

AD-A087 313

NEW JERSEY DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TRENTON
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM. ROOSEVELT PARK DAM (NJ00378) RAHWA--ETC(U)
JAN 80 R J MCDERMOTT


F/6 13/13

DACW61-79-C-0011


NL

UNCLASSIFIED

1 of 1
90-04-1



END
DATE
FILMED
9-80
DTIC



ADA087313

DDG FILE WCL

2

LEVEL

1

RAHWAY RIVER BASIN
SOUTH BRANCH RAHWAY RIVER
MIDDLESEX COUNTY
NEW JERSEY

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

NJ 00378

DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 31 1980

PHASE 1 INSPECTION REPORT NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

CONTAINS COLOR PLATES: ALL DDG
EDITIONS WILL BE IN BLACK AND WHITE.



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Philadelphia District
Corps of Engineers
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

JANUARY 1980

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

80 7 30 02

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NJ00378	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A087323	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Phase I Inspection Report National Dam Safety Program Roosevelt Park Dam NJ00378 Middlesex County, New Jersey		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED FINAL
7. AUTHOR(s) RICHARD McDERMOTT		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Storch Engineering 220 Ridgedale Ave. Florham Park, N.J. 07932		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DACW61-79-C-0011
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS NJ Department of Environmental Protection Division of Water Resources P.O. Box CN029 Trenton, NJ 08625		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) U.S. Army Engineer District, Philadelphia Custom House, 2d & Chestnut Streets Philadelphia, PA 19106		12. REPORT DATE January, 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 75
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Copies are obtainable from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Dams Visual Inspection Embankments National Dam Safety Program Safety Roosevelt Park Dam Structural Analysis		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report cites results of a technical investigation as to the dam's adequacy. The inspection and evaluation of the dam is as prescribed by the National Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367. The technical investigation includes visual inspection, review of available design and construction records, and preliminary structural and hydraulic and hydrologic calculations, as applicable. An assessment of the dam's general condition is included in the report.		

NOTICE

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
FROM THE BEST COPY FURNISHED BY
THE SPONSORING AGENCY. ALTHOUGH
IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT CERTAIN POR-
TIONS ARE ILLEGIBLE, IT IS BEING
RELEASED IN THE INTEREST OF MAKING
AVAILABLE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS
POSSIBLE.**



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
CUSTOM HOUSE-2 D & CHESTNUT STREETS
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19106

IN REPLY REFER TO
NAPEN-N

24 JUL 1980

Honorable Brendan T. Byrne
Governor of New Jersey
Trenton, New Jersey 08621

Dear Governor Byrne:

Inclosed is the Phase I Inspection Report for Roosevelt Park Dam in Middlesex County, New Jersey which has been prepared under authorization of the Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367. A brief assessment of the dam's condition is given in the front of the report.

Based on visual inspection, available records, calculations and past operational performance, Roosevelt Park Dam, initially listed as a high hazard potential structure, but reduced to a significant hazard potential structure as a result of this inspection, is judged to be in fair condition. The dam's spillway is considered inadequate because a flow equivalent to nine percent of the 100-year flood would cause the dam to be overtopped. To ensure adequacy of the structure, the following actions, as a minimum, are recommended:

a. The spillway's adequacy should be determined by a qualified professional consultant engaged by the owner using more sophisticated methods, procedures and studies within six months from the date of approval of this report. Within three months of the consultant's findings remedial measures to ensure spillway adequacy should be initiated.

b. Within six months from date of approval of this report, the following remedial actions should be initiated:

(1) A qualified professional consultant should be engaged to prepare a detailed design for embankment improvements, including any necessary filling and regrading, and the embankment should be renovated accordingly.

(2) The concrete walls, spillway approach channel, outlet pipe and spillway structure should be thoroughly inspected and renovated.

NAPEN-N

Honorable Brendan T. Byrne

(3) The gate lift stem and the lifting mechanism should be thoroughly inspected and renovated if necessary. Also, the lock securing the lifting mechanism should be repaired or replaced.

(4) All trees on the embankment should be removed.

c. The owner should develop an emergency action plan which outlines actions to be taken by the operator to minimize the downstream effects of an emergency, together with an effective warning system, within six months from the date of approval of this report.

d. Within one year from the date of approval of this report, the owner should develop written operating procedures and a periodic maintenance plan to ensure the safety of the dam.

A copy of the report is being furnished to Mr. Dirk C. Hofman, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the designated State Office contact for this program. Within five days of the date of this letter, a copy will also be sent to Congressman Patton of the Fifteenth District. Under the provision of the Freedom of Information Act, the inspection report will be subject to release by this office, upon request, five days after the date of this letter.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the National Technical Information Services (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161 at a reasonable cost. Please allow four to six weeks from the date of this letter for NTIS to have copies of the report available.

An important aspect of the Dam Inspection Program will be the implementation of the recommendations made as a result of the inspection. We accordingly request that we be advised of proposed actions taken by the State to implement our recommendations.

Sincerely,



JAMES G. TON
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

1 Incl
As stated

Copies furnished:

Mr. Dirk C. Hofman, P.E., Deputy Director
Division of Water Resources
N.J. Dept. of Environmental Protection
P.O. Box CNO29
Trenton, NJ 08625

Mr. John O'Dowd, Acting Chief
Bureau of Flood Plain Regulation
Division of Water Resources
N.J. Dept. of Environmental Protection
P.O. Box CNO29
Trenton, NJ 08625

Accession For	
NTIS GMA&I	☒
DDC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Available or special
A	

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM (NJ00378)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL CONDITIONS

This dam was inspected on 9 November 1979 by Storch Engineers under contract to the State of New Jersey. The State, under agreement with the U.S. Army Engineer District, Philadelphia, had this inspection performed in accordance with the National Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367.

Roosevelt Park Dam, initially listed as a high hazard potential structure, but reduced to a significant hazard potential structure as a result of this inspection, is judged to be in fair overall condition. The dam's spillway is considered inadequate because a flow equivalent to nine percent of the 100-year flood would cause the dam to be overtopped. To ensure adequacy of the structure, the following actions, as a minimum, are recommended:

a. The spillway's adequacy should be determined by a qualified professional consultant engaged by the owner using more sophisticated methods, procedures and studies within six months from the date of approval of this report. Within three months of the consultant's findings remedial measures to ensure spillway adequacy should be initiated.

b. Within six months from date of approval of this report, the following remedial actions should be initiated:

(1) A qualified professional consultant should be engaged to prepare a detailed design for embankment improvements, including any necessary filling and regrading, and the embankment should be renovated accordingly.

(2) The concrete walls, spillway approach channel, outlet pipe and spillway structure should be thoroughly inspected and renovated.

(3) The gate lift stem and the lifting mechanism should be thoroughly inspected and renovated if necessary. Also, the lock securing the lifting mechanism should be repaired or replaced.

(4) All trees on the embankment should be removed.

c. The owner should develop an emergency action plan which outlines actions to be taken by the operator to minimize the downstream effects of an emergency, together with an effective warning system, within six months from the date of approval of this report.

d. Within one year from the date of approval of this report, the owner should develop written operating procedures and a periodic maintenance plan to ensure the safety of the dam.

APPROVED: _____

JAMES G. TON

Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

DATE: _____

⑨ Final Rept., ⑩ Richard S. / McDermott

⑥ PHASE I REPORT
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

⑪ Jan 80

12, 87

Name of Dam: Roosevelt Park Dam, (NJ00378)
State Located: New Jersey
County Located: Middlesex
Drainage Basin: Rahway River Basin,
Stream: South Branch Rahway River, Middlesex County,
Date of Inspection: November 9, 1979, New Jersey.

⑬ DACW 61-79-C-0011

Phase I Inspection Report.

Assessment of General Conditions of Dam

Based on visual inspection, past operational performance and Phase I engineering analyses, the dam is assessed as being in fair overall condition.

Based on investigations of the downstream flood plain made in connection with this report, it is recommended that the hazard potential classification be downgraded from high to significant hazard.

Hydraulic and hydrologic analyses indicate that the spillways are not sufficient to pass the designated spillway design flood (100-year storm) without an overtopping of the dam. The spillways are capable of passing approximately 8 percent of the spillway design flood. Therefore, the owner should engage a professional engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams in the near future to perform more accurate hydraulic and hydrologic analyses relating to the spillway capacity. Based on the findings of the analyses, the need for and type of remedial measures should be determined and then implemented.

The embankment is eroded in several locations and exhibits evidence of previous washouts adjacent to each side of the spillway structure. Therefore, the owner should engage a professional engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams in the near future to prepare a

410891

JP


detailed design for embankment improvements, including any necessary filling and regrading, and the embankment should be renovated accordingly.

It is further recommended that the following remedial measures be undertaken by the owner in the near future.

- 1) The concrete walls, spillway approach channel, outlet pipe and spillway structure should be thoroughly inspected and renovated.
- 2) The gate lift stem should be repaired and the lifting mechanism should be thoroughly inspected and renovated if necessary. Also, the lock securing the lifting mechanism should be repaired or replaced.
- 3) All trees on the embankment should be removed.

In the near future, the owner of the dam should develop written operating procedures and a periodic maintenance plan to insure the safety of the dam.


Richard J. McDermott, P.E.


John E. Gribbin, P.E.



OVERVIEW - ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

29 NOVEMBER 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL CONDITION OF DAM	i
OVERVIEW PHOTO	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
PREFACE	vi
SECTION 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION	1
1.1 General	
1.2 Description of Project	
1.3 Pertinent Data	
SECTION 2 - ENGINEERING DATA	9
2.1 Design	
2.2 Construction	
2.3 Operation	
2.4 Evaluation	
SECTION 3 - VISUAL INSPECTION	11
3.1 Findings	
SECTION 4 - OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	14
4.1 Procedures	
4.2 Maintenance of Dam	
4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities	
4.4 Description of Warning System	
4.5 Evaluation	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 5 - HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC	16
5.1 Evaluation of Features	
SECTION 6- STRUCTURAL STABILITY	18
6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability	
SECTION 7 - ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	20
7.1 Dam Assessment	
7.2 Recommendations	
PLATES	
1 KEY MAP	
2 VICINITY MAP	
3 SOIL MAP	
4 GENERAL PLAN	
5 SPILLWAY STRUCTURE	
6 DAM SECTION	
7 PHOTO LOCATION PLAN	
APPENDICES	
1 Check List - Visual Inspection	
Check List - Engineering Data	
2 Photographs	
3 Engineering Data	
4 Hydraulic/Hydrologic Computations	
5 Bibliography	

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. 30214. 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 dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam will continue to represent the condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that the unsafe conditions be detected.

Phase I inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the Spillway Test flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. The test 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 INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM, I.D. 00378

SECTION 1: PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 General

a. Authority

Public Law 92-367, August 8, 1972 authorized the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, to initiate a National Program of Dam Inspection throughout the United States. The Division of Water Resources of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in cooperation with the Philadelphia District of the Corps of Engineers has been assigned the responsibility of supervising the inspection of dams within the State of New Jersey. Storch Engineers has been retained by the NJDEP to inspect and report on a selected group of these dams. The NJDEP is under agreement with the Philadelphia District of the Corps of Engineers.

b. Purpose of Inspection

The visual inspection of Roosevelt Park Dam was made on November 9, 1979. The purpose of the inspection was to make a general assessment of the structural integrity and operational adequacy of the dam structure and its appurtenances.

1.2 Description of Project

a. Description

Roosevelt Park Dam is an earthfill dam with a central concrete structure serving as spillway, auxiliary spillway and outlet works. The spillway consists of two concrete weirs extending along portions of the upstream side of the dam and discharging through two openings in the central spillway structure. The weirs are fitted with timber stoplogs which can be used to regulate the lake level within a vertical range of 1 foot.

The auxiliary spillway consists of a combination cast iron grate and concrete chute located on top of the central spillway structure. A gated opening in the upstream wall of the spillway structure serves as outlet works. The spillway structure discharges through a 48-inch reinforced concrete pipe to a cobblestone lined downstream channel.

The crest of the dam is generally level and uniform in width and is paved with a gravel foot path. The upstream face of the dam consists of a concrete wall for a portion of its length and a grassed slope for the remainder. The downstream face of the dam is generally grassed with bushes and trees located along the majority of its length.

The elevation of the spillway crest is 58.3, national geodetic vertical datum (N.G.V.D.) while that of the auxiliary spillway is 58.8. The crest of dam is at elevation 59.8 and the downstream channel bed elevation is 52.1. The overall length of the dam is 638 feet and its height is 7.7 feet.

b. Location

Roosevelt Park Dam is located in the Town of Edison, Middlesex County, New Jersey. It impounds a recreational lake located in a small public park adjacent to Roosevelt Hospital. Principal access to the dam is through the park which is entered from Parsonage Road. Discharge from the spillway of the dam flows into the South Branch of Rahway River.

c. Size and Hazard Classification

Size and Hazard Classification criteria presented in "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams," published by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are as follows:

SIZE CLASSIFICATION

	<u>Impoundment</u>	
	<u>Storage (Ac-ft)</u>	<u>Height (Ft.)</u>
Small	< 1000 and ≥ 50	< 40 and ≥ 25
Intermediate	≥ 1000 and $< 50,000$	≥ 40 and < 100
Large	$\geq 50,000$	≥ 100

HAZARD POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Loss of Life</u> (Extent of Development)	<u>Economic Loss</u> (Extent of Development)
Low	None expected (no permanent structures for human habitation)	Minimal (Undeveloped to occasional structures or agriculture)
Significant	Few (No urban developments and no more than a small number of inhabitable structures)	Appreciable (Notable agriculture, industry or structures)
High	More than a small number	Excessive (Extensive community, industry or agriculture)

The following data relating to size and downstream hazard for Roosevelt Park Dam have been obtained for this Phase I assessment:

Storage 65 acre-feet

Height 7.7 feet

Potential Loss of Life:

A public road bridge (Parsonage Road) is located 300 feet downstream from the dam. Four dwellings are located about 1000 feet downstream and lie approximately 10 feet above the stream bed. Six dwellings are located about 2000 feet downstream and lie approximately 5 feet above the stream bed. Failure of the dam could possibly cause loss of life.

Potential Economical Loss:

In addition to the Parsonage Road bridge, a railroad bridge is located 700 feet downstream and another road bridge 1700 feet downstream from the dam. Damage could be sustained by these bridges as a result of dam failure.

Therefore, Roosevelt Park Dam is classified as "Small" size and "Significant" hazard potential.

d. Ownership

Roosevelt Park Dam is owned by the County of Middlesex and is operated by the Middlesex County Parks Department, P. O. Box 661, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

e. Purpose of Dam

The purpose of the dam is the impoundment of a lake used for recreation.

f. Design and Construction History

Roosevelt Park Dam reportedly was constructed by the WPA in 1935.

g. Normal Operational Procedures

The dam and appurtenances are operated and maintained by the Middlesex County Parks Department. Repairs are made on an "as needed" basis.

Reportedly, the outlet works gate is generally opened during heavy rainstorms. The gate is also used to drain the lake for maintenance purposes. The lake was last drawn down in or around 1964.

1.3 Pertinent Data

a. Drainage Area 1.2 square miles

b. Discharge at Damsite

Maximum flood at damsite	Unknown
Outlet works at pool elevation	92 c.f.s.
Spillway capacity at top of dam	113 c.f.s.

c. Elevation (N.G.V.D.)

Top of Dam	59.8
Maximum pool-design surcharge	60.6
Spillway crest	58.3
Auxiliary Spillway Crest	58.8
Stream bed at toe of dam	52.1
Maximum tailwater	55.4 (Estimated)

d. Reservoir

Length of maximum pool	1400 feet (Estimated)
Length of recreation pool	1300 feet (Scaled)

e. Storage (Acre-feet)

Recreation pool	26 acre-feet
Design surcharge	94 acre-feet
Top of dam	65 acre-feet

f. Reservoir Surface (acres)

Top of dam	35 acres (Estimated)
Maximum Pool - design surcharge	39 acres (Estimated)
Recreation pool	11 acres

g. Dam

Type	Earthfill
Length	638 feet
Height	7.7 feet
Sideslopes - Upstream	Varies: Vertical, and 2 horiz. to 1 vert.
- Downstream	10 horiz. to 1 vert.
Zoning	Unknown
Impervious core	Unknown
Cutoff	Unknown
Grout curtain	Unknown

h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel

N.A.

i. Spillway

Type	Weir and Orifice
Length of weir	273 feet
Opening of orifice in each side of spillway structure	1.4 feet
Crest elevation	58.3
Gates	N.A.
Approach channel	Concrete channel leading to orifice in each side of central spillway structure.
Discharge channel	48-inch RCP

j. Auxiliary Spillway

Type	Drop Inlet and Chute
Length of Weir	11 feet
Crest elevation	58.8
Gates	N.A.
Approach channel	N.A.
Discharge channel	Drop Inlet: 48-inch RCP Chute: Chute serves as discharge channel

k. Regulating Outlet

3' X 3' lift gate

SECTION 2: ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design

No plans nor calculations pertaining to the original construction of the dam could be obtained. Reportedly, drawings relating to the repair in 1970 are available in the files of the Middlesex County Parks Department.

2.2 Construction

No data nor reports pertaining to the construction of the dam are available.

2.3 Operation

No data nor reports pertaining to the operations of the dam are available.

2.4 Evaluation

a. Availability

Available engineering data is limited to that which is on file at the Middlesex County Parks Department. The file contains drawings relating to the repair in 1970.

b. Adequacy

Available engineering data pertaining to Roosevelt Park Dam is not adequate to be of significant assistance to the performance of a Phase I evaluation. A list of absent information is included in paragraph 7.1.b.

c. **Validity**

The validity of engineering data cannot be assessed due to the absence of data.

SECTION 3: VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Findings

a. General

The inspections of Roosevelt Park Dam were performed on November 9, 1979 by staff members of Storch Engineers. A copy of the visual inspection check list is contained in Appendix 1. The following procedures were employed for the inspection:

- 1) The embankment of the dam, appurtenant structures and adjacent areas were examined.
- 2) The embankment and accessible appurtenant structures were measured and key elevations determined by surveyor's level.
- 3) The embankment, appurtenant structures and adjacent areas were photographed.

b. Dam

The crest of the dam is generally level and uniform in width and serves as a foot path for pedestrians using the park. The downstream face of the dam is grassed with some trees and bushes. On the downstream side of the dam near the spillway significant erosion in the form of gullies was noted. It appears that the erosion has been caused by frequent overtopping of the dam. On each side of the spillway structure, evidence of previous embankment washouts was observed. The washed out areas were filled with large pieces of concrete and asphalt as well as with soil.

The concrete wall comprising the upstream face of a portion of the dam and also serving as spillway crest was observed to be in generally satisfactory condition. This wall also forms one side of the spillway approach channel. The concrete wall comprising the other side of the spillway approach channel was leaning in the upstream direction in several locations and steel anchors were observed to be in place at some of the construction joints. In one location, the wall was supported by a timber brace.

c. Appurtenant Structures

The concrete spillway structure shows some spalling on the upper slab at the upstream end. The concrete on the chute appears to be more recent than on other parts of the spillway. Spalling was observed on the inside surface of the spillway structure on the upstream wall near the gate opening. Also, slight leakage was observed at the bolts used to secure the gate. The outlet works operating mechanism was not operated at the time of inspection and the stem was observed to be bent. The 48-inch reinforced concrete pipe appeared to be in satisfactory condition with some spalling along the invert.

d. Reservoir Area

The impoundment of the dam is 1300 feet long with a width varying from 400 to 700 feet. It is surrounded by a grassed park and its shore slopes are generally moderate. The only structure on the lake is a pedestrian timber bridge near the upstream end. Soundings in the lake indicated that sediment in the lake is concentrated at the upstream end.

e. Downstream Channel

The spillway discharges into the South Branch of Rahway River which is quite well defined in the vicinity of the dam. Between the dam and Parsonage Road the river appears to be a manmade channel with well formed sides paved with cobble stones for half of the length. Obstructions to flood stage flow are caused by three downstream bridges within 1700 feet of the dam.

SECTION 4: OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Procedures

The level of water in the Roosevelt Park Dam impoundment is regulated by discharge over the spillway weirs and through the openings normally fitted with stoplogs. The outlet works of the dam can be used to drain the lake or to augment the discharge capacity of the spillway. Reportedly, the gate is opened during heavy storms by County Parks maintenance personnel.

The most recent drawdown of the lake occurred 10 years ago when the outlet gate was reportedly replaced. It was reported that 5 days was required to drain the lake completely.

4.2 Maintenance of the Dam

Reportedly, maintenance is performed only on an "as needed" basis. The most recent maintenance reportedly was performed during 1979 when the gravel path on the dam crest was completely renovated to correct erosion caused by recent overtopping.

4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities

The outlet works for the dam is maintained on an "as needed" basis. It was reportedly serviced 10 years ago when the gate was replaced.

4.4. Description of Warning System

Reportedly, no warning system is currently in use for the dam.

4.5 Evaluation of Operational Adequacy

The operation of the dam has not been successful to the extent that the dam reportedly has been overtopped nearly every year.

Maintenance is inadequate and maintenance documentation is poor. Areas of maintenance that have not been adequately performed are:

- 1) Gate lift stem bent and the lock on the chain has the key broken in it.
- 2) Spalls and deterioration on both the outside and inside of the spillway structure.
- 3) Washout sections adjacent to the central spillway structure not properly filled.
- 4) Erosion on the embankment not properly filled.
- 5) Trees and bushes on the embankment not removed.

SECTION 5: HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC

5.1 Evaluation of Features

a. Design Data

The intensity of storm water runoff that the spillway should be able to handle is based on the size and hazard classification of the dam. This runoff intensity, called the spillway design flood (SDF) is described in terms of return frequency or probable maximum flood (PMF) depending on the extent of the dam's size and potential hazard. According to the "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams" published by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The SDF for Roosevelt Dam falls in a range of 100-year frequency to 1/2 PMF. In this case, the low end of the range, 100-year frequency, is chosen since the factors used to select size and hazard classification are on the low side of their respective ranges.

The SDF peak computed for Roosevelt Dam is 1394 c.f.s. This value is derived from the 100-year flood hydrograph computed by the use of the HEC-1-DB Flood Hydrograph Computer Program using the SCS Method. Hydrologic computations and computer output are contained in Appendix 4.

The spillway discharge rates were computed by the use of an orifice formula appropriate for the configuration of the spillway structure. The combined spillway and auxiliary spillway discharge with lake level equal to the top of the dam was computed to be 113 c.f.s. The SDF was routed through the dam by use of the HEC-1-DB computer program using the

modified Puls Method. In routing the SDF, it was found that the dam crest would be overtopped by a depth of 0.8 feet. Accordingly, the subject spillways are assessed as being inadequate in accordance with criteria developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

b. Experience Data

Reportedly, the dam has been overtopped approximately once each year and the embankment adjacent to the spillway structure has been partially washed out. No damage to downstream structures was reported at the time of the overtoppings and washout.

c. Visual Observation

Erosion and evidence of a washout of the embankment were observed at the time of inspection.

d. Overtopping Potential

As indicated in paragraph 5.1.a. a storm of magnitude equal to the SDF would cause overtopping of the dam to a height of 0.8 foot over the crest of the dam. The spillways are capable of passing approximately 8 percent of the SDF with lake level equal to the top of dam.

SECTION 6: STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability

a. Visual Observations

The dam appeared, at the time of inspection to be outwardly structurally sound with no evidence of cracks or distress. No seepage was observed near the dam during inspection. The displacement or leaning of the concrete wall forming one side of the spillway approach channel does not appear to be an indication of distress in the embankment.

b. Generalized Soils Description

The generalized soils description of the dam site consists of alluvial soil composed of stratified materials deposited by streams overlying glacial terminal moraine. The terminal moraine consists of silt, sandy silt and silty sand with varying amounts of gravel and small amounts of clay deposited at the outer edge of the ice sheet during the Wisconsin stage of continental glaciation. The glacial terminal moraine overlies soft red shale bedrock known as the Brunswick Formation.

c. Design and Construction Data

The analysis of structural stability and construction data for the embankment are not available.

d. Operating Records

No operating records are available for the dam. The water level of Roosevelt Park Lake is not monitored.

e. Post-Construction Changes

Reportedly, the spillway structure was reconstructed and the outlet gate was replaced around 1970.

f. Seismic Stability

Roosevelt Park is located in Seismic Zone 1 as defined in "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dam" which is a zone of very low seismic activity. Experience indicates that dams in Seismic Zone 1 will have adequate stability under seismic loading conditions if they have adequate stability under static loading conditions. Roosevelt Park Dam appeared to be stable under static loading conditions at the time of inspection.

SECTION 7: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Dam Assessment

a. Safety

Based on hydraulic and hydrologic analyses outlined in Section 5 and Appendix 4, the spillways of Roosevelt Park Dam are assessed as being inadequate. The spillways are not able to pass the SDF without an overtopping of the dam.

The embankment appeared, at the time of inspection, to be generally outwardly stable, with previous washouts on both sides of the spillway structure filled by dumped soil, concrete and asphalt.

The structural integrity of the dam is considered adequate based on visual inspection. No reported nor written evidence was found that would contradict that assessment.

b. Adequacy of Information

Information sources for this report include 1) field inspections, 2) USGS quadrangle, 3) aerial photograph from Middlesex County, 4) consultation with maintenance personnel of Roosevelt Park. The information obtained is sufficient to allow a Phase I assessment as outlined in "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams."

Some of the absent data are as follows:

1. Construction and as-built drawings.
2. Description of fill material for embankment.
3. Design computations and reports.
4. Maintenance documentation.
5. Soils report for the site.

c. **Necessity for Additional Data/Evaluation**

Although some data pertaining to Roosevelt Park Dam are not available, additional data are not considered imperative for this Phase I evaluation.

7.2 **Recommendations**

a. **Remedial Measures**

Based on hydraulic and hydrologic analyses outlined in paragraph 5.1.a, the spillways are considered to be inadequate. It is therefore recommended that a professional engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams be engaged in the near future to perform more accurate hydraulic and hydrologic analyses relating to the spillway capacity. Based on the findings of these analyses, the need for and type of remedial measures should be determined and then implemented.

In addition, it is recommended that a professional engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams be engaged in the near future to prepare a detailed design for embankment

improvements, including any necessary filling and regrading, and the embankment should be renovated accordingly.

It is further recommended that the following remedial measures be undertaken by the owner in the near future.

- 1) The concrete walls, spillway approach channel, outlet pipe and spillway structure should be thoroughly inspected and renovated.
- 2) The gate lift stem should be repaired and the lifting mechanism should be thoroughly inspected and renovated if necessary. Also the lock securing the lifting mechanism should be repaired or replaced.
- 3) All trees on the embankment should be removed.

b. Maintenance

In the near future, the owner of the dam should develop written operating procedures and a periodic maintenance plan to insure the safety of the dam.

PLATES

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM




PLATE I

STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS

KEY MAP


ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

I.D. N.J. 00378

SCALE: NONE

DATE: NOV., 1979



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COLLECTED MATERIAL

PLATE 2

STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY


DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS VICINITY MAP ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

I.D. N.J. 00378

SCALE: AS SHOWN

DATE: NOV., 1979



Legend

- AR Recent alluvium composed of stratified materials deposited by streams.
- GMM-24 Glacial Terminal moraine. Silt, sandy silt and silty sand with varying amounts of gravel and small amounts of clay deposited at the outer edge of the ice sheet during the Wisconsin stage of continental glaciation.

NOTE: Information taken from Rutgers University Soil Survey of New Jersey, Report No. 10, Middlesex County, and Geologic Map of New Jersey prepared by Lewis and Kummel.

PLATE 3

STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY


INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS SOIL MAP ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

I.D. NJ00378


SCALE: NONE

DATE: NOV., 1979



Previous Wash

Crest of Dam



Length of Dam = 638'

LAKE

NOTE:
Information taken from field
inspection November 9, 1979.




PLATE 4

STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY


DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS
GENERAL PLAN
ROOSEVELT PARK DAM


I.D.N.J. 00378

SCALE: NOT TO SCALE

DATE: DEC. 7, 1979




PLAN



SECTION

NOTES:

- 1 Information taken from field inspection November 9, 1979.
- 2 Elevations based on N.G.V.D. Estimated from U.S.G.S. quadrangle



PLAN

SECTION

PLATE 5

STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY


DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS
SPILLWAY STRUCTURE
ROOSEVELT PARK DAM

I.D.N.J. 00378

SCALE NOT TO SCALE

DATE: DEC., 1979



NOTES:

1. Information taken from field inspection November 9, 1979.
2. Elevations based on N.G.V.D. Estimated from U.S.G.S. quadrangle

PLATE 6

**STORCH ENGINEERS
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY**


**DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
N.J. DEPT. OF ENVIR. PROTECTION
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY**

**INSPECTION AND EVALUATION OF DAMS
DAM SECTION
ROOSEVELT PARK DAM**

I.D. N.J. 00378

SCALE: NOT TO SCALE

DATE: DEC., 1979



OVERVIEW

Previous Washout

Crest of Dam


5

Length of Dam = 638'

LAKE

NOTE:

Information taken from field inspection November 9, 1979.



APPENDIX 1

Check List - Visual Inspection

Check List - Engineering Data

Check List
Visual Inspection
Phase I

Name of Dam Roosevelt Park Dam County Middlesex State New Jersey Coordinators NJDEP

Date(s) Inspection 11/9/79 Weather P-Cloudy Temperature 50°F

Pool Elevation at Time of Inspection 58.0 M.S.L. Tailwater at Time of Inspection 52.5 M.S.L.

Inspection Personnel:

<u>John Gribbin</u>	<u>Alan Volle</u>
<u>Ronald Lai</u>	<u>Thomas Miller</u>
<u>Richard McDermott</u>	

J. Gribbin Recorder

Present: John Rusnak, Park Foreman

EMBANKMENT

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
GENERAL	Embankment generally grass covered with small trees on the downstream face. Gravel footpath along full length of crest.	Recommend removal of trees.
JUNCTION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT, SPILLWAY AND DAM	Evidence of previous washouts on each side of spillway structure. Dumped fill consisting of soil and large pieces of concrete and asphalt on each side of spillway structure.	Recommend regrading of embankment.
ANY NOTICEABLE SEEPAGE	None observed	
STAFF GAGE AND RECORDER	None observed	
DRAINS	None observed	

EMBANKMENT

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
SURFACE CRACKS	None observed	
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR BEYOND THE TOE	None observed	
SLOUGHING OR EROSION OF EMBANKMENT AND ABUTMENT SLOPES	Several areas of erosion noted on downstream side of embankment. Erosion adjacent to downstream wingwalls of spillway structure.	Eroded conditions indicate frequent over-topping of dam.
VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT OF THE CREST	Vertical: Generally level Horizontal: Curved	
RIPRAP FAILURES	None	

OUTLET WORKS

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CONCRETE SURFACES IN OUTLET CONDUIT	48" RCP in generally satisfactory condition with minor spalling at invert.	
INTAKE STRUCTURE	Concrete deteriorated on each side of gate. Minor leakage at locations of bolts securing gate. Condition of majority of concrete satisfactory.	Recommend inspection and renovation if necessary.
OUTLET STRUCTURE	Same as outlet conduit.	
OUTLET CHANNEL	Outlet channel lined with cobble stones - satisfactory condition.	
GATE AND GATE HOUSING	Steel gate appeared to be in satisfactory condition. Gate operating stem bent. Padlock used to lock operating mechanism contains broken key.	Mechanism not operated at time of inspection. Recommend inspection and renovation if necessary. Recommend repair of lock.

SPILLWAY

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CREST	Concrete and stoplogs are generally in satisfactory condition. One stoplog leaking around edges.	
APPROACH CHANNEL	Concrete wall on embankment side leaning at some locations. Steel anchors exposed at two locations. Wall supported by timber at one location. Concrete wall on lake side in generally satisfactory condition.	
CENTRAL SPILLWAY STRUCTURE	Structure generally stable. Some spalling observed at top.	
TRAINING WALLS	Spalling observed on both left and right training walls.	
CHUTE AND WALKWAY SLAB	Generally in satisfactory condition.	

INSTRUMENTATION

VISUAL EXAMINATION	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
MONUMENTATION/SURVEYS	N.A.	
OBSERVATION WELLS	N.A.	
WEIRS	N.A.	
PIEZOMETERS	N.A.	
OTHER	None	

RESERVOIR

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
SLOPES	Shore slopes range from 5% to 10%.	
SEDIMENTATION	Approximately 2 feet of sediment was measured in vicinity of outlet gate.	
STRUCTURES ALONG BANKS	Six culverts discharge into Roosevelt Lake. A foot bridge spans one end of lake.	

DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL

VISUAL EXAMINATION OF	OBSERVATIONS	REMARKS OR RECOMMENDATIONS
CONDITION (OBSTRUCTIONS, DEBRIS, ETC.)	Downstream is clean and straight with no significant obstructions between the dam and the Parsonage Road Bridge. Three downstream bridges within 1700' cause partial obstructions.	
SLOPES	Slopes of downstream channel banks are approximately 30%.	
STRUCTURES ALONG BANKS	No structures along the banks were observed for a distance of approx. 700 feet. Two housing developments were located near the channel within 2000 feet.	

CHECK LIST
ENGINEERING DATA
DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION

ITEM	REMARKS
DAM - PLAN	Available - Middlesex County Engineering Dept.
SECTIONS	
SPILLWAY - PLAN	Available - Middlesex County Engineering Dept.
SECTIONS	
DETAILS	
OPERATING EQUIPMENT PLANS & DETAILS	Not Available
OUTLETS - PLAN	Available - Middlesex County Engineering Dept.
DETAILS	
CONSTRAINTS	
DISCHARGE RATINGS	
HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC DATA	Not Available
RAINFALL/RESERVOIR RECORDS	Not Available
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	Not Available
LOCATION MAP	Available - Middlesex County Engineering Dept.

ITEM REMARKS

DESIGN REPORTS Not Available

GEOLOGY REPORTS Not Available

DESIGN COMPUTATIONS
HYDROLOGY & HYDRAULICS
DAM STABILITY
SEEPAGE STUDIES Not Available

MATERIALS INVESTIGATIONS
BORING RECORDS
LABORATORY
FIELD Not Available

POST-CONSTRUCTION SURVEYS OF DAM Not Available

BORROW SOURCES

ITEM	REMARKS
MONITORING SYSTEMS	Not Available
MODIFICATIONS	Not Available
HIGH POOL RECORDS	Not Available
POST CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING STUDIES AND REPORTS	Not Available
PRIOR ACCIDENTS OR FAILURE OF DAM DESCRIPTION REPORTS	Evidence of washout adjacent to spillway was observed. Reportedly, the dam is overtopped every year.
MAINTENANCE OPERATION RECORDS	Not Available

APPENDIX 2

Photographs



PHOTO 1
SPILLWAY AND AUXILIARY SPILLWAY STRUCTURE



PHOTO 2
CREST AND UPSTREAM FACE OF DAM

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM
9 NOVEMBER 1979



PHOTO 3
OUTLET WORKS OPERATING MECHANISM



PHOTO 4
SPILLWAY AND OUTLET WORKS DISCHARGE

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM
9 NOVEMBER 1979



PHOTO 5

STOPLOG IN WEIR ALONG SPILLWAY APPROACH CHANNEL



PHOTO 6

DISPLACEMENT OF CONCRETE WALL ALONG SPILLWAY APPROACH CHANNEL

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM
9 NOVEMBER 1979



PHOTO 7
WASHOUT REPAIR AT
NORTH SIDE OF SPILLWAY STRUCTURE




PHOTO 8
WASHOUT REPAIR AT
SOUTH SIDE OF SPILLWAY STRUCTURE

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM
9 NOVEMBER 1979



PHOTO 9
DOWNSTREAM FACE OF DAM AND SPILLWAY DISCHARGE



PHOTO 10
DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL

ROOSEVELT PARK DAM
9 NOVEMBER 1979

APPENDIX 3

Engineering Data

CHECK LIST
HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC DATA
ENGINEERING DATA

DRAINAGE AREA CHARACTERISTICS: 60% developed, 40% park

ELEVATION TOP NORMAL POOL (STORAGE CAPACITY): 58.0 (26 Ac-ft)

ELEVATION TOP FLOOD CONTROL POOL (STORAGE CAPACITY): N.A.

ELEVATION MAXIMUM DESIGN POOL: 60.6

ELEVATION TOP DAM: 59.8

PRINCIPAL SPILLWAY CREST: Concrete Weir

a. Elevation 58.3

b. Type Broad Crested Weir

c. Width 1.5 feet

d. Length 273 feet

e. Location Spillover Opening on each side of spillway structure

f. Number and Type of Gates None

AUXILIARY SPILLWAY CREST: Grated Inlet and Chute

a. Elevation 58.4

b. Type Miscontrolled inlet and chute

c. Width N.A.

d. Length 10' Chute

e. Location Spillover Box inlet and end of chute at downstream channel

f. Number and Type of Gates None

OUTLET WORKS: Gated Sluice

- a. Type 48" RCP with 1ft gate
- b. Location Center of Spillway
- c. Entrance invert 52.1
- d. Exit invert 52.1
- e. Emergency draindown facilities: Sluice Gate

HYDROMETEOROLOGICAL GAGES: None

- a. Type N.A.
- b. Location N.A.
- c. Records N.A.

MAXIMUM NON-DAMAGING DISCHARGE:

(Lake stage equal to top of dam) 113 c.f.s.

APPENDIX 4

Hydraulic/Hydrologic Computations

HydrologyHydrologic Analysis

Runoff hydrograph will be developed by HEC-1-DB using SCS Triangular hydrograph with the curvilinear transformation.

Drainage Area = 1.2 Sq. miles

Infiltration Data

Initial infiltration
Constant

1.0 in
0.1 in/hr.

Time of Concentration

By SCS TR-55

Chart on overland flow
and channel flow.

Overland flow

7,000 ft

Channel flow

1,500 ft

Average slope

1.6 %

$$T_c = \left(\frac{7000}{0.9} + \frac{1500}{1.8} \right) \frac{1}{3600}$$

$$\doteq \underline{\underline{2.4 \text{ hr.}}}$$

Project Roosevelt Park Dam Made By RL Date 12-7-79
1132C Chkd By JG Date 12/14/79

Time of Concentration

By Pg 71 "Design of Small Dam" Nomograph

$$T_c = \left(\frac{11.9 L^3}{H} \right)^{0.385}$$

T_c = Time of concentration in hrs.

L = Length of longest watercourse in miles

H = Elevation difference in feet

$$T_c = \left[\frac{(11.9) \cdot (1.6)^3}{90} \right]^{0.385} = \underline{\underline{0.79 \text{ hr.}}}$$

Time of Concentration

By Gray's Method Pg 141 "Introduction to Hydrology" by Viessman et al.

$$L/\sqrt{S} = 153$$

$$P_R/r' = 12$$

$$P_R = 43 \text{ min}$$

L = length of main stream in miles

S = slope in %

P_R = Period of rise (min) $\approx$ lag time

r' = shape and scale parameters

$$\text{Lag time} = \underline{\underline{43 \text{ min}}} = 0.72 \text{ hr.}$$

STORCH ENGINEERS

Sheet 3 of 10

Project Roosevelt Park Dam

Made By RL Date 12-7-79

1132 C

Chkd By JG Date 12/14/79

Time of Concentration

by Kerby

Pg 14-36

" Handbook of Applied
Hydrology " Chow

$$t_c^{2.14} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{L_n}{\sqrt{S}}$$

t_c = time of concentration
in min.

L = Length of overland
flow in ft.

S = slope

n = 0.4 (roughness coef)

$$t_c^{2.14} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{7000 \times 0.4}{\sqrt{0.016}}$$

$$t_c = 88.7 \text{ min}$$

$$= 1.5 \text{ hr. for overland flow}$$

Channel flow = 0.23 hr.

$$T_c = \underline{\underline{1.73}} \text{ hr.}$$

Time of Concentration and Lag Time

T_c use 1.8 hr.

$$\text{Lag} = 0.6 T_c = 1.08 = \underline{\underline{1.1}} \text{ hr.}$$

Stage Discharge Calculation

Principal spillway consists of 273 feet of broad crested weir over which water flows into two spillway approach channels leading to the openings on both sides of a central spillway structure. Water then discharges through a 48" diameter pipe into the downstream channel.

Control of the principal spillway for a given headwater is the smallest of the following: weir flow, channel discharge, orifice discharge and 48" pipe capacity.

At W.L. 58.5 Orifice flow

$$Q = 0.6 (2.55) \sqrt{2g (1.05)}$$

$$= 12.5 \text{ cfs}$$

Weir flow

$$Q = CLh^{3/2}$$

$$3.3 \times 273 \times (58.5 - 58.3)^{1.5} = 81 \text{ cfs}$$

For W.L. over 58.5, orifice flow will control. Thus

$$Q = 0.6 A \sqrt{2gh}$$

Project

Roosevelt Park Dam

Made By

RL

Date

11-28-79


1132C

Chkd By

JG

Date

12/14/79

Principal
Spillway Crest

$$A = 2.55 \text{ ft}^2$$

Principal Spillway Stage Discharge

Water Level (ft)	<u>Q (cfs)</u> <u>2 orifices</u>
58.0	0
59.0	30.6
59.8 Top of Dam	37.6
60.0	39.2
61.0	46.2
62.0	52.4
63.0	57.8

Max. capacity of 48" RCP = 110 cfs

for $HW/D = 1.5$ using inlet control chart

"Hydraulic Charts For Highway Culverts"


Auxillary Spillway consists of one catch basin grate and a concrete chute located on top of the central spillway structure.

Flow thru grate use $Q = 0.6 A \sqrt{2gh}$

Assume $\frac{1}{2}$ area open $A = 3.6 \text{ ft}^2$

Flow thru orifice: use same formula

with $A = 12.3 \text{ ft}^2$



Rim of catch basin at elev. 58.84

Auxillary Spillway Stage
Discharge Data

Water Level (ft)	Q (cfs) Orifice	Q (cfs) CB.	Q (cfs) Total
58.0	0	0	0
59.0	29.0	6.9	35.9
60.0	65.9	18.7	84.6
61.0	88.6	25.4	114.0
62.0	106.6	30.7	137.3
63.0	122.0	35.4	157.4

STORCH ENGINEERS

Sheet 7 of 10Project Roosevelt Park Dam Made By RL Date 11-29-79
1132C Chkd By JG Date 12/14/79Stage Discharge Tabulation
For Spillways

Water Level (ft)	Q(cfs) Principal Spillway	Q (cfs) Auxillary Spillway	Q (cfs) Total
58	0	0	0
59	30.6	35.9	66.5
60	39.2	84.6	123.8
61	46.2	114.0	160.2
62	52.4	137.3	189.7
63	57.8	157.4	215.2

59.8 (Top of Dam)

112.5 cfs

Total length of dam

638 ft.

Flow over dam is in HEC-2-DB analysis

STORCH ENGINEERS

Sheet 8 of 10

Project Roosevelt Park Dam


Made By RL Date 11-29-79

1132 C

Chkd By JG Date 12/14/79

Stage Discharge Curve

W.L (ft)	Q (cfs)
58	0
59	66.5
60	123.8
61	160.2
62	189.7
63	215.2



Project Roosevelt Park Dam Made By RL Date 12-7-79
1132C Chkd By JG Date 12/14/79

Elevation - Area Table

Information from USGS & Aerial Photos

Elev. (MSL)	Area (Ac)
58	10.9
60	37.7
80	87.2

Dam Crest Elevation 59.8 MSL

Length of Dam 638 feet

Capacity of Outlet Works

Outlet gate 3'x3' (Assume no inflow)

$$Q = 0.6 A \sqrt{2gh}$$

To drain lake completely

h averages to 3 feet

$$Q_{avg} = 0.6 (9) \sqrt{2g(3)}$$

$$= \underline{\underline{75 \text{ cfs}}}$$

$$\text{Estimated drawdown time} = \frac{26(43560)}{75(3600)}$$

$$= \underline{\underline{4.2 \text{ hr}}}$$

STORCH ENGINEERS

Sheet 10 of 10Project 1132CMade By RL Date 12-10-79Roosevelt Park DamChkd By JG Date 12/14/7924 hr. 100 yr. rainstorm DistributionFor Roosevelt Park Dam

Time (hr)	Rain (Inches)
1	0.08
2	0.08
3	0.08
4	0.08
5	0.08
6	0.08
7	0.09
8	0.09
9	0.18
10	0.18
11	0.18
12	0.19
13	0.3
14	0.3
15	0.8
16	3.0
17	0.4
18	0.3
19	0.19
20	0.18
21	0.09
22	0.09
23	0.08
24	0.08

7.2

From TP40 US Weather Bureau

HEC-1-DB COMPUTATIONS

11
 A23
 951
 J1
 K1
 M1
 O1
 O1
 O1
 C1
 C1
 O1
 T1
 J2
 K1
 K1
 Y1
 V1
 V5
 SAE
 SSS
 SD
 KAA
 AAA
 A

[illegible]

NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM
ROOSEVELT PARK DAM NEW JERSEY
100 YR. STORM ROUTING

JOB SPECIFICATION
NQ 150 NHR 0 NMIN 20 IDAY 0 IHR 0 IMIN 0 METRC 0 IPLT 0 IPRT 3 NSTAN 0
JOPER 5 NWT 0 LROPT 0 TRACE 0

MULTI-PLAN ANALYSES TO BE PERFORMED
NPLAN= 1 NRTIO= 1 LRTIO= 1

RTIOS= 1.00

SUB-AREA RUNOFF COMPUTATION

INFLOW HYDROGRAPH TO ROOSEVELT DAM

ISTAQ LAKE	ICOMP 0	IECON 0	ITAPE 0	JPLT 0	JPRT 0	INAME 1	ISTAGE 0	IAUTO 0		
IMYDG 0	IUNG 2	TAREA 1.20	SNAP 0.00	HYDROGRAPH DATA TRSDA 1.20	TRSPC 0.00	RATIO 0.000	ISNOW 0	ISAME 1	LOCAL 0	
PRECIP DATA										
NP 72 STORM 0.00 DAJ 0.00 DAK 0.00										
PRECIP PATTERN										
.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03		
.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03		
.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06		
.10	.10	.27	.05	.05	.10	.10	.10	.10		
.13	.10	.10	.10	.27	1.00	1.00	1.00	.13		
.03	.03	.03	.03	.05	.06	.06	.06	.06		
.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03		
LOSS DATA										
LROPT 0	STRK3 0.00	DLTKR 0.00	RTIOL 1.00	ERAIN 0.00	STRKS 0.00	RTIOK 1.00	STRTL 1.00	CNSTL .10	ALSMX 0.00	RTIMP 0.00
UNIT HYDROGRAPH DATA										
TC= 0.00 LAG= 1.10										
RECESSION DATA										
STRTO= -1.00 QRCSV= -.05 RTIOR= 2.00										
UNIT HYDROGRAPH 18 END OF PERIOD ORDINATES, TC= 0.00 HOURS, LAG= 1.10 VOL= 1.00										
72.	238.	420.	455.	388.	268.	167.	111.	72.	47.	
30.	20.	13.	8.	6.	4.	2.	1.			

MO.DA	HR.MN	PERIOD	RAIN	EXCS	LOSS	COMP
1.01	.20	1	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	.40	2	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	.60	3	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	.80	4	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	1.00	5	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	1.20	6	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	1.40	7	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	1.60	8	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	1.80	9	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	2.00	10	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	2.20	11	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	2.40	12	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	2.60	13	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	2.80	14	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	3.00	15	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	3.20	16	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	3.40	17	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	3.60	18	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	3.80	19	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	4.00	20	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	4.20	21	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	4.40	22	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	4.60	23	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	4.80	24	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	5.00	25	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	5.20	26	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	5.40	27	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	5.60	28	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	5.80	29	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	6.00	30	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	6.20	31	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	6.40	32	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	6.60	33	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	6.80	34	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	7.00	35	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	7.20	36	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	7.40	37	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	7.60	38	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	7.80	39	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	8.00	40	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	8.20	41	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	8.40	42	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	8.60	43	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	8.80	44	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	9.00	45	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	9.20	46	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	9.40	47	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	9.60	48	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	9.80	49	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	10.00	50	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	10.20	51	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	10.40	52	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	10.60	53	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	10.80	54	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	11.00	55	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	11.20	56	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	11.40	57	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	11.60	58	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	11.80	59	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	12.00	60	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	12.20	61	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	12.40	62	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	12.60	63	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	12.80	64	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	13.00	65	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	13.20	66	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	13.40	67	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	13.60	68	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	13.80	69	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	14.00	70	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	14.20	71	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	14.40	72	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	14.60	73	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	14.80	74	.03	0.00	.03	1.
1.01	15.00	75	.03	0.00	.03	1.

NO.	DA	HR.	MN	PERIOD	RAIN	EXCS	LOSS	COMP	B
1					0	0	0	0	0
2					0	0	0	0	0
3					0	0	0	0	0
4					0	0	0	0	0
5					0	0	0	0	0
6					0	0	0	0	0
7					0	0	0	0	0
8					0	0	0	0	0
9					0	0	0	0	0
10					0	0	0	0	0
11					0	0	0	0	0
12					0	0	0	0	0
13					0	0	0	0	0
14					0	0	0	0	0
15					0	0	0	0	0
16					0	0	0	0	0
17					0	0	0	0	0
18					0	0	0	0	0
19					0	0	0	0	0
20					0	0	0	0	0
21					0	0	0	0	0
22					0	0	0	0	0
23					0	0	0	0	0
24					0	0	0	0	0
25					0	0	0	0	0
26					0	0	0	0	0
27					0	0	0	0	0
28					0	0	0	0	0
29					0	0	0	0	0
30					0	0	0	0	0
31					0	0	0	0	0
32					0	0	0	0	0
33					0	0	0	0	0
34					0	0	0	0	0
35					0	0	0	0	0
36					0	0	0	0	0
37					0	0	0	0	0
38					0	0	0	0	0
39					0	0	0	0	0
40					0	0	0	0	0
41					0	0	0	0	0
42					0	0	0	0	0
43					0	0	0	0	0
44					0	0	0	0	0
45					0	0	0	0	0
46					0	0	0	0	0
47					0	0	0	0	0
48					0	0	0	0	0
49					0	0	0	0	0
50					0	0	0	0	0
51					0	0	0	0	0
52					0	0	0	0	0
53					0	0	0	0	0
54					0	0	0	0	0
55					0	0	0	0	0
56					0	0	0	0	0
57					0	0	0	0	0
58					0	0	0	0	0
59					0	0	0	0	0
60					0	0	0	0	0
61					0	0	0	0	0
62					0	0	0	0	0
63					0	0	0	0	0
64					0	0	0	0	0
65					0	0	0	0	0
66					0	0	0	0	0
67					0	0	0	0	0
68					0	0	0	0	0
69					0	0	0	0	0
70					0	0	0	0	0
71					0	0	0	0	0
72					0	0	0	0	0
73					0	0	0	0	0
74					0	0	0	0	0
75					0	0	0	0	0
76					0	0	0	0	0
77					0	0	0	0	0
78					0	0	0	0	0
79					0	0	0	0	0
80					0	0	0	0	0
81					0	0	0	0	0
82					0	0	0	0	0
83					0	0	0	0	0
84					0	0	0	0	0
85					0	0	0	0	0
86					0	0	0	0	0
87					0	0	0	0	0
88					0	0	0	0	0
89					0	0	0	0	0
90					0	0	0	0	0
91					0	0	0	0	0
92					0	0	0	0	0
93					0	0	0	0	0
94					0	0	0	0	0
95					0	0	0	0	0
96					0	0	0	0	0
97					0	0	0	0	0
98					0	0	0	0	0
99					0	0	0	0	0
100					0	0	0	0	0
101					0	0	0	0	0
102					0	0	0	0	0
103					0	0	0	0	0
104					0	0	0	0	0
105					0	0	0	0	0
106					0	0	0	0	0
107					0	0	0	0	0
108					0	0	0	0	0
109					0	0	0	0	0
110					0	0	0	0	0
111					0	0	0	0	0
112					0	0	0	0	0
113					0	0	0	0	0
114					0	0	0	0	0
115					0	0	0	0	0
116					0	0	0	0	0
117					0	0	0	0	0
118					0	0	0	0	0
119					0	0	0	0	0
120					0	0	0	0	0
121					0	0	0	0	0
122					0	0	0	0	0
123					0	0	0	0	0
124					0	0	0	0	0
125					0	0	0	0	0
126					0	0	0	0	0
127					0	0	0	0	0
128					0	0	0	0	0
129					0	0	0	0	0
130					0	0	0	0	0
131					0	0	0	0	0
132					0	0	0	0	0
133					0	0	0	0	0
134					0	0	0	0	0
135					0	0	0	0	0
136					0	0	0	0	0
137					0	0	0	0	0
138					0	0	0	0	0
139					0	0	0	0	0
140					0	0	0	0	0
141					0	0	0	0	0
142					0	0	0	0	0
143					0	0	0	0	0
144					0	0	0	0	0
145					0	0	0	0	0
146					0	0	0	0	0
147					0	0	0	0	0
148					0	0	0	0	0
149					0	0	0	0	0
150					0	0	0	0	0
151					0	0	0	0	0
152					0	0	0	0	0
153					0	0	0	0	0
154					0	0	0	0	0
155					0	0	0	0	0
156					0	0	0	0	0
157					0	0	0	0	0
158					0	0	0	0	0
159					0	0	0	0	0
160					0	0	0	0	0
161					0	0	0	0	0
162					0	0	0	0	0
163					0	0	0	0	0
164					0	0	0	0	0
165					0	0	0	0	0
166					0	0	0	0	0
167					0	0	0	0	0
168					0	0	0	0	0
169					0	0	0	0	0
170					0	0	0	0	0
171					0	0	0	0	0
172					0	0	0	0	0
173					0	0	0	0	0
174					0	0	0	0	0
175					0	0	0	0	0
176					0	0	0	0	0
177					0	0	0	0	0
178					0	0	0	0	0
179					0	0	0	0	0
180					0	0	0	0	0
181					0	0	0	0	0
182					0	0	0	0	0
183					0	0	0	0	0
184					0	0	0	0	0
185					0	0	0	0	0
186					0	0	0	0	0
187					0	0	0	0	0
188					0	0	0	0	0
189					0	0	0	0	0
190					0	0	0	0	0
191					0	0	0	0	0
192					0	0	0	0	0
193					0	0	0	0	0
194					0	0	0	0	0
195					0	0	0	0	0
196					0	0	0	0	0
197					0	0	0	0	0
198					0	0	0	0	0
199					0	0	0	0	0
200					0	0	0	0	0
201					0	0	0	0	0
202					0	0	0	0	0
203					0	0	0	0	0
204					0	0	0	0	0
205					0	0	0	0	0
206					0	0	0	0	0
207					0	0	0	0	0
208					0	0	0	0	0
209					0	0	0	0	0
210					0	0	0	0	0
211					0	0	0	0	0
212					0	0	0	0	0
213					0	0	0	0	0
214					0	0	0	0	0
215									

HYDROGRAPH ROUTING

ROUTE DISCHARGE THRU DAM

ISTAT 0 ICOMP 1 IECON 0 ITAPE 0 JPLT 0 JPRT 0 INAME 1 ISTAGE 0 IAUQ 0
 DAM 1 ROUTING DATA IOPT 0 IPMP 0 LSTR 0
 GLOSS 0.0 CLOSS 0.000 AVG IRES 1 ISAME 1
 NSTPS 1 NSTDL 0 LAG 0 AMSKK 0.000 0.000 TSK STORA ISPRAT
 -58. -1

	58.00	59.00	59.80	60.00	61.00	62.00	63.00
STAGE	58.00	59.00	59.80	60.00	61.00	62.00	63.00
FLOW	0.00	66.50	113.00	123.80	160.20	189.70	215.20
SURFACE AREA=	0.	11.	38.	87.			
CAPACITY=	0.	25.	71.	1286.			
ELEVATION=	51.	58.	60.	80.			
	CREL 58.3	SPWID 0.0	COQU 0.0	EXPI 0.0	ELEV 0.0	COQL 0.0	CAREA 0.0
							EXPL 0.0

DAM DATA
 TOPEL 59.8 COGD 2.6 EXPD 1.5 DAMVID 638.

STATION DAM PLAN 1. RATIO 1

MO.DA	HR.MN	END-OF-PERIOD	PERIOD	HYDROGRAPH	ORDINATES	STORAGE	STAGE
		HOURS		INFLOW	OUTFLOW		
1.01	0.20	1		1.0	1.0	29.0	58.3
1.01	0.40	2		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	0.60	3		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	0.80	4		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	1.00	5		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	1.20	6		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	1.40	7		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	1.60	8		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	1.80	9		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	2.00	10		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	2.20	11		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	2.40	12		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	2.60	13		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	2.80	14		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	3.00	15		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	3.20	16		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	3.40	17		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	3.60	18		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	3.80	19		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	4.00	20		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	4.20	21		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	4.40	22		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	4.60	23		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	4.80	24		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	5.00	25		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	5.20	26		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	5.40	27		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	5.60	28		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	5.80	29		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	6.00	30		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	6.20	31		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	6.40	32		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	6.60	33		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	6.80	34		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	7.00	35		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	7.20	36		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	7.40	37		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	7.60	38		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	7.80	39		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	8.00	40		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	8.20	41		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	8.40	42		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	8.60	43		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	8.80	44		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	9.00	45		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	9.20	46		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	9.40	47		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	9.60	48		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	9.80	49		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	10.00	50		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	10.20	51		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	10.40	52		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	10.60	53		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	10.80	54		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	11.00	55		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	11.20	56		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	11.40	57		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	11.60	58		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	11.80	59		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	12.00	60		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	12.20	61		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	12.40	62		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	12.60	63		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	12.80	64		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	13.00	65		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	13.20	66		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	13.40	67		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	13.60	68		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	13.80	69		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	14.00	70		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	14.20	71		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	14.40	72		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	14.60	73		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	14.80	74		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	15.00	75		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	15.20	76		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	15.40	77		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	15.60	78		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	15.80	79		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	16.00	80		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	16.20	81		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	16.40	82		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	16.60	83		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	16.80	84		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	17.00	85		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	17.20	86		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	17.40	87		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	17.60	88		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	17.80	89		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	18.00	90		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	18.20	91		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	18.40	92		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	18.60	93		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	18.80	94		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	19.00	95		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	19.20	96		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	19.40	97		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	19.60	98		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	19.80	99		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3
1.01	20.00	100		1.0	1.0	28.0	58.3

SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS

ELEVATION	INITIAL VALUE	SPILLWAY CREST	TOP OF DAM			
STORAGE	58.30	58.30	59.80			
OUTFLOW	29.	29.	64.			
	20.	20.	113.			
MAXIMUM RESERVOIR W.S.ELEV	MAXIMUM DEPTH OVER DAM	MAXIMUM STORAGE AC-FT	MAXIMUM OUTFLOW CFS	DURATION OVER TOP HOURS	TIME OF MAX OUTFLOW HOURS	TIME OF FAILURE HOURS
60.59	.79	94.	1314.	5.33	17.00	0.00

APPENDIX 5

Bibliography

1. "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams," Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314.
2. Design of Small Dams, Second Edition, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.
3. Holman, William W. and Jumikis, Alfreds R., Engineering Soil Survey of New Jersey, Report No. 10, Middlesex County, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., 1953.
4. "Geologic Map of New Jersey," prepared by J. Volney Lewis and Henry B. Kummel, dated 1910 - 1912.
5. Chow, Ven Te., Ed., Handbook of Applied Hydrology, McGraw-hill Book Company, 1964.
6. Herr, Lester A., Hydraulic Charts for the Selection of Highway Culverts, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1965.
7. Safety of Small Dams, Proceedings of the Engineering Foundation Conference, American Society of Civil Engineers, 1974.
8. King, Horace Williams and Brater, Ernest F., Handbook of Hydraulics, Fifth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.