	10.000	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1979.000	1979.000	0.0
MC	0.110	0.100	0.035		0.200	0.400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SB	0.000	1.500	7.500		0.0	70.000	0.0	770.000	0.0	0.0	0.0
J1	9.000	0.0	0.0		0.0	30.000	30.000	30.000	0.0	0.0	0.0
A2	0.0	0.0	1.000		1978.000	1980.000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
A4	10.000	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1980.000	1980.000	0.0
CU	0.000	0.0	2010.000		0.0	100.000	2000.000	0.0	250.000	1780.000	0.0
GC	7700.000	1980.000	1978.000	320.000	1980.000	1980.000	1978.000	320.000	1980.000	0.0	400.000
MC	1.000	0.0	1000.000	2000.000		0.0	1200.000	2010.000	0.0	0.0	0.0
SB	0.000	0.100	0.035		0.200	0.700	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE 9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

79-617-235

CHKD. BY

DATE 9-4-79

SHEET NO.

OF 1



**Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists**

[illegible]

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE _____

9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

78-617-235

CHKD. BY

DATE _____

9-4-79

SHEET NO

C OF K



**Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists**

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

© Fiction

2120 FT

Li, F2LM

500

STATION	DISCHARGE			ELEVATION			CRWS	FG	VCH	AREA	VOL
	BLATH	U	CWSEL								
9.000	0.0	500.00	1961.64	0.0	1961.80	3.23	154.64	0.0			
9.000	0.0	1000.00	1964.05	0.0	1964.30	4.05	246.85	0.0			
9.000	0.0	1500.00	1969.70	0.0	1970.26	6.25	787.66	0.0			
9.000	0.0	2000.00	1973.28	0.0	1974.00	7.46	1450.49	0.0			
9.000	0.0	2500.00	1975.88	0.0	1976.71	8.26	2088.31	0.0			
9.000	0.0	3000.00	1978.13	0.0	1979.04	8.92	2745.04	0.0			
9.000	0.0	3500.00	1980.00	0.0	1980.96	9.44	3365.00	0.0			
9.000	0.0	4000.00	1982.76	0.0	1983.80	10.28	4380.34	0.0			
9.000	0.0	4500.00	1985.21	0.0	1986.30	10.93	5351.72	0.0			
9.000	0.0	5000.00	1987.39	0.0	1988.53	11.50	6293.21	0.0			
9.000	0.0	5500.00	1989.37	0.0	1990.56	12.01	7194.17	0.0			
9.000	0.0	6000.00	1991.20	0.0	1992.42	12.47	8067.37	0.0			
9.000	0.0	6500.00	1995.27	0.0	1996.59	13.45	10166.15	0.0			
9.000	0.0	7000.00	1998.80	0.0	2000.21	14.29	12155.60	0.0			
18.98	500.00	1968.41	1968.59	0.0	1968.59	3.43	145.95	18.98			
30.41	1000.00	1970.75	1971.03	0.0	1971.03	4.26	234.88	30.41			
85.06	2000.00	1976.42	1977.10	0.0	1977.10	6.72	559.70	85.06			
147.53	3000.00	1980.12	1981.12	0.0	1981.12	8.35	886.33	147.53			
208.30	4000.00	1982.75	1983.98	0.0	1983.98	9.47	1211.16	208.30			
273.00	5000.00	1985.01	1986.43	0.0	1986.43	10.40	1579.25	273.00			
335.09	6000.00	1986.86	1988.41	0.0	1988.41	11.12	1942.82	335.09			
432.07	7000.00	1988.75	1991.57	0.0	1991.57	12.44	2621.97	432.07			
536.97	8000.00	1992.20	1994.21	0.0	1994.21	13.45	3308.24	536.97			
649.36	9000.00	1994.37	1996.51	0.0	1996.51	14.25	3992.72	649.36			
749.59	10000.00	1996.23	1998.57	0.0	1998.57	14.92	4679.33	749.59			
848.03	11000.00	1998.14	2000.45	0.0	2000.45	15.47	5365.37	848.03			
942.24	12000.00	2002.12	2004.44	0.0	2004.44	16.32	7138.87	942.24			
1349.47	15000.00	2005.25	2007.76	0.0	2007.76	18.70	9220.80	1349.47			

SECTION 9

15750 fr

W. F. M.

25

SUBJECT

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE

9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

78-617-235

CHKD. BY DLB

DATE

9-4-79

SHEET NO.

D OF K

Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

SECTION	AT-CH	ELAIN	DISCHARGE	ELEVATION	CHWS	FG	VCH	ANEA	VUL
SECTION @ ≈ 1076.2 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 5' HOFF DS FROM BUTTRESS)	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	500.00	1971.22	1971.27	1.69	296.23	44.95
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	1000.00	1971.57	1973.64	2.17	470.78	70.42
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	3200.00	1979.81	1979.98	3.38	1167.95	183.02
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	5500.00	1983.92	1984.15	4.11	1969.44	309.46
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	7700.00	1986.82	1987.09	4.57	2921.68	442.65
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	10000.00	1989.28	1989.57	4.92	3985.73	588.55
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	12200.00	1991.27	1991.58	5.19	5072.35	730.04
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	16000.00	1994.50	1994.83	5.64	7029.17	989.32
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	21000.00	1997.17	1997.52	5.98	9002.14	1244.89
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	25400.00	1999.49	1999.84	6.27	10935.71	1495.86
SECTION @ ≈ 1076.2 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 5' HOFF DS FROM BUTTRESS)	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	29800.00	2001.52	2001.86	6.43	12789.33	1740.12
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	34200.00	2003.35	2003.70	6.56	14576.35	1978.79
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	45200.00	2007.25	2007.59	6.91	18704.05	2557.39
	1,900	4940.00	1967.00	56200.00	2010.48	2010.83	7.26	22465.71	3146.17
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	500.00	1971.25	1971.30	1.68	297.67	44.73
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	1000.00	1973.59	1973.67	2.17	461.59	71.50
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	3200.00	1979.84	1980.01	3.37	1171.81	185.71
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	5500.00	1983.95	1984.18	4.10	1977.28	313.99
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	7700.00	1986.85	1987.12	4.56	2933.05	449.37
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	10000.00	1989.31	1989.60	4.91	4000.34	597.72
SECTION @ ≈ 1076.2 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 5' HOFF DS FROM BUTTRESS)	1,800	100.00	1967.00	12200.00	1991.30	1991.61	5.18	5039.26	741.59
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	16600.00	1994.53	1994.86	5.63	7050.20	1005.48
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	21000.00	1997.20	1997.55	5.97	9026.23	1265.59
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	25400.00	1999.52	1999.87	6.25	10963.25	1520.99
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	29800.00	2001.55	2001.89	6.41	12817.52	1769.51
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	34200.00	2003.38	2003.72	6.55	14804.64	2012.28
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	45200.00	2007.28	2007.62	6.90	18734.63	2600.36
	1,800	100.00	1967.00	56200.00	2010.51	2010.86	7.25	22499.01	3197.78
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	500.00	1971.26	1971.30	1.68	297.65	44.94
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	1000.00	1973.60	1973.68	2.17	461.61	71.81
SECTION @ ≈ 1076.2 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 5' HOFF DS FROM BUTTRESS)	1,700	30.00	1967.00	3200.00	1980.10	1980.26	3.30	1208.67	186.53
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	5500.00	1984.04	1984.27	4.07	2002.90	315.36
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	7700.00	1986.88	1987.14	4.55	2944.12	451.39
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	10000.00	1989.31	1989.60	4.91	4000.52	600.47
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	12200.00	1991.30	1991.61	5.18	5039.66	745.06
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	16000.00	1994.53	1994.86	5.63	7050.27	1010.33
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	21000.00	1997.20	1997.55	5.97	9026.36	1271.80
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	25400.00	1999.52	1999.87	6.25	10963.09	1528.54
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	29800.00	2001.57	2001.92	6.40	12840.47	1778.35
	1,700	30.00	1967.00	34200.00	2003.44	2003.78	6.52	14663.37	2022.36

SUBJECT

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE

9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

78-617-235CHKD. BY DLB

DATE

9-4-79

SHEET NO.

E OF KEngineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

ELEVATION

DISCHARGE

SECTION	ALCH	ELMIN	U	CHSEL	CRIPS	EG	VCH	AREA	VUL
SECTION @ 21050 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 2100 FT US FROM BRUE)	6.900	100.00	1967.00	500.00	1971.29	0.0	1971.33	300.05	45.62
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	1000.00	1973.63	0.0	1973.70	475.71	72.89
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	3200.00	1980.13	0.0	1980.29	1212.56	189.31
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	5500.00	1984.07	0.0	1984.30	2010.77	319.97
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	7700.00	1986.91	0.0	1987.17	2955.22	458.16
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	10000.00	1989.34	0.0	1989.63	4014.30	609.67
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	12200.00	1991.33	0.0	1991.64	5055.39	756.65
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	16600.00	1994.56	0.0	1994.89	7069.76	1026.54
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	21000.00	1997.23	0.0	1997.58	9048.64	1292.55
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	25400.00	1999.55	0.0	1999.90	10987.70	1553.74
SECTION @ 21950 FT DS FROM DAM	6.900	100.00	1967.00	29800.00	2001.60	0.0	2001.94	12866.18	1807.86
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	34200.00	2003.47	0.0	2003.80	14689.66	2056.05
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	45200.00	2007.41	0.0	2007.75	18881.97	2656.62
	6.900	100.00	1967.00	56200.00	2010.67	0.0	2011.01	22693.32	3265.39
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	500.00	1971.70	0.0	1972.23	85.33	50.22
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	1000.00	1973.91	0.0	1974.63	147.04	80.32
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	3200.00	1980.26	0.0	1981.16	599.88	210.94
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	5500.00	1984.31	0.0	1985.03	1421.38	360.94
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	7700.00	1987.21	0.0	1987.79	2420.98	522.34
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	10000.00	1989.68	0.0	1990.16	3543.10	699.89
SECTION @ 22650 FT DS FROM DAM	6.900	100.00	1968.00	12200.00	1991.69	0.0	1992.10	4639.24	872.30
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	16600.00	1994.93	0.0	1995.29	6757.63	1191.61
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	21000.00	1997.64	0.0	1997.95	8846.35	1506.17
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	25400.00	1999.97	0.0	2000.26	10896.25	1814.98
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	29800.00	2002.03	0.0	2002.29	12832.08	2114.63
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	34200.00	2003.89	0.0	2004.13	14651.10	2406.31
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	45200.00	2007.83	0.0	2008.05	18697.23	3105.22
	6.900	100.00	1968.00	56200.00	2011.09	0.0	2011.31	22242.49	3801.82
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	500.00	1975.27	0.0	1975.32	255.75	63.38
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	1000.00	1977.58	0.0	1977.68	394.83	101.22
SECTION @ 22650 FT DS FROM DAM (@ 2100 FT DS FROM BRUE)	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	3200.00	1983.14	0.0	1983.26	2101.15	315.12
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	5500.00	1986.37	0.0	1986.45	4757.89	599.26
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	7700.00	1988.80	0.0	1988.86	7573.52	907.80
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	10000.00	1990.96	0.0	1991.01	10676.93	1248.32
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	12200.00	1992.78	0.0	1992.82	13730.06	1580.83
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	16600.00	1995.83	0.0	1995.86	19723.55	2212.92
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	21000.00	1998.42	0.0	1998.44	25679.75	2837.76
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	25400.00	2000.67	0.0	2000.70	31528.61	3451.20
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	29800.00	2002.64	0.0	2002.66	36965.83	4035.21
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	34200.00	2004.45	0.0	2004.47	42196.05	4598.76
SECTION @ 22650 FT DS FROM DAM	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	45200.00	2008.33	0.0	2008.35	54151.80	5914.83
	6.900	3360.00	1971.00	56200.00	2011.51	0.0	2011.59	64924.64	7163.63

SUBJECT

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE

9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

78-617-235CHKD. BY DLB

DATE

9-4-79

SHEET NO.

F OF KEngineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

SECTION @ ≈ 600 FT DS FROM DAM (@ DS FACE OF BRIDGE)	SPECIM	ALCH	ELMIN	DISCHARGE Q	ELEVATION CASEL	UNITS	EG	VCH	AREA	VUL
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	500.00	1975.30	0.0	1975.36	1.94	258.22	63.97
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	1000.00	1977.62	0.0	1977.72	2.52	397.17	102.13
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	3200.00	1983.12	0.0	1983.42	4.40	727.40	318.36
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	5500.00	1986.39	0.0	1986.47	3.05	4781.18	610.21
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	7700.00	1988.81	0.0	1988.87	2.90	7595.31	925.21
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	10000.00	1990.97	0.0	1991.02	2.79	10696.41	1272.85
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	12200.00	1992.79	0.0	1992.83	2.70	13747.41	1612.37
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	16600.00	1995.84	0.0	1995.87	2.61	19740.31	2258.22
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	21000.00	1998.42	0.0	1998.45	2.56	25721.20	2896.76
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	25400.00	2000.68	0.0	2000.70	2.50	31568.80	3523.63
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	29800.00	2002.65	0.0	2002.67	2.43	37002.70	4120.11
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	34200.00	2004.46	0.0	2004.48	2.39	42229.96	4695.67
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	38600.00	2006.34	0.0	2006.35	2.38	54183.48	6039.18
	5.000	100.00	1971.00	56200.00	2011.58	0.0	2011.60	2.42	64957.25	7312.71
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	500.00	1975.31	0.0	1975.37	1.93	258.49	64.15
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	1000.00	1977.63	0.0	1977.73	2.52	397.46	102.40
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	3200.00	1983.36	0.0	1983.67	4.31	742.73	318.87
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	5500.00	1987.27	0.0	1987.29	1.68	9206.75	615.02
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	7700.00	1989.16	0.0	1989.17	1.80	12092.10	931.99
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	10000.00	1991.15	0.0	1991.16	1.82	15507.79	1281.88
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	12200.00	1992.94	0.0	1992.96	1.83	18909.04	1623.62
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	16600.00	1995.97	0.0	1995.98	1.86	25338.47	2273.74
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	21000.00	1998.55	0.0	1998.56	1.90	31496.45	2916.46
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	25400.00	2000.81	0.0	2000.82	1.93	37404.07	3547.38
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	29800.00	2002.78	0.0	2002.79	1.94	42875.58	4147.62
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	34200.00	2004.59	0.0	2004.61	1.95	48133.36	4726.78
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	38600.00	2006.49	0.0	2006.50	2.03	60171.80	6078.55
	5.000	30.00	1971.00	56200.00	2011.74	0.0	2011.76	2.11	71029.19	7359.54
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	500.00	1975.35	0.0	1975.41	1.92	260.95	64.74
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	1000.00	1977.67	0.0	1977.77	2.50	400.00	103.32
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	3200.00	1983.79	0.0	1983.82	1.85	4755.25	125.18
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	5500.00	1987.28	0.0	1987.29	1.68	9212.39	636.16
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	7700.00	1989.16	0.0	1989.18	1.80	12094.07	959.75
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	10000.00	1991.15	0.0	1991.17	1.82	15507.79	1317.48
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	12200.00	1992.95	0.0	1992.96	1.83	18907.29	1667.02
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	16600.00	1995.97	0.0	1995.99	1.86	25334.60	2331.90
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	21000.00	1998.55	0.0	1998.56	1.90	31490.55	2988.76
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	25400.00	2000.81	0.0	2000.82	1.93	37396.81	3633.24
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	29800.00	2002.78	0.0	2002.80	1.94	42866.92	4246.04
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	34200.00	2004.60	0.0	2004.61	1.96	48123.58	4837.27
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	38600.00	2006.49	0.0	2006.50	2.03	60158.80	6216.67
	4.900	100.00	1971.00	56200.00	2011.75	0.0	2011.76	2.11	71013.62	7522.57

SUBJECT

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE

9-3-79

PROJ. NO.

78-617-235CHKD. BY DLB

DATE

9-4-79

SHEET NO.

G OF KEngineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

DISCHARGE ELEVATION

SECTION	ALCH	ELMIN	U	INSEI	CHWS	EG	VCH	AREA	VOL
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	500.00	1976.82	0.0	1977.01	3.46	144.56	76.01
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	1000.00	1979.24	0.0	1979.57	4.61	217.03	120.46
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	3200.00	1984.18	0.0	1984.26	3.46	2847.49	536.37
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	5500.00	1987.50	0.0	1987.54	2.78	5830.24	1054.01
3.000	2420.00	1972.00	7700.00	1989.38	0.0	1989.41	2.85	7793.99	1512.20
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	10000.00	1991.34	0.0	1991.37	2.81	10063.95	2027.80
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	12200.00	1993.11	0.0	1993.14	2.78	12299.62	2533.88
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	16600.00	1996.12	0.0	1996.15	2.78	16492.12	3493.76
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	21000.00	1998.68	0.0	1998.71	2.82	20470.16	4432.11
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	25400.00	2000.93	0.0	2000.95	2.83	24258.28	5345.87
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	29800.00	2002.89	0.0	2002.92	2.85	27738.61	6207.30
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	34200.00	2004.70	0.0	2004.73	2.88	31066.80	7037.00
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	45200.00	2008.58	0.0	2008.61	2.98	38638.37	8961.04
4.000	2420.00	1972.00	56200.00	2011.84	0.0	2011.87	3.11	45413.61	10756.67
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	500.00	1980.14	0.0	1980.31	3.38	148.08	84.20
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	1000.00	1982.58	0.0	1982.75	3.69	613.81	143.73
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	3200.00	1985.75	0.0	1985.88	4.28	2078.31	674.33
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	5500.00	1988.36	0.0	1988.46	4.24	3548.99	1316.70
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	7700.00	1990.16	0.0	1990.26	4.44	4690.34	1861.85
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	10000.00	1992.01	0.0	1992.10	4.48	5980.65	2477.17
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	12200.00	1993.69	0.0	1993.78	4.48	7256.95	3081.61
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	16600.00	1996.60	0.0	1996.68	4.53	9686.04	4226.93
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	21000.00	1999.11	0.0	1999.19	4.60	12011.54	5341.83
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	25400.00	2001.31	0.0	2001.39	4.63	14231.50	6423.87
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	29800.00	2003.24	0.0	2003.33	4.66	16319.82	7441.26
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	34200.00	2005.03	0.0	2005.11	4.70	18362.77	8421.38
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	45200.00	2008.88	0.0	2008.97	4.86	23155.52	10691.71
3.000	2440.00	1974.00	56200.00	2012.12	0.0	2012.21	5.04	27586.12	12801.20
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	500.00	1980.90	0.0	1980.92	1.21	411.98	91.27
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	1000.00	1983.25	0.0	1983.28	1.41	712.83	160.48
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	3200.00	1986.41	0.0	1986.48	2.30	2113.72	727.25
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	5500.00	1988.87	0.0	1988.94	2.53	3473.75	1405.17
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	7700.00	1990.64	0.0	1990.72	2.76	4462.41	1977.42
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	10000.00	1992.43	0.0	1992.52	2.91	5482.66	2621.91
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	12200.00	1994.07	0.0	1994.16	3.01	6424.59	3254.36
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	16600.00	1996.92	0.0	1997.02	3.22	8113.14	4451.67
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	21000.00	1999.40	0.0	1999.51	3.44	9661.25	5615.48
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	25400.00	2001.56	0.0	2001.70	3.63	11092.32	6743.61
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	29800.00	2003.49	0.0	2003.62	3.83	12409.32	7804.00
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	34200.00	2005.26	0.0	2005.40	4.00	13675.26	8825.90
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	45200.00	2009.09	0.0	2009.26	4.42	16575.39	11193.37
2.000	1100.00	1975.00	56200.00	2012.31	0.0	2012.51	4.80	19187.66	13391.77

SECTION
@
2350 FT
DS FROM
DAMSECTION
@
21100 FT
DS FROM
DAMSECTION
@
DS TOE
OF DAM

gci
CONSULTANTS, IN
Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

DATE	HYDROGRAPHIC END-UP PERIOD	ORIGINALS	LAG	2.37 HOURS	CI= .40	VOL= 1.00
85.	659.	1062.	1511.	1963.	2352.	2652.
86.	2703.	2366.	2237.	2115.	1899.	1889.
87.	3710.	1349.	1427.	1349.	1175.	1079.
88.	814.	769.	727.	687.	614.	542.
89.	401.	436.	415.	392.	370.	333.
90.	466.	450.	436.	423.	400.	379.
91.	151.	143.	135.	127.	120.	108.
92.	80.	81.	80.	73.	65.	56.
93.	49.	46.	44.	39.	37.	33.
94.	26.	26.	25.	22.	21.	20.

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE 9-3-79

PROJ. NO. 78-617-235

CHKD. BY DLB

DATE 9-4-79

SHEET NO. 1 OF 1



**Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists**

[illegible]

	PEAK	6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
CF5	41454.	33640.	15303.	5501.	158433H.
CMS	1174.	953.	433.	156.	44863.
INCHES		11.94	41.73	23.44	23.44
MM		303.3H	552.01	595.33	595.33
AC-FT		16681.	30352.	32734.	32734.
THOUS CU M		20576.	37439.	40377.	40377.

	8-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
PRAN				
CPS	10092.	4591.	1650.	475302.
CMS	286.	130.	47.	13459.
INCHES	3.58	6.52	7.03	7.03
MM	91.00	165.00	175.00	431.00

0.3 PMF

AC-47	9820.
6173.	12114.
5004.	9820.
5106.	9820.
11232.	12114.

PEAK	6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
16282.	14556.	6121.	2200.	633735.
470.	381.	173.	62.	17945.
	4.75	8.69	9.38	
	121.35	220.61	238.13	238.13
	12141.	12141.	13094.	13094.
	8230.	14976.	16151.	16151.

HYDROGRAPH ROUTING

MINNESOTA MINING AND MFG. CO.

	ESTD 101	ICOMP 1	IFCON 0	IFAPE 0	IFPL 0	IPRT 0	INAME 1	ISTAGE 0	IAUTO 0
			ROUTING DATA						
	CROSS 0.0	CROSS 0.000	AVG 0.00	IFRS 1	ISAME 1	IPMP 0		LSTR 0	
		ASLES 1	ASISOL 0	LAG 0	AMSKR 0.000	X 0.000	STOKA 250.	ISPRAT -1	
DATE.	1983.00	1984.00	1985.00	1986.00	2003.50	2005.30	1990.00	2009.10	1992.00
	1993.00	1994.40	2001.60	2003.50					
FLOW	0.00	1070.00	2730.00	2920.00	4670.00	6920.00	9490.00	12070.00	1994.00
	13010.00	21000.00	25400.00	29800.00	34200.00	45200.00			
CAPACITY	0.	250.	340.	700.	944.	1129.	1336.	1564.	1814.
	2085.	2113.	2378.	3028.	3385.	3764.	4164.	6544.	9590.
PERFORMANCE	1974.	1982.	1984.	1988.	1989.	1990.	1991.	1992.	1993.
	1994.	1994.	1995.	1997.	1998.	1999.	2000.	2005.	2010.

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM

BY WJV

DATE 9-3-79

PROJ. NO. 78-617-235

CHKD. BY DLB

DATE 9-4-79

SHEET NO. J OF K



PMF

0.3 PMF

0.4 PMF

CRRL SPWD COWW EXPW ELEV CUL CAREA EXPI
1982.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

DAM DATA
TUPPL CHOD EXPD DAMWID
1994.1 0.0 0.0 0.

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 32994. AT TIME 44.25 HOURS

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
29216.	15198.	5500.	1584040.
827.	430.	156.	44855.
10.37	21.58	23.43	23.43
263.46	548.22	595.22	595.22
14486.	30144.	32728.	32728.
17868.	37182.	40370.	40370.

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 10238. AT TIME 44.00 HOURS

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
9189.	4582.	1650.	475213.
260.	130.	47.	13457.
3.26	6.51	7.03	7.03
82.87	165.28	178.57	178.57
4556.	9088.	9818.	9818.
5620.	11210.	12111.	12111.

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 13389. AT TIME 44.25 HOURS

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
12061.	6108.	2200.	632619.
382.	173.	62.	17942.
4.28	8.67	9.37	9.37
108.77	220.34	238.09	238.09
5981.	14115.	13091.	13091.
7377.	14944.	16148.	16148.

REFERENCE

OUTFLOW

HYDROGRAPH

OUTFLOW

6000

6

0.26 PMF

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
 BY WJV DATE 9-3-79 PROJ. NO. 78-617-235
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 9-4-79 SHEET NO. K OF K



SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE 1982.00 250. 0.	SPILLWAY CHEST 1982.00 250. 0.	TOP OF DAM 1994.10 2113. 12200.	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-F1	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S. ELEV	1992.58	1709.	10238.	0.00	44.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
UP P4F	.40	2336.	13189.	3.00	44.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
.50	.76	2980.	16532.	5.75	44.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
.60	2.76	3637.	19705.	7.75	44.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.00	4.56	6355.	32494.	14.25	44.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
	10.50							

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams," prepared by Department of the Army Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C. (Appendix D).
2. "Unit Hydrograph Concepts and Calculations," by Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (L-519).
3. "Seasonal Variation of Probable Maximum Precipitation East of the 105th Meridian for Areas from 10 to 1,000 Square Miles and Duration of 6, 12, 24, and 48 Hours," Hydrometeorological Report No. 33, prepared by J. T. Riedel, J. F. Appleby and R. W. Schloemer Hydrologic Service Division Hydrometeorological Section, U. S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C., April 1956.
4. Design of Small Dams, U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., 1973.
5. Handbook of Hydraulic, H. W. King and E. F. Brater, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1963.
6. Standard Handbook for Civil Engineers, F. S. Merritt McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1968.
7. Open-Channel Hydraulics, V. T. Chow, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1959.
8. Weir Experiments, Coefficients, and Formulas, R. E. Horton, Water Supply and Irrigation Paper No. 200, Department of the Interior, United States Geological Survey, Washington, D. C., 1907.
9. "Probable Maximum Precipitation Susquehanna River Drainage Above Harrisburg, Pennsylvania," Hydrometeorological Report 40, prepared by H. V. Goodyear and J. T. Riedel, Hydrometeorological Branch Office of Hydrology, U. S. Weather Bureau, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., May 1965.
10. Flood Hydrograph Package (HEC-1) Dam Safety Version, Hydrologic Engineering Center, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, California, July 1978.
11. "Simulation of Flow Through Broad Crest Navigation Dams with Radial Gates," R. W. Schmitt, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District.

12. "Hydraulics of Bridge Waterways," BPR, 1970, Discharge Coefficient Based on Criteria for Embankment Shaped Weirs, Figure 24, page 46.
13. Applied Hydraulics in Engineering, Morris, Henry M. and Wiggert, James N., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2nd Edition, The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1972.
14. Standard Mathematical Tables, 21st Edition, The Chemical Rubber Company, 1973, page 15.
15. Engineering Field Manual, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 2nd Edition, Washington, D. C. 1969.

APPENDIX D
PHOTOGRAPHS

PHOTOGRAPH 1

Overview photograph of Laurel Hill Creek Dam taken from the right abutment. Note the vegetation within site reservoir area.

PHOTOGRAPH 2

Close-up view of the spillway as seen from the left sidewall. The pumphouse is visible on the extreme left portion of the view.

PHOTOGRAPH 3

View of the upstream face of Laurel Hill Creek Dam.

PHOTOGRAPH 4

View of cattails and other hydrophylic vegetation at the downstream toe of the dam.



2



1



PHOTOGRAPH 5 View of some areas void of vegetation on the downstream dam face.

PHOTOGRAPH 6 View of a small slide on the left abutment just upstream of the crest.

PHOTOGRAPH 7 View from the dam crest of the area downstream of the dam and a pond used to impound sediment dredged from the reservoir.

PHOTOGRAPH 8 View of the dam at Laurel Hill State Park located approximately 5.5 miles downstream of Laurel Hill Creek Dam.



6



5



APPENDIX E

GEOLOGY

Geology

Laurel Hill Creek Dam is located approximately 7.5 miles west of Somerset in the Allegheny Mountain Section of the Appalachian Plateaus Province. The Allegheny Mountain Section is characterized by gently folded sedimentary rock strata of Pennsylvanian age or older. Major structural axes strike from southwest to northeast of flanking strata dipping northwest and southeast.

Structurally, the dam and reservoir lie approximately midway of the Laurel Hill anticline to the west and the New Lexington (Johnstown) syncline to the east. The bedrock flanking the east side of Laurel Hill consist of Mississippian age strata in the higher elevations and Pennsylvanian age strata in the vicinity of the dam. Near the dam, the sedimentary rock strata dip to the southeast at approximately 125 feet per mile or about two degrees.

The strata underlying the alluvial and residual soils of the valley at the dam site are members of the lower half of the Conemaugh Group of Pennsylvanian age. The lower portion of the Conemaugh Group generally consists of alternating beds of shale, sandstone, limestone, minor coals, and clay. Thin beds of marine limestones and shales are present throughout.

APPENDIX F

FIGURES

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Description/Title</u>
1	General Plan (field inspection notes)
2	Project Plan
3	Dam Embankment Sections
4	Dam Spillway Details
5	Dam Spillway Training Walls and Raw Water Intake Pipe Details
6	Dam Intake Structure Details







FIGURE 1 - LAUREL HILL CREEK DAM
GENERAL PLAN : FIELD INSPECTION NOTES





FIGURE




NOTES

1. The depth and extent of cut-off trench may be modified by the Engineer on field - fill, loose sand, gravel, or other pervious material, as determined by the Engineer, shall be removed from the cut-off trench.
2. Any pervious material from excavation to be wasted shall be spread in 12" layers of upstream toe of dam to form an impervious blanket. The sequence and limit of extent of material dumping for blanket shall be as directed by Engineer.


SECTION 7A




SCALE 1" = 20'




PROFILE ALONG CUTOFF TRENCH


SCALE 1" = 20'








SPILLWAY PLAN
SCALE 1" = 10'



NOTE:
Concrete above pile top at elevation 1370 and bays shall be paid
under items 11, 12, 13. Concrete below elevation 1370 exclusive of bays
to be paid as Class B concrete fill (Wharfage).


SECTION
SCALE 1" = 10'




DESIGN WLO	MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOROUGH OF SOMERSET SOMERSET PENNSYLVANIA	DRAWN BY 4A
TRACED WLO	LAUREL MILL CREEK FILTRATION PLANT	DATE 2106
ENGINEER ACW	DAM SPILLWAY	DATE JUNE 1961
INCHES ACW	DETAILS II	
INCHES		

GARRETT FLEMING SURVEY & CARPENTER, INC.
ENGINEERS
800 N SECOND ST. HARRISBURG, PENNA.

[illegible]







REINFORCEMENT DEVELOPED RIGHT WALL



REINFORCEMENT DEVELOPED LEFT WALL

For Wall Dimensions of Sections 5H, 5I, 5J, and 5K, See Wall Dimensions Table, this sheet








SECTION 5-B SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"



SECTION 4-R SCALE 3/4" = 1'-0"

SECTION 5-F SCALE 3/4" = 1'-0"

SECTION 5-A SCALE 3/4" = 1'-0"




Height and Weight	Age 10 1/2 Feet 5 1/2 Wt 110	Bars 0 "46 10" Bars 1 "46 10" Bars 2 "46 10"
----------------------	------------------------------------	--



DATE: _____	MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY OF THE BOROUGH OF SOMERSET SOMERSET, PENNSYLVANIA	SEAL NO. 5
DESIGN E	LAUREL HILL CREEK RETENTION BASIN	200 YRS 2100
CHECKED C		DATE
APPROVED AEN	DAM ON LAUREL CREEK WALLS AND DAM WATER INTAKE HAVE DETAILS	AUGUST 1963
ISSUED NO.		

GARRETT FLEMING CONDOYT & CARPENTER, INC.
ENGINEERS
600 N. SECOND ST. HARRISBURG, PENNA.

[illegible]



APPENDIX G

REGIONAL VICINITY AND WATERSHED BOUNDARY MAP

