

AD-A082 110

GAI CONSULTANTS INC MONROEVILLE PA
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM. RESERVATION DAM. (NDI NUMBER P--ETC(U)
JAN 80

DACW31-80-C-0016


F/G 13/13

ML

UNCLASSIFIED

1-1
2000

END
DATE
FILMED
4-80
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

FILE

ADA082110

**SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN
INDIANTOWN RUN, LEBANON COUNTY**

1
B.S.

PENNSYLVANIA


RESERVATION DAM

NDI I.D. No. PA-00014

PENNDER I.D. No. 38-78

DACW 31-80-C-0016

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



**S DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 2 1 1980
A**

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**

JANUARY 1980

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited**

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

FILE COPY

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

80 3 21 073

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

**THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY
PRACTICABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED
TO DTIC 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.

ORIGINAL COPY
REPRODUCTIONS: ALL DDC
BLACK AND WHITE

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Approved for public release
DD FORM 1300
UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 08-23-2011
BY 60322 UCBAW/BJS
1
23
A

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

ABSTRACT

Reservation Dam: NDI I.D. No. PA-00014

Owner: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Military Affairs

State Located: Pennsylvania (PennDER I.D. No. 38-78)

County Located: Lebanon

Stream: Indiantown Run

Inspection Date: 7 November 1979

Inspection Team: GAI Consultants, Inc.
570 Beatty Road
Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146

↓
Based on a visual inspection, operational history, and available engineering data, the dam is considered to be in good condition.

The size classification of the facility is small and its hazard classification is considered to be high. In accordance with the recommended guidelines, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for the facility ranges between the 1/2 PMF (Probable Maximum Flood) and the PMF. Due to the high potential for damage to downstream structures and possibly loss of life, the SDF is considered to be the PMF. Results of the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis indicate the facility will pass and/or store about 77 percent of the PMF prior to embankment overtopping. Consequently, the spillway is assessed as being inadequate, but not seriously inadequate.

Deficiencies noted by the inspection team included the following: 1) large trees rooted within the downstream embankment face; 2) a damaged and inadequate spillway discharge channel; and 3) a bent gate stem and partially obstructed outlet associated with the blowoff conduit.

It is recommended that the owner:

a. Have those trees within the downstream embankment slope removed along with their stumps. This operation should be conducted under the guidance of a soils engineer experienced in the design and construction of earth and

rockfill dams. In addition, any excessive vegetation should be trimmed to facilitate detection of any seepage or erosion on the face of the dam.

b. Retain the services of a registered professional engineer experienced in hydraulics and hydrology of dams to examine the necessity for increasing the downstream channel capacity.

c. Evaluate the outlet works and make any necessary repairs to restore the system to full operability. In addition, examine the hydraulic conditions at the outlet end of the blowoff conduit with the objective of providing unobstructed flow.

d. Develop a formal warning system for the notification of downstream occupants 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.

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

GAI Consultants, Inc.

Approved by:

Bernard M. Mihalcin
Bernard M. Mihalcin, P.E.

James W. Pick
JAMES W. PICK
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer



Date 12 Feb 1980

Date 12 March 1980

DLB: BMM/sam



OVERVIEW PHOTOGRAPH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	i
ABSTRACT.	ii
OVERVIEW PHOTOGRAPH	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
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.	6
2.1 Design.	6
2.2 Construction Records.	7
2.3 Operational Records	7
2.4 Other Investigations.	7
2.5 Evaluation.	7
SECTION 3 - VISUAL INSPECTION	8
3.1 Observations.	8
3.2 Evaluation.	9
SECTION 4 - OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES.	10
4.1 Normal Operating Procedure.	10
4.2 Maintenance of Dam.	10
4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities	10
4.4 Warning System.	10
4.5 Evaluation.	10
SECTION 5 - HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC EVALUATION	11
5.1 Design Data	11
5.2 Experience Data	11
5.3 Visual Observations	11
5.4 Method of Analysis.	12
5.5 Summary of Analysis	12
5.6 Spillway Adequacy	13
SECTION 6 - EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY.	14
6.1 Visual Observations	14
6.2 Design and Construction Techniques.	14
6.3 Past Performance.	14
6.4 Seismic Stability	15
SECTION 7 - ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMEDIAL MEASURES	16
7.1 Dam Assessment.	16
7.2 Recommendations/Remedial Measures	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- APPENDIX A - VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST AND FIELD SKETCHES
- APPENDIX B - ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST
- APPENDIX C - PHOTOGRAPHS
- APPENDIX D - HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS ANALYSES
- APPENDIX E - FIGURES
- APPENDIX F - GEOLOGY

6
[REDACTED]
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
RESERVATION DAM;

(NDI PA-00014, PENNDER [REDACTED] Number 13-10)

Number

[REDACTED]
Susquehanna River Basin,
Indiantown Run; Lebanon County,
Pennsylvania. Phase I Inspection Report.

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.

15 | DACW31-80-C-0016

1.1 Purpose.

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

12 | 85

11 | Jan 80

1.2 Description of Project.

a. Dam and Appurtenances. Reservation Dam, locally known as Marquette Lake Dam, is a zoned earth embankment approximately 27 feet high and 1065 feet long, including spillway. The facility is provided with a concrete and masonry, rectangular, chute spillway with an uncontrolled, ogee-shaped weir located at the right abutment. The spillway is divided into three bays by two masonry piers that support a steel and wood plank bridge across the structure. The effective length of the spillway crest is 99 feet with 9.2 feet clearance between the bridge support steel and the crest of the weir. The outlet works consists of a 36-inch diameter cast iron pipe (C.I.P.) blowoff line controlled by two sluice gates housed within a concrete and masonry control tower located at the upstream toe of the embankment.

b. Location. Reservation Dam is located on Indiantown Run in East Hanover Township, Lebanon County, Pennsylvania on the grounds of Indiantown Gap Military Reservation. Interchange 29 of Interstate Route 81 lies approximately two miles southeast of the facility. The dam, reservoir, and watershed are located within the Indiantown Gap and Grantville, Pennsylvania 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. topographic quadrangles (see Figure 1, Appendix E). The coordinates of the dam are N 40° 26.0' and W 76° 35.9'.

411002 Gur

c. Size Classification. Small (27 feet high, 253 acre-feet storage capacity at top of dam).

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

e. Ownership. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Military Affairs
Send Correspondence to:
Commanding Officer
Headquarters, United States Army
Garrison
Fort Indiantown Gap
Annville, Pennsylvania 17003

f. Purpose. Recreation.

g. Historical Data. Reservation Dam was constructed in the early 1940's in conjunction with the wartime expansion of the military complex at Fort Indiantown Gap. The military complex was originally built to serve as a troop training facility in the late 1930's. The entire Fort Indiantown Gap Military Reservation is situated on State owned land that is leased to the U.S. Army. All of the properties and facilities within the complex, including Reservation Dam, are operated and maintained by military personnel.

1.3 Pertinent Data.

a. Drainage Area (square miles). 5.8

b. Discharge at Dam Site.

Discharge Capacity of Outlet Conduit - Discharge curves are not available.

Discharge Capacity of Spillway at Maximum Pool \cong 9870 cfs (see Appendix D, Sheet 9).

c. Elevation (feet above mean sea level). The following elevations were obtained from design drawings and field measurements based on the elevation of the spillway crest at 509 feet.

Top of Dam	518 (design) 518.5 (field)
Maximum Design Pool	Not known
Maximum Pool of Record	513.5 (June 1972)
Normal Pool	509

Spillway Crest	509
Upstream Inlet Invert	482
Downstream Outlet Invert	Not known
Downstream Embankment Toe	491.5
Streambed at Dam Centerline	488
Maximum Tailwater	Not known
d. <u>Reservoir Length (feet).</u>	
Top of Dam	1600
Normal Pool	1100
e. <u>Storage (acre-feet).</u>	
Top of Dam	253
Normal Pool	61
Design Surcharge	Not known
f. <u>Reservoir Surface (acres).</u>	
Top of Dam	26
Normal Pool	15
g. <u>Dam.</u>	
Type	Zoned earth.
Length	955 feet (excluding spillway).
Height	27 feet (field measured; crest to downstream embankment toe).
Top Width	25 feet (field). 24 feet (design).
Upstream Slope	2-1/2H:1V
Downstream Slope	2-1/2H:1V
Zoning	Figure 3 indicates embankment was designed with an impervious core composed of selected material and outer shells made up of material referred to as "earth fill".

	The downstream embankment toe is composed of rock fill.
Cutoff	Cutoff trench, located along embankment centerline, extends five feet into the impervious base of the foundation (see Figure 3).
Grout Curtain	None indicated.
h. <u>Diversion Canal and Regulating Tunnels.</u>	None.
i. <u>Spillway.</u>	
Type	Concrete and masonry, rectangular, chute channel spillway with an uncontrolled, concrete, ogee-shaped weir located at the right abutment.
Crest Elevation	509 feet.
Crest Length	99 feet (excluding bridge piers).
j. <u>Outlet Conduit.</u>	
Type	36-inch diameter C.I.P. blowoff conduit.
Length	400 feet (approximate, inlet to outlet).
Closure and Regulating Facilities	Flow through the outlet is controlled via two sluice gates located within the control tower riser.

Access

Control tower accessible from the embankment crest via a steel and wood plank foot-bridge set on masonry piers.

SECTION 2
ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design.

a. Design Data Availability and Sources. No design reports or calculations are available for any aspects of the facility. Several design drawings are contained within files located at the Engineering Office of the Fort Indiantown Gap Military Reservation. Also contained within these files is a report entitled "Inspection of Marquette Dam, Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania," dated June 5, 1978. The inspection was performed on May 12, 1978 by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District. No other reports or correspondence were made available to the inspection team.

b. Design Features.

1. Embankment. Available design drawings indicate the embankment is a zoned earth structure composed of two soil zones as shown on Figure 3. The central core is composed of material described as "Selected A-1 Material" which is flanked on both sides by outer shells composed of apparently more random material simply described as "Earth Fill." No construction specifications are available that defines these materials. A cutoff trench reportedly extends five feet into the impervious base of the foundation along the embankment centerline.

The upstream embankment face is sloped at 2-1/2H:1V and is covered between the crest and flowline by a rock riprap (see Photograph 2). The downstream slope is also set at 2-1/2H:1V and the crest width is 25 feet. The downstream embankment toe is constructed with rock fill (see Figure 3 and Photograph 4).

2. Appurtenant Structures.

a) Spillway. The spillway is a concrete and masonry, rectangular, chute channel with an uncontrolled, concrete, ogee-shaped weir located at the right abutment (see Photograph 5). The spillway is spanned by a steel and wood plank roadway bridge supported on two masonry piers. These two piers divide the spillway into three overflow bays having a total effective weir length of 99 feet (note: dimensions presented in this section are based on field measurements and do not necessarily conform with those shown on Figure 5). Spillway flows are discharged into a trapezoidal-shaped, masonry-lined channel (see Photograph 6). The channel is constructed perpendicular to the

overflow weir and carries flow parallel to the embankment toe for about 450 feet before turning downstream (see Figure 4).

b) Outlet Conduit. Design drawings (see Figure 3) indicate the outlet conduit is a 36-inch diameter C.I.P. placed below grade on a reinforced concrete saddle. Concrete cutoff collars have apparently been provided. Flow through the conduit is controlled via two sluice gates located at the control tower. The gates are operated manually from the deck of the control tower (see Figure 3; note that the control tower is constructed of masonry with a concrete deck and not solid concrete as shown. In addition, the gate house has been removed; see Photograph 10).

c. Specific Design Data and Criteria. No design reports or calculations are available for any aspect of this facility.

2.2 Construction Records.

Construction records are not available.

2.3 Operational Records.

No records of present day-to-day operation of the facility are maintained.

2.4 Other Investigations.

The facility was inspected on May 12, 1978 by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers (Baltimore District) resulting in a report dated June 5, 1978. This report is contained within the files located at the Engineering Office of the Fort Indiantown Gap Military Reservation.

2.5 Evaluation.

Available data pertaining to the facility is limited to several design drawings and one prior inspection report contained in the files at the Fort Indiantown Gap Military Reservation. Design drawings often conflict with as-built conditions, but nevertheless, provide some useful information. Field measurements were utilized wherever possible in the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis contained in Appendix D. The data are considered adequate to make a reasonable Phase I assessment of the facility.

SECTION 3
VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Observations.

a. General. The overall appearance of the facility suggests the dam and its appurtenances are currently in good condition.

b. Embankment. The embankment is considered to be in good condition although many trees cover the downstream slope of the dam (see Photograph 3). Several of these large trees (6-12 inches in diameter) have fallen; however, they have not done any significant damage to the embankment as their root systems appear shallow.

No evidence of seepage or sloughing was apparent; however, some minor ponding was observed in the area just downstream of the left abutment-embankment junction. The upstream embankment face is covered with durable sandstone riprap that is spotty in several areas. No erosion was apparent (see Photograph 2).

c. Appurtenant Structures.

1. Spillway. Visual inspection revealed the spillway to be in good condition (see Photographs 5 and 6). No evidence of physical deterioration was observed in the ogee-shaped weir, masonry piers, or adjacent concrete wing-walls. The lower downstream portion of the spillway channel was damaged by heavy discharges during the floods of June 1972 and October 1975. The extent of the damage included the displacement and loss of portions of the masonry lining along the downstream channel (see Photographs 7 and 8).

2. Outlet Conduit. The 36-inch diameter C.I.P. blowoff is reportedly functional; however, it was not operated in the presence of the inspection team. The sluice gate control mechanisms located atop the control tower riser appear to be in good condition although minor surficial corrosion is evident (see Photograph 10). It was further noted that the stem on the downstream gate was badly bent; however, both gates are reportedly operable.

Field inspection revealed that the blowoff line has been extended approximately 250 feet (Figures 2, 3, and 4 do not present as-built conditions) and exits at the base of the channel wall near the bridge shown in Photograph 11. The exit was submerged at the time of inspection; however, a hemispherical opening was observed.

d. Reservoir Area. The general area surrounding the reservoir is heavily wooded with steep slopes (see Photograph 1). No signs of slope distress were observed.

e. Downstream Channel. The stream below Reservation Dam flows in a southerly direction prior to emptying into State Memorial Lake (PennDER I.D. No. 38-80) approximately 5000 feet downstream. The area between the two facilities is relatively flat and contains numerous structures associated with Fort Indiantown Gap. Several of these structures are located immediately downstream of the dam and were flooded by several feet of water during the last major flood in 1975 (see Photograph 6). The potential for loss of life under conditions of an embankment breach is considered large even without considering the possible adverse effects such an event may have on the downstream dam at State Memorial Lake. More than a few persons generally occupy the area downstream of the dam throughout a typical day. Consequently, the hazard classification of the facility is considered to be high.

3.2 Evaluation.

The overall condition of the facility is considered to be good. The large trees observed along the downstream slope should be completely removed, including their stumps. Efforts to remove any obstruction from the discharge end of the outlet conduit and to repair the valve control mechanisms should be undertaken in order to ensure the reliability of the system. The spillway channel should be evaluated in light of the damage suffered during previous storms.

SECTION 4
OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Normal Operating Procedure.

Reservation Dam is essentially a self-regulating facility. Excess inflows are automatically discharged through the spillway located at the right abutment. The blowoff is reportedly opened annually, or as needed, to ensure its operability. No formal operations manual is available.

4.2 Maintenance of Dam.

No formal maintenance program exists at this facility. Maintenance is performed on an unscheduled basis by the maintenance staff at Fort Indiantown Gap. No formal maintenance manual is available.

4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities.

See Section 4.2 above.

4.4 Warning System.

No formal warning system has been developed for this facility.

4.5 Evaluation.

No formal operations or maintenance manuals are available for the facility. Formal manuals are recommended to ensure the continued proper care and safe operation of the facility. In addition, no formal warning system exists.

SECTION 5
HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC EVALUATION

5.1 Design Data.

No pertinent design data, calculations, or reports are available.

5.2 Experience Data.

Daily records of rainfall or spillway discharge have never been maintained at this facility. Some information pertaining to the floods of 1972 and 1975 was obtained through a review of available files and subsequent discussions with members of the engineering and maintenance staffs at the military complex. In essence, the information revealed that damage to the spillway channel was incurred in both 1972 (minor) and 1975 (more substantial). In 1972 water was reported to have been within 5 feet of the embankment crest. No estimates were given for the 1975 flood, however, it is believed to have been a lesser event. Minor flooding of the structures immediately downstream of the facility was sustained, in both cases, when water reportedly jumped the banks of the lower discharge channel.

A brief inspection report prepared by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers (Baltimore District) and dated June 5, 1978, states that "the spillway is capable of passing 65 percent of the PMF without overtopping the embankment. Thus, the spillway is considered inadequate, but not seriously inadequate." The report further states that "the present channel capacity is less than 15 percent of the spillway capacity and flows in excess of this amount will cause flooding in the area of the downstream toe of the dam."

5.3 Visual Observations.

On the date of inspection, no conditions were observed that would indicate the spillway would not perform satisfactorily during a flood event within the limits of its design. It was noted that base of the spillway bridge support steel is slightly below low top of dam elevation and was considered in the analysis.

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 D.

5.5 Summary of Analysis.

a. Spillway Design Flood (SDF). In accordance with procedures and guidelines contained in the National Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams for Phase I Investigations, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for Reservation Dam ranges between the 1/2 PMF (Probable Maximum Flood) and the PMF. This classification is based on the relative size of the dam (small), and the potential hazard of dam failure to downstream developments (high). Due to the high potential for damage to the downstream structures and possibly loss of life, the SDF for this facility is considered to be the PMF.

b. Results of Analysis. Reservation Dam was evaluated under near normal operating conditions. That is, the reservoir was initially at its normal pool or spillway elevation of 509.0 feet, with the spillway weir discharging freely. However, the outlet conduit was assumed to be non-functional for the purpose of analysis. In any event, the flow capacity of the outlet conduit is not such that it would significantly increase the total discharge capabilities of the facility. The spillway consists of a rectangular chute channel with an uncontrolled, concrete, ogee-shaped weir. All pertinent engineering calculations relative to the evaluation of this facility are provided in Appendix D.

Overtopping analysis (using the Modified HEC-1 Computer Program) indicated that the discharge/storage capacity of Reservation Dam can accommodate only about 77 percent of the PMF (SDF) prior to the overtopping of the embankment (Appendix D, Summary Input/Output Sheets, Sheet C). The peak PMF inflow of about 13,320 cfs was minimally attenuated by the storage/discharge capabilities of the dam and reservoir, such that the resulting peak PMF outflow was about 13,310 cfs (Appendix D, Sheet C). Under the PMF, the embankment would be overtopped for approximately 3.8 hours, with a maximum depth of inundation equal to about 1.0 feet above

the low top of dam elevation of 518.5 feet (Appendix D, Sheet D).

5.6 Spillway Adequacy.

Although Reservation Dam cannot accommodate its SDF (the PMF), the possible downstream consequences of embankment failure due to overtopping were not evaluated. Breaching analysis of the dam was not performed in accordance with Corps directive ETL-1110-2-234, since the facility can safely pass a flood of 1/2 PMF magnitude. Since Reservation Dam cannot accommodate a PMF-size flood, its spillway is considered to be inadequate, but not seriously inadequate.

SECTION 6
EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

6.1 Visual Observations.

a. Embankment. Based on visual observations, the embankment appeared to be in good condition. No evidence of seepage, excess settlement, or slope erosion were observed. Large trees cover the downstream slope and are considered to be a significant deficiency as their root systems may offer a course for a possible piping problem through the embankment. Trees which may eventually uproot and topple, for whatever reason, are also a potential threat to the overall stability of the slope.

b. Appurtenant Structures.

1. Spillway. The spillway is considered to be in good condition. The lower channel, which runs approximately parallel to the downstream embankment toe, is grossly underdesigned and cannot safely accommodate the large discharges which accompany a major flood event. This deficiency threatens the safety of both the downstream embankment toe and those structures located immediately downstream of the dam. Any plans to further repair the already damaged portions of the channel should provide for its redesign so that it will at least accommodate the maximum discharge capacity of the present spillway.

2. Outlet Conduit. The outlet conduit is reportedly in good condition. The blowoff was not operated in the presence of the inspection team and consequently its present condition was not verified. The discharge end of the outlet conduit appears to be partially obstructed and should be cleared immediately.

6.2 Design and Construction Techniques.

A review on available information implies that the facility has been designed in accordance with modern accepted engineering practice. No construction records are available.

6.3 Past Performance.

Very little documented information is available from the owner and none from PennDER. Data gathered by the inspection team revealed that the embankment safely accommodated the increased stresses brought on by the last major

floods in 1972 and 1975. In 1972, water was reported to have been within 5 feet of the embankment crest. No estimates were given for the 1975 flood, however, it is believed to have been a lesser event. Minor flooding of the structures immediately downstream of the facility was sustained, in both cases, when water reportedly jumped the banks of the lower discharge channel. No other damage was reported.

6.4 Seismic Stability.

The dam is located within Seismic Zone No. 1 and it is thought that the static stability of the structure is sufficient to withstand minor earthquake-induced dynamic forces. However, no investigations or calculations were performed to confirm this belief.

SECTION 7
ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 Dam Assessment.

a. Safety. Based on the visual inspection and hydrologic/hydraulic analysis, the facility is considered to be in good condition.

The size classification of the facility is small and its hazard classification is considered to be high. In accordance with the recommended guidelines, the Spillway Design Flood (SDF) for the facility ranges between the 1/2 PMF (Probable Maximum Flood) and the PMF. Due to the high potential for damage to downstream structures and possibly loss of life, the SDF is considered to be the PMF. Results of the hydrologic and hydraulic analysis indicate the facility will pass and/or store about 77 percent of the PMF prior to embankment overtopping. Consequently, the spillway is assessed as being inadequate, but not seriously inadequate.

Deficiencies noted by the inspection team included the following; 1) large trees along the downstream embankment face; 2) a damaged and inadequate spillway discharge channel and; 3) a bent gate stem and partially obstructed outlet associated with the blowoff conduit.

b. Adequacy of Information. The available data are considered sufficient to make a reasonable Phase I assessment of the facility.

c. Urgency. It is suggested that the recommendations listed below be implemented as soon as possible.

d. Necessity for Additional Investigations. No additional investigations are deemed necessary at this time.

7.2 Recommendations/Remedial Measures.

It is recommended that the owner:

a. Have those trees within the downstream embankment slope removed along with their stumps. This operation should be conducted under the guidance of a soils engineer experienced in the design and construction of earth and rockfill dams. In addition, any excessive vegetation should be trimmed to facilitate detection of any seepage or erosion on the face of the dam.

b. Retain the services of a registered professional engineer experienced in hydraulics and hydrology of dams to examine the necessity for increasing the downstream channel capacity.

c. Evaluate the outlet works and make any necessary repairs to restore the system to full operability. In addition, examine the hydraulic conditions at the outlet end of the blowoff conduit with the objective of providing unobstructed flow.

d. Develop a formal warning system for the notification of downstream occupants 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.

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

APPENDIX A

VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST AND FIELD SKETCHES

**CHECK LIST
VISUAL INSPECTION
PHASE 1**

NAME OF DAM Reservation Dam STATE Pennsylvania COUNTY Lebanon
NDI # PA -- 00014 PENNDR # 38-78
TYPE OF DAM Earth SIZE Small HAZARD CATEGORY High
DATE(S) INSPECTION 7 November 1979 WEATHER Partly Cloudy TEMPERATURE 50° @ 1:00 p.m.
POOL ELEVATION AT TIME OF INSPECTION 509.2 M.S.L.
TAILWATER AT TIME OF INSPECTION N/A M.S.L.

INSPECTION PERSONNEL

B. M. Mihalcin
D. J. Spaeder
D. L. Bonk

OWNER REPRESENTATIVES

U.S. Civil Service at Fort Indiantown Gap
Donald Doyle (Roads and Grounds Foreman)

OTHERS

RECORDED BY D. L. Bonk

EMBANKMENT

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA · 00014
SURFACE CRACKS	None observed.	
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR BEYOND THE TOE	None observed.	
SLOUGHING OR EROSION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT SLOPES	None observed.	
VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT OF THE CREST	Horizontal - good. Vertical - good.	
RIPRAP FAILURES	Riprap covering the upstream face is spotty between the control tower and left abutment. Bare soil is exposed but no apparent erosion has taken place.	
JUNCTION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT, SPILLWAY AND DAM	Good.	

EMBANKMENT

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	ND# PA. 00014
DAMP AREAS IRREGULAR VEGETA- TION (LUSH OR DEAD PLANTS)	Minor ponding observed at toe of left abutment-embankment junction. Possibly poor toe drainage. Downstream face is covered with large trees (12-inch diameter and less), primarily locust and maple. Several toppled trees were observed near left abutment. Root system appear to be shallow.	
ANY NOTICEABLE SEEPAGE	None through embankment (see above).	
STAFF GAGE AND RECORDER	None.	
DRAINS	None observed.	
	Rock observed exposed at right abutment. Composed primarily of shales and silty shales with near vertical bedding planes. Major joint patterns are parallel and perpendicular to the axis of the dam.	

OUTLET WORKS

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA - 00014
INTAKE STRUCTURE	Intake submerged, not observed. Masonry structure in good condition. Piers and steel bridge in good condition.	
OUTLET CONDUIT (CRACKING AND SPALLING OF CONCRETE SURFACES)	None observed.	
OUTLET STRUCTURE	N/A	
OUTLET CHANNEL	The outlet discharges into the masonry spillway channel about 500 feet downstream of the embankment. The outlet was partially silted and fully submerged on the day of the inspection.	
GATE(S) AND OPERATIONAL EQUIPMENT	Sluice gate controls exposed atop gate house. Both controls are externally corroded (minor). Downstream gate stem is severely bent. Gates are reportedly functional.	

EMERGENCY SPILLWAY

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA. 00014
TYPE AND CONDITION	Masonry spillway with ogee-shaped concrete overflow crest. Divided into three bays by two masonry piers that support a wood and steel overhead roadway bridge. Good condition.	
APPROACH CHANNEL	N/A	
SPILLWAY CHANNEL AND SIDEWALLS	Good condition.	
STILLING BASIN PLUNGE POOL	Good condition.	
DISCHARGE CHANNEL	Evidence of damage to the masonry sidewalls of the channel resulting from the floods of 1972 and 1975 was observed in the channel from between 150 to 500 feet left of the overflow crest.	
BRIDGE AND PIERS EMERGENCY GATES	Good condition.	

SERVICE SPILLWAY


ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA - 00014
TYPE AND CONDITION	N/A	
APPROACH CHANNEL	N/A	
OUTLET STRUCTURE	N/A	
DISCHARGE CHANNEL	N/A	

INSTRUMENTATION

ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA ·	00014
MONUMENTATION SURVEYS	None.		
OBSERVATION WELLS	None.		
WEIRS	None.		
PIEZOMETERS	None.		
OTHERS			

RESERVOIR AREA AND DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL


ITEM	OBSERVATIONS/REMARKS/RECOMMENDATIONS	NDI# PA. 00014
SLOPES: RESERVOIR	Steep and heavily wooded.	
SEDIMENTATION	None observed.	
DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL (OBSTRUCTIONS, DEBRIS, ETC.)	The stream into which the spillway discharges flows in a southerly direction prior to emptying into State Memorial Lake (PennDER I.D. No. 38-80) approximately 5,000 feet downstream.	
SLOPES: CHANNEL VALLEY	Broad, flat, tree and brush covered floodplain.	
APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF HOMES AND POPULATION	The area between Marquette and State Memorial Lakes contains numerous structures associated with the military complex. More than a few persons generally occupy the area downstream of the dam throughout a typical day.	



RESERVATION DAM
 GENERAL PLAN - FIELD INSPECTION NOTES

RESERVATION DAM

PROFILE OF DAM CREST
FROM FIELD SURVEY



SCALE:
VERTICAL: 1 IN. = 4 FT.
HORIZONTAL: 1 IN. = 200 FT.

APPENDIX B
ENGINEERING DATA CHECKLIST

**CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
PHASE I**

NAME OF DAM Reservation Dam

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 00014
PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND TITLE	Walt Moyer - Deputy Director of Facilities Engineering Donald Doyle - Roads and Ground Foreman	
REGIONAL VICINITY MAP	See Figure 1, Appendix E (U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute topographic quadrangles, Grantville and Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania).	
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	Information not available. See Section 1.2.g.	
AVAILABLE DRAWINGS	Four design drawings (not "as-builts") available from Fort Indiantown Gap Engineering Office. See Appendix E, Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5.	
TYPICAL DAM SECTIONS	See Appendix E, Figure 3.	
OUTLETS: PLAN DETAILS DISCHARGE RATINGS	See Appendix E, Figure 2. See Appendix E, Figure 3. Not available.	

**CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
PHASE I
(CONTINUED)**

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 00014
SPILLWAY: PLAN SECTION DETAILS	See Appendix E, Figure 4. See Appendix E, Figure 5.	
OPERATING EQUIP- MENT PLANS AND DETAILS	Not available.	
DESIGN REPORTS	Not available.	
GEOLOGY REPORTS	Not available.	
DESIGN COMPUTATIONS: HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS STABILITY ANALYSES SEEPAGE ANALYSES	Not available.	
MATERIAL INVESTIGATIONS: BORING RECORDS LABORATORY TESTING FIELD TESTING	Not available.	

**CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
PHASE I
(CONTINUED)**

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA - 00014
BORROW SOURCES	Not known.	
POST CONSTRUCTION DAM SURVEYS	None.	
POST CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING STUDIES AND REPORTS	Report dated June 5, 1978 entitled, "Inspection of Marquette Dam, Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania" by the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, available from Fort Indiantown Gap Engineering Office.	
HIGH POOL RECORDS	Discussions with representatives of the owner indicate highest pool to have occurred in June 1972 when the level was approximately 5 feet below the embankment crest.	
MONITORING SYSTEMS	None.	
MODIFICATIONS	None recorded since original construction; however, available drawings do not depict current as-built conditions.	

**CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
PHASE I
(CONTINUED)**

ITEM	REMARKS	NDI# PA · 00014
PRIOR ACCIDENTS OR FAILURES	High discharges resulting from floods in 1972 and 1975 caused damage to the lower spillway discharge channel and flooding of some of the structures located downstream.	
MAINTENANCE: RECORDS MANUAL	Maintenance performed as needed. No formal records or manual are available.	
OPERATION: RECORDS MANUAL	No formal records or manual are available.	
OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	No formal procedures.	
WARNING SYSTEM AND/OR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES	None.	
MISCELLANEOUS		

GAI CONSULTANTS, INC.

**CHECK LIST
HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC
ENGINEERING DATA**

NDI ID # 00014
PENNER ID # 38-78

SIZE OF DRAINAGE AREA: 5.8 square miles
ELEVATION TOP NORMAL POOL: 509 STORAGE CAPACITY: 61 acre-feet
ELEVATION TOP FLOOD CONTROL POOL: - STORAGE CAPACITY: -
ELEVATION MAXIMUM DESIGN POOL: - STORAGE CAPACITY: -
ELEVATION TOP DAM: 518.5 STORAGE CAPACITY: 253 acre-feet.

SPILLWAY DATA

CREST ELEVATION: 509 feet
TYPE: Rectangular chute with ogee-shaped crest
CREST LENGTH: 99 feet (excluding bridge piers)
CHANNEL LENGTH: 600 feet
SPILLOVER LOCATION: Right abutment
NUMBER AND TYPE OF GATES: None

OUTLET WORKS


TYPE: 36-diameter C.I.P. blowoff conduit
LOCATION: Approximate center of embankment
ENTRANCE INVERTS: 482 feet
EXIT INVERTS: Not known
EMERGENCY DRAWDOWN FACILITIES: Two sluice gates within control tower

HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL GAGES

TYPE: -
LOCATION: -
RECORDS: -

MAXIMUM NON-DAMAGING DISCHARGE: 3,200 cfs (approximate; June 1972)

APPENDIX C
PHOTOGRAPHS



RESERVATION DAM
PHOTOGRAPH KEY MAP

PHOTOGRAPH 1 View of Marquette Lake as seen from the crest of Reservation Dam.

PHOTOGRAPH 2 View of the upstream slope of Reservation Dam as seen from the right abutment.

PHOTOGRAPH 3 View of the downstream slope as seen from the right abutment.

PHOTOGRAPH 4 View of embankment showing downstream rock toe.



2



4



1




3

PHOTOGRAPH 5 View, looking upstream, of the spillway.

PHOTOGRAPH 6 View of the area immediately downstream of the embankment as seen from the spillway bridge.

PHOTOGRAPH 7 View, looking upstream, of the lower portion of the spillway discharge channel that runs approximately parallel to the downstream embankment toe.

PHOTOGRAPH 8 View of the damaged portion of the spillway discharge channel. Note that the masonry channel walls have been completely washed away in the foreground of the view.



5



6



7




8


PHOTOGRAPH 9 View of the masonry control tower and access bridge.

PHOTOGRAPH 10 View of the gate control mechanisms atop the control tower. Note the surficial corrosion of the equipment.


PHOTOGRAPH 11 View of the discharge channel approximately 500 feet beyond the downstream embankment toe. Blowoff line (inundated) exits through channel wall at base.



10



11



9

APPENDIX D
HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULICS ANALYSES

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 shown 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 specified 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 elevations of failure hydrographs for each location.

HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS
DATA BASE

NAME OF DAM: RESERVATION DAM

PROBABLE MAXIMUM PRECIPITATION (PMP) = 22.2 INCHES/24 HOURS (1)

STATION	1	2	3
STATION DESCRIPTION	RESERVATION DAM		
DRAINAGE AREA (SQUARE MILES)	5.8		
CUMULATIVE DRAINAGE AREA (SQUARE MILES)	-		
ADJUSTMENT OF PMF FOR DRAINAGE AREA LOCATION (%) (1)			
6 HOURS	120		
12 HOURS	130		
24 HOURS	139		
48 HOURS	145		
72 HOURS	148		
SNYDER HYDROGRAPH PARAMETERS			
ZONE (2)	15-B		
C_p (3)	0.85		
C_t (3)	2.20		
L (MILES) (4)	4.1		
L_{ca} (MILES) (4)	2.0		
$t_p = C_t (L \cdot L_{ca})^{0.3}$ (HOURS)	4.14		
SPILLWAY DATA			
CREST LENGTH (FEET)	99.0		
FREEBOARD (FEET)	9.5		

- (1) HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL REPORT 40, U.S. WEATHER BUREAU, 1965.
- (2) HYDROLOGIC ZONE DEFINED BY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, BALTIMORE DISTRICT, FOR DETERMINATION OF SNYDER COEFFICIENTS (C_p AND C_t).
- (3) SNYDER COEFFICIENTS
- (4) L = LENGTH OF LONGEST WATERCOURSE FROM DAM TO BASIN DIVIDE.
 L_{ca} = LENGTH OF LONGEST WATERCOURSE FROM DAM TO POINT OPPOSITE BASIN CENTROID.

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
BY DJS DATE 11-12-79 PROJ. NO. 79-203-314
CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 1 OF 12



DAM STATISTICS

- HEIGHT OF DAM \approx 27 FT (FIELD MEASURED)
(FROM TOE OF EMBANKMENT TO CREST)

- ELEVATION OF TOP OF DAM : 518.0 (DESIGN; FIGURE 2)
518.5 (FIELD)

- ELEVATION OF NORMAL POOL : 509.0 (FIGURE 3)

- UPSTREAM INLET INVERT ELEVATION :
482 (FIGURE 3)

- DOWNSTREAM OUTLET INVERT ELEVATION : NOT KNOWN

- DOWNSTREAM EMBANKMENT TOE : 491.5 (FIELD)

- STREAMBED ELEVATION AT DAM CENTERLINE : 488 (FIGURE 3)

- MAXIMUM POOL STORAGE CAPACITY : 453 ACRES-FT (SEE FIG. 5)
(AT TOP OF DAM)

- NORMAL POOL STORAGE CAPACITY : 61 ACRES-FT (SEE FIG. 5)

- SURFACE AREA AT NORMAL POOL : 15 ACRES (SEE FIG. 1)

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 72-732-214
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 2 OF 12



- DRAINAGE AREA \approx 5.8 SQUARE MILES

(MEASURED ON U.S.G.S. 7.5
 MINUTE QUADS; GRANTVILLE, AND
 INDIANTOWN GAP, PA)

NOTE 1:

TAKEN FROM "DAMS, RESERVOIRS, AND NATURAL LAKES," WATER
 RESOURCES BULLETIN NO. 5, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
 DEPT. OF FORESTS AND WATER, HARRISBURG, PA, 1979.

DAM CLASSIFICATION

SIZE : SMALL

(REFERENCE 1, TABLE 1)

HAZARD CLASSIFICATION : HIGH

(FIELD OBSERVED)

REQUIRED SDF : $\frac{1}{2}$ PMF to PMF

(REF. 1, TABLE 3)

HYDROGRAPH PARAMETERS

- LENGTH OF LONGEST WATERCOURSE, L, \approx 4.1 MILES

- LENGTH OF LONGEST WATERCOURSE FROM DAM TO BASIN CENTER, L_{CA}, \approx 2.0 M.

(MEASURED ON U.S.G.S. 7.5 MINUTE QUADS; GRANTVILLE AND
 INDIANTOWN GAP, PA)

$C_e = \underline{2.20}$

$C_p = \underline{0.85}$

(SUPPLIED BY USGS, ZONE 15-B,
 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY ZJS DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 79-203-314
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 3 OF 12



$$\begin{aligned}
 T_p &= \text{SNYDER'S STANDARD LAG} = C_2 (L \times L_{ca})^{0.3} \\
 &= (2.00) (4.1 \times 2.0)^{0.3} \approx \underline{4.14 \text{ HOURS}}
 \end{aligned}$$

(NOTE: HYDROGRAPH VARIABLES USED HERE ARE DEFINED IN REFERENCE 2, IN SECTION ENTITLED "SNYDER SYNTHETIC UNIT HYDROGRAPH")

RESERVOIR SURFACE AREA

- SURFACE AREA AT NORMAL LEVEL (ELEV 509.0) = 15 ACRES (NOTE 1)
- S.A. AT ELEV 520 = 28 ACRES
- S.A. AT ELEV 530 = 43 ACRES

(PLANIMETERED ON U.S.G.S. 7.5 MINUTE QUADS, INDIANTOWN GAP AND GRANTVILLE, PA)

- ELEVATION OF LOW TOP OF DAM = 518.5 (FIELD NOTES)

- RATE OF S.A. INCREASE PER FOOT RISE IN RESERVOIR ELEVATION:

$$\frac{\Delta SA}{\Delta H} = \frac{28 - 15}{520 - 509} \approx \underline{1.18 \text{ AC/FT}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \therefore \text{SA @ ELEV } 518.5 &= 15 + [(1.18 \text{ AC/FT})(518.5 - 509)] \\
 &= \underline{26.2 \text{ ACRES}}
 \end{aligned}$$

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVOIR DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 79-312-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 4 OF 12



- ASSUME 2500 STORAGE AT THE BASE OF THE UPSTREAM TOE, APPROXIMATELY ELEVATION 491.0 (SEE FIGURE 3).

RESERVOIR ELEVATION - STORAGE RELATIONSHIP

- BETWEEN THE ASSUMED MINIMUM RESERVOIR ELEVATION AND NORMAL POOL ELEVATION, A LINEAR RELATIONSHIP WILL BE ASSUMED BETWEEN ELEVATION AND STORAGE.
- FOR ELEVATIONS ABOVE THAT OF NORMAL POOL, ASSUME THAT THE MODIFIED PRISMOIDAL RELATIONSHIP REPRESENTS THE CHANGES IN STORAGE VOLUME WITH INCREASE IN ELEVATION:

$$\Delta V_{1-2} = \frac{h}{3} (A_1 + A_2 + \sqrt{A_1 \times A_2}) \quad (\text{AREA IN ACRES})$$

WHERE ΔV_{1-2} = INCREMENTAL INCREASE IN VOLUME BETWEEN ELEVATIONS 1 & 2 (IN ACRE-Feet)

h = ELEVATION 1 - ELEVATION 2 (FT)

A_1 = SA @ ELEV 1 (ACRES)

A_2 = SA @ ELEV 2

CALCULATION OF SURFACE AREAS (SA):

$$A_i = A_0 + \left[\left(\frac{\Delta SA}{\Delta H} \right) (ELEV_i - ELEV_0) \right]$$

WHERE A_i = SA @ ELEV i (ACRES)

A_0 = SA @ ELEV 0

(BELOW ELEV 500.0, ELEV₀ WILL BE NORMAL POOL ELEV (240.0). ABOVE ELEV 500.0, ELEV₀ WILL BE 500.0.)

$\frac{\Delta SA}{\Delta H}$ = RATE OF SA INCREASE PER FOOT RISE IN ELEVATION (FEET)
 ($\frac{3}{11}$ @ 115 BELOW 500.0; $\frac{45}{55}$ @ 55 ABOVE 500.0)

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 79-00000000
 CHKD. BY JLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 5 OF 12



ELEVATION-STORAGE TABLE :

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	AC (ACRES)	ΔV_{1-2} (AC-FT)	TOTAL VOLUME (AC-FT)	RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	AC	ΔV_{1-2} (AC-FT)	TOTAL VOL. (AC-FT)
491.0	0	—	0	(LOW TOP OF DAM) 518.5	26	13	253
(NORMAL POOL) 509.0	15	—	61	519.0	27	13	266
510.0	16	15	76	520.0	28	27	293
511.0	17	16	92	521.0	29	28	321
512.0	19	18	110	522.0	29	29	350
513.0	20	19	129	523.0	30	29	379
514.0	21	20	149	524.0	31	30	409
515.0	22	21	170	525.0	32	31	440
516.0	23	22	192	530.0	35	167	607
517.0	24	23	215	535.0	39	185	712
518.0	26	25	240	540.0	43	225	997

PMP CALCULATIONS

- FROM REFERENCE 9, FIGURE 2, OBTAIN PMP VALUE FOR A DRAINAGE AREA OF 200 SQUARE MILES, FOR A DURATION OF 24 HOURS:

PRECIP = 22.2 INCHES

- FROM FIGURE 1, REFERENCE 9, THE STORMIC ADJUSTMENT FACTOR = 1.25

- AREA CORRECTION FACTOR (REF. 9) :

DURATION (HR.) :	6	12	24	48	72
FACTORS :	1.175	1.270	1.360	1.425	1.450

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY RJS DATE 11-17-79 PROJ. NO. 79-203-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 6 OF 12




- TOTAL CORRECTION FACTOR, 1.02 X AREA CORRECTION FACTOR:

DURATION (HRS) :	6	12	24	48	72
FACTOR :	120	130	139	145	148

- HOP BROOK FACTOR (ADJUSTMENT FOR BASIN SHAPE AND FOR THE LESSER LIKELIHOOD OF SEVERE STORM CENTERING OVER SMALL BASIN) FOR D.A. = 5.8 SQ. MI., IS 0.80 (REF 4, p. 48)

SPILLWAY CAPACITY


PROFILE OF SPILLWAY (FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS AND DESIGN DRAWINGS) (NOT TO SCALE)



PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY TJS DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 79-222-214
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 7 OF 12

gai
 CONSULTANTS, INC.
 Engineers • Geologists • Planners
 Environmental Specialists

CROSS-SECTION OF SPILLWAY (FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS)
 (NOT TO SCALE)



- THE SPILLWAY CONSISTS OF A RECTANGULAR CHUTE CHANNEL WITH AN UNCONTROLLED CONCRETE Ogee-SHAPED WEIR. APPROACH LOSSES ARE CONSIDERED NEGLIGIBLE HERE. FOR RESERVOIR ELEVATIONS BELOW 519.2, ($H \leq 9.2$ FT), THE DISCHARGE IS GIVEN BY THE EQUATION

$$Q = CLH^{3/2} \quad (\text{REF 4, p. 373})$$

WHERE Q = DISCHARGE (CFS)
 C = COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE (VARIABLE)
 L = EFFECTIVE LENGTH OF CHUTE (FT)
 H = HEAD OF RESERVOIR ABOVE SPILLWAY CREST (FT)

- THE EFFECTIVE LENGTH OF THE SPILLWAY CREST IS 99.0 FEET. FOR PIERS OTHER THAN POINTED-NOSE PIERS, A REDUCTION FACTOR IS NORMALLY USED TO ACCOUNT FOR SIDE CONTRACTION OF FLOW. HOWEVER, SINCE THERE ARE POINTED-NOSE PIERS USED HERE, THE REDUCTION FACTOR IS ZERO.
 (REF 4, p. 373)

JECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM



BY DTS DATE 11-17-79 PROJ. NO. 70-203-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 8 OF 12

- THE DESIGN TOP OF DAM ELEVATION, AS SHOWN ON FIGURE 2, CORRESPONDS TO THE DESIGN TOP OF WINGWALL ELEVATION 518.0. FIELD MEASUREMENTS INDICATE THE PRESENT TOP OF WINGWALL ELEVATION TO BE SET AT 518.2 FEET. IT CAN LOGICALLY BE ASSUMED THAT THE DESIGN WAS ALTERED, AT SOME POINT, TO ACCOMMODATE THE BRIDGE ACROSS THE SPILLWAY AND THE ASPHALT ROAD SURFACE AT THE ENDABUTMENT, ETC. FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS, THE ELEVATION OF THE LOW CHORD OF THE DAM, 518.2, IS ASSUMED TO REPRESENT THE DESIGN HEAD ELEVATION. FOR HEADS OTHER THAN THAT OF DESIGN HEAD, THE DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT, C , MUST BE MODIFIED, TO ACCOUNT FOR REDUCED FLOWS BELOW DESIGN HEAD, AND INCREASED FLOWS ABOVE DESIGN HEAD. APPROX AND SUBMERGENCE EFFECTS ARE ASSUMED TO BE NEGLECTABLE HERE, FROM OBSERVATION OF DOWNSTREAM CONDITIONS.

$p = \text{FOREBAY DEPTH} = 2.8 \text{ FT}$ (FIELD MEASURED)
 $H_0 = \text{ASSUMED DESIGN HEAD} = 518.2 - 509.0 = 9.2 \text{ FT}$
 $\frac{p}{H_0} = \frac{2.8}{9.2} \approx 0.304, \therefore C_0 \approx 3.69$ (REF. 4, p. 378, FIG. 5-4)

SPILLWAY RATING CURVE FOR ELEVATIONS BELOW LOW CHORD OF DAM

RESERVOIR ELEV (FT)	H (FT)	H/H ₀	C/C ₀	C	Q _{TOT} (CFS)
509.0	—	—	—	—	0
510.0	1	0.11	0.82	3.03	200
511.0	2	0.22	0.86	3.17	890
512.0	3	0.33	0.88	3.25	1670
513.0	4	0.43	0.91	3.36	2660
514.0	5	0.54	0.93	3.43	3800
515.0	6	0.65	0.95	3.51	5100
516.0	7	0.76	0.97	3.58	6560
517.0	8	0.87	0.98	3.62	8110
518.0	9	0.98	0.99	3.65	9760
518.2	9.2	1.00	1.0	3.69	12,190

① C/C_0 TAKEN FROM FIG 2-50 REF. 4 (p. 375)
 ② $C = \% \times 3.69$
 ③ $Q_{TOT} = CLH^{3/2}$

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVOIR DAM
 BY DD DATE 11-13-79 PROJ. NO. 79-202-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 9 OF 12



- FOR RESERVOIR ELEVATIONS ABOVE 518.3 AND BELOW 531.6, THE DISCHARGE UNDER THE LOW CHORD OF THE BRIDGE WILL ESSENTIALLY BE ORIFICE FLOW (SLUICE FLOW):

$$Q = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2g} CL (H_1^{3/2} - H_2^{3/2}) \quad (\text{REF 4, p. 385})$$

WHERE Q = FLOW THROUGH A LOW-HEAD ORIFICE (CFS)
 C = COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE
 L = LENGTH (OF CREST) = 99 FT
 H_1 = TOTAL HEAD ON BOTTOM OF ORIFICE
 = ELEV. - 509.0
 H_2 = TOTAL HEAD ON TOP OF ORIFICE
 = ELEV. - 518.2

SPILLWAY RATING CURVE FOR SLUICE FLOW:

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	H_1 (FT)	H_2 (FT)	$H_1^{3/2} - H_2^{3/2}$ (FT)	$\frac{1}{2}$	C	$Q = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2g} CL (H_1^{3/2} - H_2^{3/2})$
518.5	2.5	0.3	1.2	2.97	2.67	9870
518.7	2.7	0.5	2.2	3.15	2.67	13,120
519.0	3.0	0.8	2.2	3.12	2.67	10,480
520.0	4.0	1.8	2.2	3.84	2.67	11,550
521.0	5.0	2.8	2.2	3.77	2.67	12,500
522.0*	6.0	3.8	2.2	3.71	2.67	13,570
523.0	7.0	4.8	2.2	3.66	2.67	14,410
524.0	8.0	5.8	2.2	3.61	2.67	15,430
525.0	9.0	6.8	2.2	3.57	2.67	16,170

① FROM FIG. 107, p. 385, REFERENCE TO THE SPILLWAY RATING CURVE FOR SLUICE FLOW UNDER THE LOW CHORD OF THE BRIDGE.
 * - ABOVE ELEVATION 531.6, WEIR FLOW ALSO OCCURS UNDER THE BRIDGE. (SEE P. 11)

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVOIR DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-14-79 PROJ. NO. 79-2-2-214
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 10 OF 12



- FOR DISCHARGE OVER THE SPILLWAY BRIDGE, USE RELATIONSHIP FOR A BROAD-CRESTED WEIR:

$$Q = CLH^{3/2} \quad (\text{REF 5, p. 5-53})$$

WHERE Q = DISCHARGE OVER WEIR (CFS)
 L = LENGTH OF WEIR 5109 FT
 H = TOTAL HEAD ON WEIR
 = RESERVOIR ELEV - 531.6
 C = DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT = 2.63 (REF 5, p. 5-43)

RATING CURVE FOR DISCHARGE OVER SPILLWAY BRIDGE:

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	H (FT)	$Q = CLH^{3/2}$ (CFS)	$Q_{TOTAL} = Q_{BRIDGE} + Q_{SPILLWAY}$ (CFS)
528.0	0.4	70	13,660
530.0	1.4	470	14,880
534.0	2.4	1070	16,500
535.0	2.4	1800	17,970

RATING CURVE FOR DAM EMBANKMENT

- ASSUME THAT THE EMBANKMENT ACTS ESSENTIALLY AS A BROAD CRESTED WEIR WHEN OVERFLOWED. THIS, THE DISCHARGE WILL BE DEFINED BY THE RELATIONSHIP

$$Q = CLH^{3/2} \quad (\text{SEE ABOVE}).$$

PROJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-14-79 PROJ. NO. 79-303-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 11 OF 12



— FIRST, FIND LENGTH OF EMBANKMENT SUBMERGED FOR VARIOUS RESERVOIR ELEVATIONS:

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	APPROXIMATE EMBANKMENT LENGTH (FT)	
518.5 (LOW TOP OF DAM)	0	
518.7	620	(TAKEN FROM FIELD NOTES AND 1963 INDIANAPOLIS MAP T-11)
519.0	890	
520.0	1040	
522.0	1240	
525.0	1500	

— ASSUME INCREMENTAL DISCHARGES OVER EMBANKMENT ARE APPROXIMATELY TRAVERSEWISE IN CROSS-SECTION. INCREMENTAL AREA OF FLOW $\approx H_i [(L_1 + L_2)/2]$. THEREFORE, THE TOTAL AVERAGE FLOW-AREA WEIGHTED HEAD, H_{w-T} , \approx TOTAL FLOW AREA / L_2 .
 (L_1 = LENGTH AT LOWER ELEVATION, L_2 = LENGTH AT UPPER ELEVATION.)

RESERVOIR ELEV (FT)	L_1 (FT)	L_2 (FT)	INCREMENTAL HEAD, H_i (FT)	① INCR. FLOW AREA A_i (FT ²)	TOTAL FLOW AREA, A_T (FT ²)	② TOTAL WTD HEAD H_{w-T} (FT)	③ $\frac{H_{w-T}}{L}$	④ C	⑤ Q (CFS)
518.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
518.7	0	620	0.2	62	62	0.1	0.0	2.72	60
519.0	620	890	0.3	327	389	0.3	0.3	2.79	440
520.0	890	1040	1.0	765	1254	1.2	0.0	3.24	4160
522.0	1040	1240	2.0	2280	3534	2.7	2.12	3.25	18,700
525.0	1240	1500	3.0	4110	7644	5.1	3.90	3.28	57,700

① $A_i = \left(\frac{L_1 + L_2}{2}\right) H_i$

② $H_{w-T} = \frac{A_T}{L_2}$

③ L = WIDTH OF CREST = 205 FT

④ C , DISCHARGE COEFFICIENT, TAKEN FROM REF 12, FIG. 24

⑤ $Q = CL_2 H_{w-T}^{3/2}$

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY DJS DATE 11-17-79 PROJ. NO. 79-303-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 11-16-79 SHEET NO. 12 OF 12



TOTAL FACILITY RATING CURVE

$Q_{TOTAL} = Q_{SPILLWAY} + Q_{EMBALEMENT}$

($Q_{SPILLWAY}$ TAKEN FROM SHEETS 8, 9, + 10; $Q_{EMBALEMENT}$ FROM SHEET 11.)

RESERVOIR ELEVATION (FT)	$Q_{SPILLWAY}$ (CFS)	$Q_{EMBALEMENT}$ (CFS)	Q_{TOTAL} (CFS)
509.0 (SPILLWAY CREST)	0		0
510.0	300		300
511.0	890		890
512.0	1670		1670
513.0	3660		3660
514.0	3800		5500
515.0	5110		5110
516.0	6560		6560
517.0	8110		8110
518.0	9760		9760
518.5 (LOW TOP OF DAM)	9870	0	9870
518.7	10,120	60	10,180
519.0	10,480	440	10,920
520.0	11,550	4160	15,710
521.0	12,500	8900 *	21,300
522.0	13,660	13,700	32,360
523.0	14,880	36000 *	40,580
524.0	16,500	37,000 *	53,500
525.0	17,970	55,000	71,170

* INTERPOLATED, SEMI-LOG PLOT.

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVOIR DAM
 BY ZJS DATE 12-3-79 PROJ. NO. 79-203-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 12-5-79 SHEET NO. B OF D



Engineers • Geologists • Planners
 Environmental Specialists

U
 MO, DA HR, MM PERIOD MAIN EXCS LOSS
 6-MD-UP-PERIOD FLUID
 COMP G MO, DA HR, MM PERIOD MAIN EXCS LOSS COMP U

PMF

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
10683	3646	1240	35740
302	103	35	10116
17.13	23.39	23.87	22.87
435.18	594.13	606.38	606.38
5297	7237	7381	7381
6534	8920	9104	9104

0.7 PMF

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
7478	2552	868	250068
212	72	25	7081
11.99	16.37	16.71	16.71
304.63	415.89	424.47	424.47
3708	5062	5167	5167
4574	6244	6373	6373

0.8 PMF

6-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
8546	2917	992	285792
242	83	28	8093
13.71	18.71	19.10	19.10
348.15	475.30	485.11	485.11
4238	5785	5905	5905
5227	7136	7283	7283

INFLOWS
 INTO
 RESERVOIR

HYDROGRAPH ROUTING

ROUTE THROUGH RESERVOIR

STAGE	509.00	510.00	511.00	512.00	513.00	514.00	515.00	516.00	517.00
FLOW	0.00	100.00	890.00	1670.00	2680.00	3800.00	5110.00	6580.00	8110.00
	9870.00	10180.00	10920.00	15710.00	21300.00	32360.00	40880.00	51500.00	61170.00

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION

RESERVOIR DAM

BY RJS DATE 12-3-79 PROJ. NO. 79-232-314

CHKD. BY DLG DATE 12-3-79 SHEET NO. C OF D



Engineers • Geologists • Planners
Environmental Specialists

CAPACITY =	0.	76.	92.	110.	129.	149.	170.	192.	215.
	240.	286.	293.	321.	370.	379.	409.	440.	507.
ELEVATION =	491.	510.	511.	512.	513.	514.	515.	516.	517.
	518.	519.	520.	521.	522.	523.	524.	525.	530.
	CREL	SPWID	CUOM	EXPM	ELEVI.	COOL	CANEA	EXPL	
	509.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

DAM DATA
INPEL CUOM EXPD DAMWID
518.5 0.0 0.0 0.

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 13310. AT TIME 43.25 HOURS

PEAK	0-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
13310.	10665.	3645.	1240.	357125.
	302.	103.	35.	10133.
	17.11	23.39	23.87	23.87
	434.48	594.02	606.19	606.19
	5289.	7230.	7379.	7379.
	6523.	8919.	9101.	9101.

PMF

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 9299. AT TIME 43.50 HOURS

PEAK	0-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
9299.	7464.	2582.	868.	249985.
	211.	72.	25.	7079.
	11.97	16.37	16.71	16.71
	304.06	415.81	424.33	424.33
	3701.	5081.	5165.	5165.
	4565.	6243.	6311.	6311.

0.7 PMF

PEAK OUTFLOW IS 10636. AT TIME 43.50 HOURS

PEAK	0-HOUR	24-HOUR	72-HOUR	TOTAL VOLUME
10636.	8531.	2916.	992.	285695.
	301.	63.	28.	8090.
	13.68	18.71	19.09	19.09
	347.53	475.20	484.94	484.94
	4230.	5784.	5903.	5903.
	5218.	7135.	7281.	7281.

0.8 PMF

RESERVOIR
OUTFLOW
HYDROGRAPHS

OVERLAYS

0.7 PMF

SUBJECT DAM SAFETY INSPECTION
RESERVATION DAM
 BY DJS DATE 12-3-79 PROJ. NO. 79-203-014
 CHKD. BY DLB DATE 12-3-79 SHEET NO. D OF D



SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

RATIO OF PMF	ELEVATION STORAGE OUTFLOW	INITIAL VALUE	SPIGWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM DEPTH OVER DAM	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
.50	516.05	509.00	509.00	518.50	0.00	6643.	193.	0.00	6643.	43.50	0.00
.60	516.91	61.	61.	253.	0.00	7971.	213.	0.00	7971.	43.50	0.00
.70	517.72	0.	0.	9870.	0.00	9299.	233.	0.00	9299.	43.50	0.00
.77*	518.50					9870	253		9870		
.80	518.88				.38	10636.	263.	1.50	10636.	43.50	0.00
1.00	519.50				1.00	13310.	279.	3.75	13310.	43.25	0.00

* BY INTERPOLATION; OVERTOPPING OCCURS AT APPROXIMATELY 0.77 PMF.

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 E

FIGURES

LIST OF FIGURES


<u>Figure</u>	<u>Description/Title</u>
1	Regional Vicinity and Watershed Boundary Map
2	General Plan
3	Cross Section
4	Plan of Spillway Channel
5	Spillway Details



GRANTVILLE, PA.
 NW/4 HUMMELSTOWN 15 QUADRANGLE
 N4022.5—W7637.5/7.5

1969
 PHOTOREVISED 1975
 AMS 5664 I NW—SERIES V831


INDIANTOWN GAP, PA.
NE/4 HUMMELSTOWN 15 QUADRANGLE
N4022.5—W7630/7.5
1969
PHOTOREVISED 1977
AMS 5664 I NE—SERIES V831




LONGEST WATERCOURSE
⊙ CENTROID OF DRAINAGE AREA


FIGURE 1


REGIONAL VICINITY
AND
WATERSHED BOUNDARY MAP

















APPENDIX F

GEOLOGY

Geology

Reservation Dam is located on the boundary between the Appalachian Mountain section and the Great Valley section of the Valley and Ridge physiographic province of central and eastern Pennsylvania. The Appalachian Mountain section lies immediately north and west of the dam whereas the Great Valley section contains the dam and lands downstream of the reservoir. Bedrock immediately underlying the dam and also contained within the abutments consists of dark-gray shale and shaly siltstone of the Martinsburg Formation of Middle Ordovician age. The Martinsburg Formation crops out in a northeast-trending belt through central Lebanon County and forms the northern half of the Great Valley section. The Martinsburg Formation is bounded on the north by the disconformably overlying Juniata Formation and the Tuscarora Formation, and on the south by a series of overlapping fault sheets of generally older carbonate rocks apparently thrust onto it.

In the highlands above the dam and reservoir, Indiantown Run passes through a watergap in Blue Mountain and drains a small intermontane valley of the Appalachian Mountain section. This region is composed of a broad band of long, narrow mountain ridges and intermontane valleys which cross the state from the south-central border nearly to the northeast corner. Intense lateral compression from the southeast produced a series of high amplitude anticlines and synclines

whose axes generally trend in a southwest-northeast direction. Folding was followed by uplift. Subsequent erosion cut valleys in the soft nonresistant beds and left the hard, resistant strata as ridges. In several instances, such as at Indiantown Gap, superposed streams cut across the resistant ridges during the course of uplift.


Blue Mountain is composed of the highly resistant Tuscarora and Juniata Formations of Upper Ordovician and Silurian age. The slopes of the mountain, particularly on the Great Valley side, are blanketed with talus or colluvium ranging from five to fifty feet in thickness. This material consists of a mixture of quartzite boulders and shale developed from the underlying Tuscarora and Juniata Formations.

Groundwater in the Martinsburg Formation occurs chiefly in secondary openings in the rock, such as joints and other fractures. Primary openings (the void space between the individual grains of a rock) have been closed in the Martinsburg Formation by compaction and cementation following deposition. Steep-dipping joints and other fractures are the most important secondary openings through which groundwater can flow in this formation.

Carswell, Louis D., et. al., "Geology and Hydrology of the Martinsburg Formation in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania Geologic Survey, Groundwater Report W 24, Harrisburg, 1968.

Hall, George M., "Groundwater in Southeastern Pennsylvania,"
Pennsylvania Geologic Survey, Bulletin W 2, Harrisburg, 1934.

Meisler, Harold, "Hydrology of the Carbonate Rocks of the
Lebanon Valley, Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania Geologic Survey,
Groundwater Report W 18, Harrisburg, 1963.



L E G E N D

PENNSYLVANIAN

ANTHRACITE REGION

P_{pd} Post-Pottsville Formations
Brown or gray sandstones and shales with some conglomerate and numerous mineable coals.

P_d Pottsville Group
Light gray to white, coarse grained sandstones and conglomerates with some mineable coal; includes Sharp Mountain, Schuylkill, and Tumbling Run Formations.

MISSISSIPPIAN

M_{mc} Mauch Chunk Formation
Red shales with brown to greenish gray fluggy sandstones; includes Greenbrier Limestone in Fayette, Westmoreland, and Somerset counties; Loganbana Limestone at the base in southwestern Pennsylvania.

M_p Pocono Group
Predominantly gray, hard, massive, cross-bedded conglomerate and sandstone with some shale; includes in the Appalachian Plateau Burgoon, Shenango, Cayuga, Cassawago, Corra, and Knapp Formations; includes part of "Osage" of M. L. Fuller in Potter and Tioga counties.

DEVONIAN

UPPER

CENTRAL AND EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA

D_{ck} Catskill Formation
Chiefly red to brownish shales and sandstones; includes gray and greenish sandstone tongues named Elk Mountain, Honesdale, Shohola, and Delaware River to the east.

D_m Marine beds
Gray to olive brown shales, graywackes, and sandstones contains "Channing beds" and "Pottom" beds including Bucklet, Bradley, Havell, and Trimmers Rock, Tully Limestone at base.

SILURIAN

S_{bm} Bloomsburg Formation
Red, thin and thick bedded shale and siltstone with local nests of sandstone and thin impure limestone; some green shale in places.


S_c Clinton Group
Predominantly Rose Hill Formation - Reddish purple to greenish gray, thin to medium bedded, fossiliferous shale with intertonguing "iron sandstones" and local gray, fossiliferous limestone; above the Rose Hill is brown to white quartzitic sandstone (Ketch) interbedded upward with dark gray shale (Rochester).

Tuscarora Formation
White to gray, medium to thick bedded, fine grained, quartzitic sandstone, conglomeratic in part.

ORDOVICIAN

GREAT VALLEY

O_{ms} Martinsburg Formation
Gray to dark gray, light gray to olive weathering shale O_m with thick sandstone interbeds O_{ms}; east of Susquehanna River contains interbedded red shale, gray to brown sandstone, and thin bedded limestone O_{ms}; has associated andesite lavas O_m in Lebanon County.



REFERENCE:
GEOLOGIC MAP OF PENNSYLVANIA PREPARED BY COMMONWEALTH OF PENNA. DEPT. OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS, DATED 1960, SCALE 1" = 4 MILES

GEOLOGY MAP

jai

CONSULTANTS, INC.