


AD-A144 325


NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL DAMS
SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NUM..(U) CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM
MA NEW ENGLAND DIV FEB 80

1. 2

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 13/13 NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A

AD-A144 325

NAUGATUCK RIVER BASIN
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

1

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO.3 DAM
CT 00323

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

DTIC FILE COPY



DTIC
S AUG 13 1984 D

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

FEBRUARY 1980

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT II
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

84 08 09 044

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER CT 00323	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A144 325	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Seymour Reservoir No.3 Dam NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL DAMS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED INSPECTION REPORT
7. AUTHOR(s) U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS DEPT. OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, NEDED 424 TRAPELO ROAD, WALTHAM, MA. 02254		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE February 1980
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 75
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		18a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Cover program reads: Phase I Inspection Report, National Dam Inspection Program; however, the official title of the program is: National Program for Inspection of Non-Federal Dams; use cover date for date of report.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) DAMS, INSPECTION, DAM SAFETY, Naugatuck River Basin Oxford, Connecticut		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Seymour Reservoir No.3 Dam consists of an earth embankment with a masonry core wall. The embankment has a top width of 14 feet and a maximum height of 42 feet. The overall length of the dam is 730 feet, including a 23.5 foot long concrete overflow spillway. Based on the visual inspection and a review of all available pertinent data, the dam is considered to be in fair condition. The dam is classified as "Intermediate" in size with a significant hazard potential. A test flood equal to 1/2 the Probable Maximum Flood was selected.		



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
424 TRAPELO ROAD
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02154

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
NEDED

APR 21 1969

Honorable Ella T. Grasso
Governor of the State of Connecticut
State Capitol
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Dear Governor Grasso:

Inclosed is a copy of the Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam Phase I Inspection Report, which was prepared under the National Program for Inspection of Non-Federal Dams. This report is presented for your use and is based upon a visual inspection, a review of the past performance and a brief hydrological study of the dam. A brief assessment is included at the beginning of the report. I have approved the report and support the findings and recommendations described in Section 7 and ask that you keep me informed of the actions taken to implement them. This follow-up action is a vitally important part of this program.

A copy of this report has been forwarded to the Department of Environmental Protection, the cooperating agency for the State of Connecticut. In addition, a copy of the report has also been furnished the owner, The Bridgeport Hydraulic Company, 835 Main Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06609.

Copies of this report will be made available to the public, upon request, by this office under the Freedom of Information Act. In the case of this report the release date will be thirty days from the date of this letter.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and the Department of Environmental Protection for your cooperation in carrying out this program.

Sincerely,

Max B. Scheider
MAX B. SCHEIDER

Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Division Engineer

Incl
As stated

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Special
A/1	

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM
CT 00323



NAUGATUCK RIVER BASIN
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 13 1984
S D

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT
Approved for public release Distribution Unlimited

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

IDENTIFICATION NO: CT 00323
NAME OF DAM: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam
TOWN: Oxford
COUNTY AND STATE: New Haven County, Connecticut
STREAM: Tributary to Hemp Swamp Brook
DATE OF INSPECTION: November 28, 1979

BRIEF ASSESSMENT

The Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam consists of an earth embankment with a masonry core wall. The embankment has a top width of 14 feet and a maximum height of 42 feet. The overall length of the dam is 730 feet, including a 23.5 foot long concrete overflow spillway. The outlet works consist of a 12-inch cast iron low level outlet or blowoff pipe through the earth embankment and core wall.

The dam impounds the Seymour No. 3 Reservoir, a storage reservoir for public water supply for the Valley Division of the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company.

Based on the visual inspection and a review of all available pertinent data, the dam is considered to be in fair condition. Features that could affect the structural integrity of the dam are undermining and seepage associated with the left wall of the spillway discharge channel; uncontrolled seepage that bypasses the underdrain; and the absence of an upstream gate on the low level outlet or blowoff line.

Based on the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the dam is classified as "Intermediate" in


size, with a "Significant" hazard potential. A Test Flood equal to one-half the Probable Maximum Flood (1/2 PMF) was selected in accordance with the Corps of Engineers' Guidelines. The calculated Test Flood inflow of 190 cfs results in a routed outflow of 185 cfs.

The spillway can discharge 132 percent of the routed Test Flood outflow with flashboards and 151 percent without flashboards. The Test Flood would not overtop the dam.

It is recommended that the owner engage the services of a qualified, registered engineer to design and oversee construction of repairs to the left wall of the spillway discharge channel; investigate the significance of the uncontrolled seepage observed downstream of the dam and design control measures as required; and design provisions for the installation of an upstream gate on the low level outlet or blowoff pipe.


Technical inspections by a qualified, registered engineer should be performed every year; a formal operations and maintenance manual should be prepared; and a formal warning system should be put into effect.

The owner should implement the recommendations as described herein and in greater detail in Section 7 of the Report within one year after receipt of this Phase I Inspection Report.


Donald L. Smith, P.E.
Project Engineer



ROALD HAESTAD, INC.


Roald Haestad
President



This Phase I Inspection Report on Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam has been reviewed by the undersigned Review Board members. In our opinion, the reported findings, conclusions, and recommendations are consistent with the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, and with good engineering judgment and practice, and is hereby submitted for approval.

Carney M. Terzian

CARNEY M. TERZIAN, MEMBER
Design Branch
Engineering Division

Richard J. DiBuono

RICHARD DIBUONO, MEMBER
Water Control Branch
Engineering Division

Aramast Mahtesian

ARAMAST MAHTESIAN, CHAIRMAN
Geotechnical Engineering Branch
Engineering Division

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

Joe B. Fryar

JOE B. FRYAR
Chief, Engineering Division

PREFACE

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

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the dam is based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection along with data available to the inspection team. In cases where the reservoir was lowered or drained prior to inspection, such action, while improving the stability and safety of the dam, removes the normal load on the structure and may obscure certain conditions which might otherwise be detectable if inspected under the normal operating environment of the structure.

It is important to note that the condition of a dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions, and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the present condition of the dam will continue to represent the

condition of the dam at some point in the future. Only through continued care and inspection can there be any chance that unsafe conditions be detected.

Phase I Inspections are not intended to provide detailed hydrologic and hydraulic analyses. In accordance with the established Guidelines, the Spillway Test Flood is based on the estimated "Probable Maximum Flood" for the region (greatest reasonably possible storm runoff), or fractions thereof. Because of the magnitude and rarity of such a storm event, a finding that a spillway will not pass the test flood should not be interpreted as necessarily posing a highly inadequate condition. The test flood provides a measure of relative spillway capacity and serves as an aide in determining the need for more detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies, considering the size of the dam, its general condition and the downstream damage potential.

The Phase I Investigation does not include an assessment of the need for fences, gates, no-trespassing signs, repairs to existing fences and railings and other items which may be needed to minimize trespass and provide greater security for the facility and safety of the public. An evaluation of the project for compliance with OSHA rules and regulations is also excluded.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	i
BRIEF ASSESSMENT	ii - iii
REVIEW BOARD PAGE	iv
PREFACE	v - vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii - ix
OVERVIEW PHOTO	x
LOCATION PLAN	xi

INDEX TO REPORT

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
1. <u>PROJECT INFORMATION</u>	1 - 8
1.1 GENERAL	1
a. AUTHORITY	1
b. PURPOSE OF INSPECTION	1
1.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT	2 - 4
a. LOCATION	2
b. DESCRIPTION OF DAM AND APPURTENANCES	2
c. SIZE CLASSIFICATION	3
d. HAZARD CLASSIFICATION	3
e. OWNERSHIP	3
f. OPERATOR	3
g. PURPOSE OF DAM	4
h. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	4
i. NORMAL OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE	4
1.3 PERTINENT DATA	5 - 8
2. <u>ENGINEERING DATA</u>	9 - 10
2.1 DESIGN DATA	9
2.2 CONSTRUCTION DATA	9
2.3 OPERATION DATA	9
2.4 EVALUATION OF DATA	10

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
3. <u>VISUAL INSPECTION</u>	11 - 14
3.1 FINDINGS	11 - 13
a. GENERAL	11
b. DAM	11 - 12
c. APPURTENANT STRUCTURES	12 - 13
d. RESERVOIR AREA	13
e. DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL	13
3.2 EVALUATION	13 - 14
4. <u>OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES</u>	15 - 16
4.1 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	15
a. GENERAL	15
b. DESCRIPTION OF ANY WARNING SYSTEM IN EFFECT	15
4.2 MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	15
a. GENERAL	15
b. OPERATING FACILITIES	15
4.3 EVALUATION	15 - 16
5. <u>EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES</u>	17 - 19
5.1 GENERAL	17
5.2 DESIGN DATA	17
5.3 EXPERIENCE DATA	17
5.4 TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS	17 - 19
5.5 DAM FAILURE ANALYSIS	19
6. <u>EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY</u>	20
6.1 VISUAL OBSERVATION	20
6.2 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION DATA	20
6.3 POST-CONSTRUCTION CHANGES	20
6.4 SEISMIC STABILITY	20

DESCRIPTION	PAGES
7. <u>ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMEDIAL MEASURES</u>	21 - 22
7.1 DAM ASSESSMENT	21
a. CONDITION	21
b. ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION	21
c. URGENCY	21
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	21 - 22
7.3 REMEDIAL MEASURES	22
a. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES	22
7.4 ALTERNATIVES	22

INDEX TO APPENDIXES

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION	PAGES
A	INSPECTION CHECKLIST	A1 - A6
B	ENGINEERING DATA	B-1 - B-13
C	PHOTOGRAPHS	C1 - C7
D	HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS	D1 - D28
E	INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS	E1



OVERVIEW PHOTO

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM - CT 00323

TRIBUTARY TO HEMP SWAMP RESERVOIR

OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

DATE: 10/10/69

[illegible]

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

xi

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

PROJECT INFORMATION

SECTION 1

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 New England Division of the Corps of Engineers has been assigned the responsibility of supervising the inspection of dams within the New England Region. Roald Haestad, Inc., has been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the State of Connecticut. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to Roald Haestad, Inc. under a letter of November 1, 1979, from William E. Hodgson, Jr., Colonel, Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW33-80-C-0015 has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

b. Purpose of Inspection

The Purposes of the program are to:

1. Perform technical inspection and evaluation of non-federal dams to indentify conditions requiring correction in a timely manner by non-federal interest.
2. Encourage and prepare the States to quickly initiate effective dam inspection programs for non-federal dams.
3. To update, verify and complete the National Inventory of Dams.

1.2 Description of Project

a. Location

The dam is located downstream of Seymour Reservoir No. 4, on an unnamed tributary to Hemp Swamp Brook in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut, between Chestnut Tree Hill Road and the Oxford-Beacon Falls Town Line. The dam is shown on the Naugatuck Quadrangle Map having coordinates of latitude N 41°26.7', and longitude W 73°05.4'.

b. Description of Dam and Appurtenant Structures

The dam consists of an earth embankment with a masonry core wall. The embankment has a top width of 14 feet, a maximum height of 42 feet, an upstream slope of 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, and a downstream slope of approximately 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical. The upstream slope is protected with riprap and the downstream slope is grass covered. Drawings indicate that the core wall extends approximately 4 feet below the original ground surface to within 3 feet of the top of the dam. The core wall has a top width of 2 feet and increases 1 foot in width for every 10 feet of depth. The overall length of the dam is 730 feet, including a 23.5 foot long concrete overflow spillway located near the right end of the dam. A steel beam bridge with a wood deck spans the spillway. The outlet works located approximately 210 feet from the right abutment consists of a 12-inch cast iron low level outlet or blowoff pipe through the dam and core wall controlled by a manually operated downstream gate. Drawings indicate that the pipe is supported by a masonry core wall and that an upstream intake structure with screens is located at the toe of the upstream slope. Drawings also indicate that an under-drain was installed at the downstream toe of the dam.

c. Size Classification - "Intermediate"

According to the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, a dam is classified as "Intermediate" in size if the height is between 40 feet and 100 feet, or the dam impounds between 1,000 Acre-Feet and 50,000 Acre-Feet. The dam has a maximum height of 42 feet and a maximum storage capacity of 245 Acre-Feet. Therefore, the dam is classified as "Intermediate" in size based on height.

d. Hazard Classification "Significant"

Based on the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the Hazard Classification for the dam is "Significant". A dam failure analysis indicated that a breach of Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam would cause Seymour Reservoir No. 2 Dam to be overtopped by approximately 4 feet and Seymour Reservoir No. 1 Dam to be overtopped by approximately 7-1/2 feet. For computational purposes the downstream dams were assumed not to fail. The depth of flow in the stream in the area of four downstream houses prior to dam breach is 2 feet, based on the maximum spillway capacity of 280 cfs. The peak flow in this area due to the dam breach is 13,000 cfs, equivalent to a depth of flow of 9.8 feet or approximately 2.5 feet above the sill elevation of the four houses. The dam failure could result in the loss of a few lives and an economic loss associated with the failure of the downstream dams.

e. Ownership

Former Owner: The Seymour Water Company

Present Owner: The Bridgeport Hydraulic Company
835 Main Street
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06609
(203) 367-6621

f. Operator

George Smith, Manager, Valley Division
The Bridgeport Hydraulic Company
70 New Haven Road
Seymour, Connecticut 06483
(203) 888-4511

g. Purpose of Dam

The dam impounds Seymour Reservoir No. 3, a storage reservoir for public water supply for the Valley Division of the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company.

h. Design and Construction History

The dam was designed in 1915 and construction was assumed to have taken place in 1915 also. No records of the original construction are known to exist, but it is believed that the dam was constructed by C.W. Blakeslee and Sons. In 1960 the dam was raised approximately 2 feet, a downstream drain and embankment constructed, and modifications made to the spillway discharge channel. The construction was done by C.W. Blakeslee and Sons, as designed by Clarence Blair Associates, Inc. In 1968, portions of the spillway weir and portions of the training walls were rebuilt by Park City Builders. No plans for the work are known to exist, but it is reported that 3/4-inch reinforcing rods were grouted approximately 3 feet into ledge prior to constructing the new concrete weir and constructing the new concrete walls against the existing stone masonry walls.

i. Normal Operational Procedures

Seymour Reservoir No. 3 is a storage reservoir for public water supply. During the summer months the low level outlet or blowoff is left open to allow water to flow to two downstream reservoirs (Reservoir Nos. 1 and 2) prior to treatment and distribution. The low level outlet or blowoff at an upstream reservoir (Reservoir No. 4) is also left open during the summer months to supplement the flow to the downstream reservoirs.

1.3 Pertinent Data

a. Drainage Area

The drainage area consists of 0.68 square miles of rolling, wooded terrain, the majority of which is either State Forest or is owned by the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company.

b. Discharge at Damsite

The discharge at the damsite is over a 23.5-foot long concrete overflow spillway. Outlet works consist of a 12-inch long cast iron low level outlet or blowoff through the dam controlled by a downstream gate.

1. Outlet Works (conduit) Size:	12-inch
Invert Elevation:	413.3 at Outlet
Discharge Capacity:	13 cfs
2. Maximum Known Flood at Damsite:	Unknown
3. Ungated Spillway Capacity at Top of Dam:	280 cfs
Elevation:	455.4*
4. Ungated Spillway Capacity at Test Flood Elevation:	185 cfs
Elevation:	455.0
5. Gated Spillway Capacity at Normal Pool Elevation:	N/A
Elevation:	N/A
6. Gated Spillway Capacity at Test Flood Elevation:	N/A
Elevation:	N/A
7. Total Spillway Capacity at Test Flood Elevation:	185 cfs
Elevation:	455.0
8. Total Project Discharge at Top of Dam:	280 cfs
Elevation:	455.4*
9. Total Project Discharge at Test Flood Elevation:	185 cfs
Elevation:	455.0

*Low Point of Dam Crest

c. Elevation - Feet Above NGVD (formerly MSL Datum of 1929)

1. Streambed at Toe of Dam:	413
2. Bottom of Cutoff:	412
3. Maximum Tailwater:	N/A
4. Recreation Pool:	N/A
5. Full Flood Control Pool:	N/A
6. Spillway Crest:	453
7. Design Surcharge - Original Design:	Unknown
8. Top of Dam:	456± Average 455.4 Low Point
9. Test Flood Surcharge:	455.0

d. Reservoir - Length in Feet

1. Normal Pool:	900
2. Flood Control Pool:	N/A
3. Spillway Crest Pool:	900
4. Top of Dam:	900
5. Test Flood Pool:	900

e. Storage - Acre-feet

1. Normal Pool:	206 Ac.-Ft.
2. Flood Control Pool:	N/A
3. Spillway Crest Pool:	206 Ac.-Ft.
4. Top of Dam:	245 Ac.-Ft.
5. Test Flood Pool:	232 Ac.-Ft.

f. Reservoir Surface - Acres

1. Normal Pool:	13 Acres
2. Flood-Control Pool:	N/A
3. Spillway Crest:	13 Acres
4. Test Flood Pool:	14 Acres
5. Top of Dam:	14 Acres

g. Dam

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Type: | Earth embankment with masonry core wall |
| 2. Length: | 730 feet |
| 3. Height: | 42 feet |
| 4. Top Width: | 14 feet |
| 5. Side Slopes: | 2 Horizontal to 1 Vertical Upstream
2.5 Horizontal to 1 Vertical Downstream |
| 6. Zoning: | Unknown |
| 7. Impervious Core: | Masonry core wall 2 feet wide at top, increases in width 1 foot for each 10 feet of depth |
| 8. Cutoff: | Core wall extends 4 feet below original ground |
| 9. Crout Curtain: | N/A |
| 10. Other: | Underdrain at downstream toe |

h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 1. Type: | N/A |
| 2. Length: | N/A |
| 3. Closure: | N/A |
| 4. Access: | N/A |
| 5. Regulating Facilities: | N/A |

i. Spillway

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Type: | Concrete Overflow |
| 2. Length of Weir: | 23.5 |
| 3. Crest Elevation
with Flashboards: | 453 |
| without Flashboards: | 451.2 (2.9-foot long slot only) |
| 4. Gates: | N/A |
| 5. Upstream Channel: | None |
| 6. Downstream Channel: | Discharge channel paved with
stones and mortar |
| 7. General: | Concrete training wall and
bridge abutments poured over
existing stone masonry.
Bridge over spillway. |

j. Regulating Outlets

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1. Invert: | 413.3 at outlet |
| 2. Size: | 12-inch |
| 3. Description: | Cast iron pipe through dam
and core wall; supported on
masonry wall; controlled by
downstream gate. |
| 4. Control Mechanism: | Manually operated gate valve. |
| 5. Other: | Capacity - 13 cfs |

ENGINEERING DATA
SECTION 2

2.1 Design Data

Design data consisted of the original plans for the dam, dated January, 1915, and plans for the raising of the dam and installation of a downstream underdrain, dated October, 1960, by Clarence Blair Associates, Inc. No plans are known to exist for the reconstruction of the spillway and construction of the bridge.

2.2 Construction Data

No construction data was available for review. It is reported that the dam was originally constructed by C.W. Blakeslee and Sons about 1915. The raising of the dam and construction of the downstream underdrain were performed by C.W. Blakeslee and Sons about 1960. The spillway weir and portions of the training walls were reconstructed in 1968 by Park City Builders. No plans for this work are known to exist, but Water Company personnel indicate that 3/4-inch diameter reinforcing rods were grouted approximately 3 feet into ledge to anchor the new concrete weir. The new concrete walls were constructed over and around the existing stone masonry walls.

2.3 Operational Data

Daily records of the reservoir level are maintained. The reservoir is normally below spillway level between late summer and early spring.

2.4 Evaluation of Data

a. Availability

Existing data was provided by the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company. A list of available reference material is given in Appendix B.

b. Adequacy

The information that was available, along with the visual inspection, past performance history, and hydraulic and hydrologic calculations, were adequate to assess the condition of the facility.

c. Validity

Field inspections and surveys indicate that the dam was constructed substantially as shown on the plans and as indicated by the owner.

VISUAL INSPECTION

SECTION 3

3.1 Findings

a. General

The visual inspection of the dam was conducted on November 28, 1979. At the time of inspection, the water level was approximately 6.5 feet below spillway level. The general condition of the dam at the time of the inspection was fair.

The dam is an earth embankment with a concrete overflow spillway located near the right end of the dam. The outlet works consist of a 12-inch cast iron pipe through the dam controlled by a downstream valve.

b. Dam

The upstream slope of the dam is covered with riprap except for the upper 1 to 2 feet of the slope. There is some downward movement of the riprap and some erosion near the crest, Photo 1.

The crest is used as a service road and it is in good condition with no significant erosion. The elevation of the crest varies.

The downstream slope is grass covered with no evidence of seepage, Photo 2. The difference in the color of the grass on the downstream slope as shown in Photo 2 did not appear to be associated with seepage. Some soft and depressed areas were observed against the left wall of the spillway discharge channel.

Downstream of the dam three major wet areas were observed. An 8-inch pipe is apparently a discharge for an underdrain, shown in the October 1960 drawings. The pipe is discharging near the

12-inch blowoff pipe, Photo 3. The discharge was estimated at approximately 60 gals/min. A second wet area exists approximately 50 feet to the left of the blowoff pipe (see Figure 2, Appendix B). No pipe was observed in this area, the ground was soft and spongy, and there was standing water with rust-colored floccules. A third wet area exists at the toe near the left abutment where a corrugated metal pipe was discharging rust-colored water, Photo 4. Immediately upstream of the end of the corrugated metal pipe there is what appears to be a toe berm, which is not shown in the October 1960 drawings.

c. Appurtenant Structures

The spillway has a concrete weir and concrete training walls which are in good condition, Photos 5 and 6. The spillway discharge channel has stone masonry walls on each side, except for a concrete left wall added at the downstream end of the stone masonry wall when the downstream slopes were flattened, as shown on the October 1960 drawings, Photo 7. There is seepage into the channel from the right in an area where the stone masonry wall is missing and bedrock is exposed. In one location, a crack has developed in the right wall, Photo 8. Adjacent to the top of the left wall there are indications of ground settlement, Photo 9. In the concrete section of the left wall, there is a seep near the top of the wall, Photo 10, and a void under the foundation of the wall extending about 2 feet horizontally under the foundation. The floor of the channel is paved with stones and mortar. There are some voids in the paved floor, Photo 11, as a result of the missing mortar. Farther downstream the floor is bouldery and water could be observed

flowing under the boulders. The flow of water at the end of the channel, Photo 12, exceeds the observed seepage out of the right abutment. Thus, there is considerable additional seepage entering the spillway channel, possibly under the left wall and from the dam and its foundation. The seep in the left concrete wall, Photo 10, is indicative of a water level in the dam next to the spillway that is close to the surface of the slope.

A 12-inch low level outlet pipe is controlled by a downstream valve. The valve and downstream end of the pipe can be observed in Photo 3 (pipe left of photo).

A steel beam bridge with a wooden deck spans the spillway, Photos 5 and 6. One of the beams is slightly bent, but there are no indications that the bending took place after construction of the bridge. The concrete abutments which form the spillway training walls are in good condition, as is the wooden deck.

d. Reservoir Area

The shore of the reservoir is thickly wooded. No indications of slope instability were observed in the vicinity of the dam.

e. Downstream Channel

The downstream channel is a natural streambed leading into Seymour Reservoir No. 2.

3.2 Evaluation

On the basis of the visual inspection, the dam is judged to be in fair condition. The future integrity of the dam can be affected by the following:

- a) Undermining of the left wall of the spillway channel

and apparent seepage under the wall can eventually lead to collapse of the wall.

- b) Uncontrolled seepage downstream of the dam that is bypassing the underdrain system can lead to erosion and piping.
- c) The inability to shut off the low level outlet or blow-off at the upstream end should a leak occur.
- d) The erosion and movement of riprap at the left side of the spillway.

OPERATIONAL AND MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

SECTION 4

4.1 Operational Procedures

a. General

The low level outlet or blowoff is normally opened during the summer months to allow water to flow from the impoundment to downstream reservoirs (Seymour Reservoir Nos. 1 and 2). An inspection of the dam was made by Philip W. Genovese and Associates, Inc. in January 1979. A copy of the inspection report is included in Appendix B.

b. Description of Any Warning System in Effect

The dam is monitored during periods of heavy rainfall and if an emergency arose, steps would be taken to notify the downstream residents.

4.2 Maintenance Procedures

a. General

Normal maintenance procedures consist of mowing the grass on the downstream slopes and regrading the roadway at the top of the dam as required. Necessary repairs are also made as required.

b. Operating Facilities

No formal maintenance procedures exist for the operating facilities.

4.3 Evaluation

Present operations and maintenance procedures are satisfactory and should remain in effect. The current practice of having the dam inspected by a qualified, registered engineer should continue, with the inspections being made annually. An operations and maintenance manual should be prepared for the dam and operating facilities.

The warning system which is currently in effect should be formalized and should include monitoring of the dam during extremely heavy rains, and procedures for notifying downstream authorities in the event of an emergency.

EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC FEATURES

SECTION 5

5.1 General

Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam is the second reservoir in a series of four, and is located upstream of Reservoir Nos. 1 and 2. The dam has a tributary watershed of 0.68 square miles, 0.54 square miles of which are tributary to Reservoir No. 4 upstream. The terrain is "rolling", wooded hills essentially undeveloped, with most of the watershed owned by the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company or designated as State Forest. The spillway is concrete, 23.5 feet wide, with a slot in the center for flashboards 2.9 feet wide and 1.8 feet deep. Flashboards were in place at the time of inspection.

The dam crest is uneven with a low point 2.4 feet above spillway level.* The average crest height of the dam is 3 feet above spillway. The spillway has a capacity of 245 cfs with the flashboards and 280 cfs without the flashboards before overtopping the low point of the dam crest.

5.2 Design Data

No computations were found for the design of the dam or the spillway. An engineering report dated January 2, 1979 gives the spillway capacity as 249 cfs with the flashboards.

5.3 Experience Data

There is no known record of the dam ever overtopping.

5.4 Test Flood Analysis

Based on the dam failure analysis the dam is classified as "Significant" hazard potential. The size of the dam is "Intermediate"

*Spillway level = top of flashboards

because of height although it has only 245 Acre-Feet of storage.

Based on the Corps of Engineers' Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the Test Flood should be in the range of 1/2 PMF to PMF, depending on the involved risk. A Test Flood equal to 1/2 PMF was selected. Flood routing was started at Seymour Reservoir No. 4 Dam, the upper reservoir in the series. An inflow flood peak of 575 cfs was calculated for the 0.54 square mile watershed of Reservoir No. 4 Dam using the peak runoff of 1,060 cubic feet per second per square mile (csm) from the guide curve for "rolling" terrain supplied by the Corps of Engineers. A triangular hydrograph was calculated using the methodology given in Design of Small Dams by the Bureau of Reclamation. The peak inflow rate of 575 cfs and a total runoff of 9.5 inches for the 1/2 PMF were used to calculate the inflow hydrograph. The flood was routed through Reservoir No. 4. Only about one-third of the outflow from Reservoir No. 4 goes to Reservoir No. 3, the remainder flows into Reservoir No. 2. The outflow from Reservoir No. 4 was added to the inflow for the 0.14 square mile watershed of Reservoir No. 3 to obtain the total inflow hydrograph for Reservoir No. 3. Peak inflow to Reservoir No. 3 is 190 cfs. The arithmetical trial-and-error tabular method was used for the routings. Both reservoirs were assumed to be initially at spillway level.

The Test Flood was routed through Reservoir No. 3 and produced a maximum discharge of 185 cfs which would come within 0.4 feet of overtopping the low point in the dam crest. The spillway capacity of 245

cfs with flashboards is equal to 132 percent of the Test Flood. The spillway capacity of 280 cfs without flashboards is equal to 151 percent of the Test Flood. The spillway capacity is judged to be adequate.

5.5 Dam Failure Analysis

A dam failure analysis was made using the "Rule of Thumb" guidance provided by the Corps of Engineers. Failure was assumed with water level at the top of the dam. The dam breach calculations show a peak release of 91,500 cfs into the valley below the dam. This would empty the reservoir in less than 2 minutes. The flood wave was routed through Seymour Reservoir Nos. 2 and 1 and downstream to the confluence with the Naugatuck River.

Seymour Reservoir No. 2 has a large surface area relative to No. 3 and substantially reduces the flood wave. The flood wave would overtop Reservoir No. 2 Dam by about 4 feet and Reservoir No. 1 Dam by about 7-1/2 feet. For computation purposes the dams were assumed not to fail.

The depth of flow in the stream in the area of four downstream houses prior to dam breach is 2 feet, based on the maximum spillway capacity of 280 cfs. The peak flow in this area due to the dam breach is 13,000 cfs, equivalent to a depth of flow in the river of 9.8 feet or approximately 2.5 feet above sill elevation of the four houses. The dam is classified as "Significant" hazard potential. A dam failure could result in the loss of a few lives and an economic loss associated with the failure of the downstream dams.

The dam breach calculations and the areas of potential flooding are shown in Appendix D.

EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY

SECTION 6

6.1 Visual Observations

The visual inspection did not disclose any indications of structural instability.

6.2 Design and Construction Data

The design and construction data consist of a plan dated January 1915 showing cross sections, and a plan of the dam; and drawings dated October 1960, which show the flattening of the downstream slope, installation of an underdrain and raising of the dam. A core wall is shown on the original plan, but no information is presented on the type of soil in the earth embankment. Thus a stability analysis cannot be performed and the evaluation of structural stability is based solely on the visual inspection.

6.3 Post-Construction Changes

Seymour Reservoir No. 4 Dam was constructed in 1951, approximately 1,000 feet upstream from Reservoir No. 3. The bridge over the spillway was constructed at an unknown date and the original spillway was rebuilt in 1968.

6.4 Seismic Stability

The dam is located in Seismic Zone I and in accordance with the recommended Phase I inspection guidelines does not warrant seismic stability analysis.

ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, & REMEDIAL MEASURES
SECTION 7

7.1 Dam Assessment

a. Condition

On the basis of the visual inspection, the dam is judged to be in fair condition. The following features can affect the future integrity of the dam:

1. Undermining of the left wall of the spillway discharge channel and seepage apparently occurring under the wall.
2. Uncontrolled seepage downstream of the dam that is bypassing the underdrain.
3. The 12-inch cast iron pipe through the dam is controlled by a downstream gate. Therefore, the line is under pressure at all times, and can not be shut off on the upstream side should a leak develop.

b. Adequacy of Information

The information available was sufficient for performing a Phase I Inspection.

c. Urgency

The recommendations presented in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 should be carried out within one year of receipt of this Report by the owner.

7.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations should be carried out under the direction of a qualified, registered engineer.

1. Design and construct repairs to the foundation for

the left wall of the spillway discharge channel. The design should consider the need for seepage control measures behind the wall.

2. Investigate the significance of the uncontrolled seepage observed downstream of the dam that was bypassing the underdrain pipes. Design and construct any required seepage control measures.
3. Provide an upstream gate on the blowoff line so that the pipe through the dam is not under pressure continuously.

7.3 Remedial Measures

a. Operation and Maintenance Procedures

1. Technical inspections by qualified, registered engineers should be made annually.
2. A formal operations and maintenance manual for the dam and operating facilities should be prepared.
3. A formal warning system should be put into effect and should include monitoring of the dam during extremely heavy rains (presently in effect) and procedures for notifying downstream authorities in the event of an emergency.
4. The riprap slope protection to the left of the spillway should be repaired.

7.4 Alternatives

There are no practical alternatives to the above recommendations.

APPENDIX A

VISUAL CHECK LIST WITH COMMENTS

VISUAL INSPECTION CHECK LIST PARTY ORGANIZATION

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam

DATE: 11/28/79 TIME: 1:30 p.m. WEATHER: Sunny - Approximately 40°

W.S. ELEVATION: 446.5 U.S. N/A DN.S
(6.5' below spillway)

<u>PARTY</u>	<u>DISCIPLINE</u>
1. <u>Donald L. Smith, P.E. - Roald Haestad, Inc.</u>	<u>Civil/Hydrologist</u>
2. <u>Ronald G. Litke, P.E. - Roald Haestad, Inc.</u>	<u>Civil Engineer</u>
3. <u>Gonzalo Castro, Ph.D., P.E. - Engineers, Inc.</u>	<u>Geotechnical Engineer</u>
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____

<u>PROJECT FEATURE</u>	<u>INSPECTED BY</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
1. <u>Dam Embankment</u>	<u>GC</u>	<u>Good - Extensive down-stream seepage</u>
2. <u>Outlet Works-and Structure</u>	<u>RGL,DLS,GC</u>	<u>No intake channel or structure observed.</u>
3. <u>Outlet Works-and Structure</u>	<u>RGL,DLS,GC</u>	<u>No outlet structure. Channel is natural streambed.</u>
4. <u>Outlet Works-Appr. & Disch.</u>	<u>RGL,DLS,GC</u>	<u>No appr. channel. Weir and walls good. Dis. chan. fair.</u>
5. <u>Outlet Works-Service Bridge</u>	<u>RGL,DLS</u>	<u>Good</u>
6. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____
11. _____	_____	_____
12. _____	_____	_____

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam DATE: 11/28/79
 PROJECT FEATURE: Dam Embankment NAME: GC
 DISCIPLINE: Geotechnical Engineer NAME: _____

AREA ELEVATION	CONDITIONS
<u>DAM EMBANKMENT</u>	
<u>CREST ELEVATION</u>	<u>456 Average</u>
<u>CURRENT POOL ELEVATION</u>	<u>446.5</u>
<u>MAXIMUM IMPOUNDMENT TO DATE</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
<u>SURFACE CRACKS</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>PAVEMENT CONDITION</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>MOVEMENT OR SETTLEMENT OF CREST</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>LATERAL MOVEMENT</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>VERTICAL ALIGNMENT</u>	<u>Appears good</u>
<u>HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT</u>	<u>Too irregular to judge</u>
<u>CONDITION AT ABUTMENT AND AT CONCRETE STRUCTURES</u>	<u>Depressions on downstream slope against spillway channel wall</u>
<u>INDICATIONS OF MOVEMENT OF STRUCTURAL ITEMS ON SLOPES</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>TRESPASSING ON SLOPES</u>	<u>None of significance</u>
<u>VEGETATION ON SLOPES</u>	<u>Downstream slope grass covered</u>
<u>SLOUGHING OR EROSION OF SLOPES OR ABUTMENTS</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>ROCK SLOPE PROTECTION - RIPRAP FAILURES</u>	<u>Some downslope displacements of riprap</u>
<u>UNUSUAL MOVEMENT OR CRACKING AT OR NEAR TOES</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>EMBANKMENT OR DOWNSTREAM SEEPAGE</u>	<u>Extensive seepage area downstream of toe</u>
<u>PIPING OR BOILS</u>	<u>None observed</u>
<u>FOUNDATION DRAINAGE FEATURES</u>	<u>None known</u>
<u>TOE DRAINS</u>	<u>Two apparent discharge pipes. Approx. 60 gpm from drain near blowoff outlet</u>
<u>INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEM</u>	<u>None known</u>

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam DATE: 11/28/79
 PROJECT FEATURE: Intake Structure
Outlet Works - and Channel NAME: DLS
 DISCIPLINE: Civil Engineer NAME: RGL

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
OUTLET WORKS - INTAKE CHANNEL AND INTAKE STRUCTURE	
A. APPROACH CHANNEL:	None observable
SLOPE CONDITIONS	
BOTTOM CONDITIONS	
ROCK SLIDES OR FALLS	
LOG BOOM	
DEBRIS	
CONDITION OF CONCRETE LINING	
DRAINS OR WEEP HOLES	
B. INTAKE STRUCTURE:	
CONDITION OF CONCRETE	N/A
STOP LOGS AND SLOTS	N/A

COMMENTS:

Plans indicate a structure at the intake to the blowoff
 which is normally submerged.

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam DATE: 11/28/79

PROJECT FEATURE: Outlet Structure
Outlet Works - and Channel NAME: GC

DISCIPLINE: Geotechnical, Civil Engineers NAME: RGL,DLS

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
OUTLET WORKS - OUTLET STRUCTURE AND OUTLET CHANNEL	No outlet structure observed
GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE	N/A
RUST OR STAINING	N/A
SPALLING	N/A
EROSION OR CAVITATION	N/A
VISIBLE REINFORCING	N/A
ANY SEEPAGE OR EFFLORESCENCE	N/A
CONDITION AT JOINTS	N/A
DRAIN HOLES	N/A
CHANNEL	Natural streambed
LOOSE ROCK OR TREES OVERHANGING CHANNEL	None of significance
CONDITION OF DISCHARGE CHANNEL	Good

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam DATE: 11/28/79
Spillway Weir,
 PROJECT FEATURE: Outlet Works - Appr. & Disch. Channel NAME: GC
 DISCIPLINE: Geotechnical, Civil Engineers NAME: RGL,DLS

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
<u>OUTLET WORKS - SPILLWAY WEIR, APPROACH AND DISCHARGE CHANNELS</u>	
A. <u>APPROACH CHANNEL:</u>	No approach channel
<u>GENERAL CONDITION</u>	
<u>LOOSE ROCK OVERHANGING CHANNEL</u>	
<u>TREES OVERHANGING CHANNEL</u>	
<u>FLOOR OF APPROACH CHANNEL</u>	
B. <u>WEIR AND TRAINING WALLS:</u>	
<u>GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE</u>	Good
<u>RUST OR STAINING</u>	None observed
<u>SPALLING</u>	None observed
<u>ANY VISIBLE REINFORCING</u>	No
<u>ANY SEEPAGE OR EFFLORESCENCE</u>	Minor efflorescence on right training wall (Bridge Abutment)
<u>DRAIN HOLES</u>	None observed
C. <u>DISCHARGE CHANNEL:</u>	
<u>GENERAL CONDITION</u>	Fair
<u>LOOSE ROCK OVERHANGING CHANNEL</u>	None observed
<u>TREES OVERHANGING CHANNEL</u>	None of significance
<u>FLOOR OF CHANNEL</u>	Paved with stone and mortar. Some holes.
<u>OTHER OBSTRUCTIONS</u>	None observed

COMMENTS:

Left concrete wall of discharge channel undermined approximately 2 feet. Efflorescence present approximately 1 foot below top of wall.

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECK LIST

PROJECT: Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam DATE: 11/28/79
 PROJECT FEATURE: Service Bridge NAME: RGL
 DISCIPLINE: Civil Engineers NAME: DLS

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITIONS
<u>OUTLET WORKS - SERVICE BRIDGE</u>	
A. <u>SUPER STRUCTURE:</u>	
<u>BEARINGS</u>	Bears on concrete
<u>ANCHOR BOLTS</u>	Beams cast against, or into N/A - back wall
<u>BRIDGE SEAT</u>	Good
<u>LONGITUDINAL MEMBERS</u>	Downstream beam bent, appears to have been bent prior to bridge construction
<u>UNDER SIDE OF DECK</u>	Good
<u>SECONDARY BRACING</u>	N/A
<u>DECK</u>	Wood in good condition
<u>DRAINAGE SYSTEM</u>	N/A
<u>RAILINGS</u>	None
<u>EXPANSION JOINTS</u>	N/A
<u>PAINT</u>	Good
B. <u>ABUTMENT AND PIERS:</u>	
<u>GENERAL CONDITION OF CONCRETE</u>	Good
<u>ALIGNMENT OF ABUTMENT</u>	Good
<u>APPROACH TO BRIDGE</u>	Normal
<u>CONDITION OF SEAT AND BACKWALL</u>	Good

APPENDIX B


ENGINEERING DATA

LIST OF REFERENCES

The following references are all located at the Bridgeport Hydraulic Company, 835 Main Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

1. Plan, Profile and Sections "Seymour Water Company, Proposed Dam and Reservoir", January 30, 1915.
2. Profile and Sections, "Seymour Water Company, Reservoir No. 3", Clarence Blair and Associates, Inc., October 1960.
3. Contour Map of Reservoir Below Spillway Level, "Seymour Reservoir No. 3, 67,000,000 Gallons", August 1963.
4. Inspection Report, "Seymour Reservoir No. 3", by Philip W. Genovese & Associates, Inc., January 1979.

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR #3



DAM INSPECTION

Bridgeport Hydraulic Company Dams

Name of Dam: Seymour Reservoir #3

I. PROJECT INFORMATION:

A. AUTHORITY:

This inspection was authorized by a letter from Bridgeport Hydraulic Company dated October, 13, 1978 to Philip W. Genovese & Associates, Inc. Said letter was signed by Edward Stangl, whose title is Manager - Project Engineering. The letter was also signed by Robert Reinert, Vice President of Engineering and Planning.

B. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the study is to perform inspection and evaluation of various Bridgeport Hydraulic Dams in terms of their safety.

C. DESCRIPTION:

Seymour Reservoir #3 and the reservoir dam are located in the Town of Oxford, Connecticut. The reservoir impounds an unnamed tributary which flows several thousand feet from the dam to its confluence with the Naugatuck River. The Seymour Reservoir Dam #3 is an earthen dam with concrete spillway.

Dam: Seymour Reservoir #3

D. PERTINENT DATA:

1. Drainage Area: 0.66 square miles 422 acres
2. Discharge at Dam: Does not apply.
3. Elevation: Drawn down at time of inspection.
4. Reservoir: Maximum pool length = 800 ft $\pm$
5. Storage: Does not apply.
6. Reservoir Surface: Does not apply.
7. Dam:
 - Type: Earthen
 - Length: 750 ft $\pm$
 - Height: 35 ft
 - Top Width: 15 ft $\pm$
 - Side Slopes: Up Stream approx. 2 to 1
Down Stream approx. 3.2 to 1
8. Diversion and Regulating Controls: Does not apply.
9. Spillway: See Attached Sketch
 - Type: Concrete and cement rubble masonry
 - Length of Weir: See Attached Sketch
 - Gates: None
 - Up Stream Channel: See Attached Sketch
 - Down Stream Channel: See Attached Sketch

Dam: Seymour Reservoir #3

II. ENGINEERING DATA (Existing):

Cross Sections (Bridgeport Hydraulics) September, 1960; Profiles and
Typical Cross Section (Blair Associates) October, 1960; Contours
(B.H.) August, 1963.

III. VISUAL INSPECTION:

A. FINDINGS:

The earthen embankment appears to have adequate slope stability with some minor settlement up stream. There is some seepage down stream beyond the toe at approximately the same distance as the pipe outlet toward the easterly end of the dam. Slope protection is in the form of stone rip-rap and armour stone up stream and grass down stream.

Blair Associates, New Haven, Connecticut drawings of 10/1960 indicate toe and foundation drains.

B. EVALUATION:

The dam appears to be in good condition with the exception of the deficiencies noted under "FINDINGS".

Dam: Seymour Reservoir #3

IV. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES:

Does not apply

V. HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSES:

The results of the analysis of the hydrology and hydraulics of the dam indicate that with flashboards, in place, the dam would be overtopped at a flow of 249 cfs, which compares to a frequency of approximately 110 years. The hydraulic controls for this structure are:

<u>Control</u>	<u>Flow (cfs)</u>	<u>Frequency (years)</u>
Top of Dam, w/flbds. *	249	110
Bottom of Bridge	327	200+

*flashboards

VI. STRUCTURAL STABILITY:

A. VISUAL OBSERVATION:

1. Embankment: Visual examination of the embankment indicates no structural problems.

2. Appurtenant Structures: Visual inspection of the spillway and retaining walls reveals no evidence of instability.

Dam: Seymour Reservoir #3

B. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION DATA:

Does not apply

C. OPERATING RECORDS:

Does not apply

D. POST CONSTRUCTION CHANGES:

Does not apply

E. SEISMIC STABILITY:

The dam is located in seismic zone #1.


VII. DAM ASSESSMENT:

Visual inspection of the dam indicates generally good condition. This condition designation means the facility requires action within 2 to 3 years by the owner for the specific areas described.

Item that requires action is: Further investigation of the entire series of Seymour dams in respect to breaching and potential downstream damage to relatively new development on Pine Bridge Road.

Prepared by: Robert L. Jones, P.E.

Project Engineer




SPILLWAY DISCHARGE - CFS

11/7/78

PTD

Seymour Reservoir #3



Seymour Res. #2

Oxford Ct.

11/25/78

	BS	FS	Elv
①	7.92		
②		3.06	
③		5.42	

Spury vent


Top of 6" sp
to 1" 1/2" top
Top of Dam
Top of pump



APPENDIX C

PHOTOGRAPHS

FIGURE 3



SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO 3

ROAD HASTAD, INC
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND
COMPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASS

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED DAMS

PHOTO LOCATION PLAN

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO 3 DAM

OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

DATE	CHECKED	APPROVED	SCALE	1" = 10'
JOS	TVS			

Denotes Photo Number and
Direction in which Photo was Taken



PHOTO NO. 1

UPSTREAM SLOPE OF DAM
NOTE DISPLACED RIPRAP AND EROSION
OF SLOPE ABOVE RIPRAP



PHOTO NO. 2

DOWNSTREAM SLOPE AS VIEWED
FROM SPILLWAY DISCHARGE CHANNEL

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS

SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

CT 00323

28 NOV '79



PHOTO NO. 3

DISCHARGE OF PIPE APPARENTLY CONNECTED TO UNDERDRAIN.
BLOWOFF PIPE AT LEFT.



PHOTO NO. 4

APPARENT UNDERDRAIN DISCHARGE
AT TOE OF DAM NEAR LEFT ABUTMENT

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS

SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK
OXFORD, CONNCECICUT

CT 00323

28 NOV '79



PHOTO NO. 5

SPILLWAY, DISCHARGE CHANNEL
AND SERVICE BRIDGE



PHOTO NO. 6

UPSTREAM SIDE OF SPILLWAY
AND SERVICE BRIDGE

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. CAMS

SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

CT 00323

28 NOV '79




PHOTO NO. 7

CONCRETE PORTION
OF LEFT WALL OF
SPILLWAY DISCHARGE
CHANNEL



PHOTO NO. 8

CRACK IN RIGHT WALL
OF SPILLWAY DISCHARGE
CHANNEL

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS

SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK

OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

00323

28 NOV '79



PHOTO NO. 9

DEPRESSION ADJACENT TO LEFT
WALL OF SPILLWAY DISCHARGE
CHANNEL




PHOTO NO. 10

SEEP NEAR TOP OF LEFT WALL
OF SPILLWAY DISCHARGE CHANNEL

U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS

SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

CT 00323

28 NOV '79




PHOTO NO. 11

SPILLWAY DISCHARGE CHANNEL BOTTOM
NOTE 1 FOOT DEEP CAVITY
INDICATED BY RULER




PHOTO NO. 12

CHANNEL DOWNSTREAM OF SPILLWAY
SHOWING FLOW DUE TO SEEPAGE
INTO CHANNEL

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF
INSPECTION OF
NON-FED. DAMS


SEYMOUR RES. NO. 3 DAM
TR. TO HEMP SWAMP BROOK
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

CT 00323
28 NOV '79

APPENDIX D

HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS

FIGURE 4



WATERSHED PLAN

SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM
OXFORD, CONNECTICUT

SCALE: 1" = 2000'

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

NAUGATUCK QUADRANGLE 1972

BY...D.L.S....DATE...1/3/80... **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO...1...OF...25...
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY...S.L....DATE...1/14/80... 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO...049-07...
SUBJECT...SEYMOUR NO.3 SPILLWAY CAPACITY...

SPILLWAY ELEV. = 453.0

Coeff. @ Spillway = 2.8

Coeff. @ Crest = 2.7

SPILLWAY LENGTH = 23.5'

FREEBOARD = 2.4 feet (TO LOW POINT OF ENHANCEMENT CREST)

$$\text{SPILLWAY CAPACITY} = CLH^{3/2} = 2.8(23.5)(2.4)^{3/2}$$

W/FLASHBOARDS

$$= 245 \text{ CFS AT TOP OF DAM}$$

$$\text{SPILLWAY CAPACITY} = 2.8(2.9)(4.2)^{3/2} + 2.8(20.4)(2.4)^{3/2}$$

W/O FLASHBOARDS

$$= 282 \text{ CFS AT TOP OF DAM}$$

AVERAGE ELEV. TOP OF DAM = 456 (LOW POINT 455.4)
LENGTH OF DAM CREST @ EL. 456 = 750' Not Incl. Spillway
ASSUME BRIDGE LOST IN FLOOD

DEPTH OF FLOW - FT	451.2 SPILLWAY SLOT	453.0 MAIN SPILLWAY	456.0 OVER CREST	TOTAL FLOW (CFS)
451.2 0				
1	8	0	0	5
453.0 1.8	20	0	0	20
3	42	75	0	117
4	65	186	0	251
456.0 4.8	85	297	0	382
6	119	491	2662	3272
7	150	677	6,608	7,435
8	184	882	11,592	12,658
10	257	1341	24,012	25,610
12	338	1961	39,122	41,321
14	425	2424	56,508	59,367

BY...DLS...DATE 1/3/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

SHEET NO. 2 OF 25


CONSULTING ENGINEERS

CKD BY...SL...DATE 1/14/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 042-07

SUBJECT...SEYMOUR NO. 3 - SPILLWAY CAPACITY W/O Flashboards...



BY D.A.S. DATE 1/13/80**ROALD HAESTAD, INC.**
CONSULTING ENGINEERSSHEET NO. 3 OF 35CKD BY S.A. DATE 1/9/80


37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 272-Q.7SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - SPILLWAY CAPACITYSPILLWAY CAPACITY WITH FLASHBOARDS

ASSUME BRIDGE LOST IN FLOOD

<u>DEPTH OF FLOW - FT.</u>	<u>SPILLWAY</u>	<u>OVER CREST</u>	<u>TOTAL FLOW - CFS</u>
1	66	0	66
2	186	0	186
3	342	0	342
4	526	2025	2,551
5	736	5728	6,464
6	967	10,522	11,489
7	1219	16,200	17,419
8	1489	22,640	24,129
10	2091	37,504	39,585
12	2735	54,675	57,410
14	3447	73,878	77,325

BY.....SL.....DATE 1/9/80..... **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 4.....OF 25.....
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY DLS DATE 1/21/80..... 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 049-07.....
SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - Spillway Capacity W/Flashboards.....



BY DLS DATE 1/2/82 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 5 OF 25
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS
 CKD BY SL DATE 1/14/82 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 042-07
 SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - AREA-CAPACITY

Elv.	HEIGHT ABOVE SPILLWAY - FT.	SURFACE AREA - ACRES	AVE. SURFACE AREA - ACRES	STORAGE CAPACITY - AL-FT.
453	0	13		
	1	13	13	13
	2	14	13.5	26.5
	3	14	14	40.5
	4	14	14	54.5
	5	15	14.5	69
	6	15	15	84
459	8	15	15	114
	10	16	15.5	145
	12	16	16	177
	14	17	16.5	210
470	16	18	17.5	245

BY...*DEP*... DATE...*1/19/80*...

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS


SHEET NO...*6*... OF...*25*...

CKD BY...*SA*... DATE...*1/14/80*...

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO...*049-07*...

SUBJECT...*SEYMOUR NO. 3*... *STORAGE - CAPACITY CURVE*...



BY J.A.S. DATE 1/23/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 7 OF 25
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY SL DATE 1/28/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 049-07
SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - TEST FLOOD - 1/2 PMF

THE TEST FLOOD ROUTING FOR SEYMOUR NO. 3
WAS DEVELOPED BY CALCULATING AN INFLOW
HYDROGRAPH FOR SEYMOUR NO. 4, ROUTING
THE FLOOD THROUGH THE RESERVOIR AND
ADDING THE OUTFLOW TO THE INFLOW
FOR SEYMOUR NO. 3.

THE COMPUTATIONS BELOW ARE BASED ON THE SPILLWAY
CAPACITY BEFORE OVERTOPPING THE LOW POINT OF THE DAM.

PEAK OUTFLOW FOR SEYMOUR NO. 3 = 185 CFS

SPILLWAY CAPACITY = 280 CFS W/O FLASHBOARDS

OR $\frac{280}{185} \times 100 = 151\%$ OF THE TEST FLOOD

SPILLWAY CAPACITY = 245 CFS W/ FLASHBOARDS

OR $\frac{245}{185} \times 100 = 132\%$ OF THE TEST FLOOD

BY DLS DATE 1/8/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 8 OF 25
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY SL DATE 1/15/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 049-12
SUBJECT SEYMOUR RES. NO. 4 DAM - TEST FLOOD - 1/2 PMF

TEST FLOOD = $\frac{1}{2}$ PMF

DRAINAGE AREA = 343 ACRES = 0.54 sq. mi.

FROM CORPS OF ENG. CHART FOR "ROLLING" TERRAIN

PMF = 2,125 cfs / sq. mi (2.0 sq. mi. minimum)

PMF = 2,125 x 0.54 sq. mi. = 1148 cfs

$\frac{1}{2}$ PMF = $\frac{1}{2}$ (1148) = 574 cfs

USE VOLUME OF RUNOFF = 9.5" = 274 Ac.-Ft.

FROM DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS

$$q_p = \frac{484 A Q}{T_p} \quad T_b = 2.67 T_p$$

q_p = PEAK RATE OF RUNOFF - cfs

A = DRAINAGE AREA - sq. mi.

Q = TOTAL RUNOFF IN INCHES

T_p = TIME IN HOURS FROM START OF RISE TO PEAK

T_b = TIME BASE OF HYDROGRAPH IN HOURS

$$574 = \frac{484 (0.54) (9.5)}{T_p}$$

T_p = 4.3 HOURS

T_b = 2.67 (4.3) = 11.5 HOURS

BY DLS DATE 1/18/80

ROALD HAESBOD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS


SHEET NO. 9 OF 25

CKD BY SL DATE 1/14/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-12

SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 4 - TEST FLOOD - 1/2 PMF



BY SL DATE 1/9/80CHKD. BY DLB DATE 1/11/80SUBJECT: SEYMOUR NO. 4 - Flood RoutingROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERSSHEET NO. 10 OF 25JOB NO. 049-12

TIME HOURS	ΔT HOURS	AVERAGE RATE OF INFLOW Q _i CFS	AVERAGE INFLOW ACRE-FEET	TRIAL RES. STORAGE EL. END OF Δt	AVERAGE RATE OF OUTFLOW CFS	AVERAGE OUTFLOW FOR Δt ACRE-FEET	INCREMENTAL STORAGE, ΔS ACRE-FEET	TOTAL STORAGE ACRE-FEET	RESERVOIR ELEVATION END OF Δt
0		0						0	
1	1	65	5.4	532.2		0	5.4	5.4	532.1
2	1	200	16.5	532.5		0	16.5	21.9	532.1
3	1	335	27.7	532.0	7	1	26.7	48.6	533.2
4	1	463	38.3	533.2	9	1	26.7	75.3	533.2
5	1	540	44.6	533.5	21	2	26.3	101.6	534.0
6	1	485	40.1	534.0	38	3	35.3	136.9	534.0
7	1	405	33.5	535.0	109	9	35.6	172.5	534.9
8	1	320	26.4	534.9	104	9	35.6	208.1	534.9
9	1	240	19.8	535.4	205	17	23.1	231.2	535.4
10	1	160	13.2	535.5	170	14	26.1	257.3	535.4
11	1	85	7.0	535.8	201	17	16.5	273.8	535.8
12	1	12	1.0	535.7	218	18	15.5	289.3	535.7
13	1			535.9	235	20	6.4	295.7	535.9
14	1			535.9	247	21	5.4	301.1	535.9
15	1			535.9	247	21	1.2	302.3	535.9
16	1			535.9	253	21	1.2	303.5	535.9
17	1			535.8	247	21	7.8	311.3	535.7
18	1			535.7	242	20	6.8	318.1	535.7
19	1			535.6	224	19	12.0	330.1	535.5
20	1			535.5	219	18	11.0	341.1	535.5
21	1			535.0	181	15	14.0	355.1	535.1
22	1			535.1	186	16	15.0	370.1	535.1
23	1			534.9	155	13	13.0	383.1	534.8
24	1			534.8	149	12	12.0	395.1	534.8
25	1			534.5	119	10	10.0	405.1	534.6
26	1			534.6	124	10	10.0	415.1	534.6

BY D.A.S. DATE 1/10/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

SHEET NO. 11 OF 25


CONSULTING ENGINEERS

CKD BY S.L. DATE 1/11/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-12

SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 4 - FLOOD ROUTING



BY D.H.S. DATE 1/19/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO 12 OF 25
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY S.L. DATE 1/15/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO 049-07
SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - TEST FLOOD 1/2 PMF

DRAINAGE AREA = 432 ACRES = 0.68 sq. mi.
= 0.54 (SEYMOUR NO. 4) + 0.14 (SEYMOUR NO. 3)
FROM CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHART "ROLLING" TERRAIN

MPF = 2125 CFS / sq. mi. (2.0 sq. mi. minimum)

PMF = 2125 x 0.14 sq. mi. = 298 CFS

1/2 PMF = 1/2 x 298 = 149 CFS

USE DEPTH OF RUNOFF = 19" / 2 = 9.5"

VOLUME OF RUNOFF = 0.14 sq. mi x 640 Ac / sq. mi. x 9.5" / 12" / ft.

V = 71 AC-FT.

FROM DESIGN OF SMALL DAMS

$$q_p = \frac{484 A Q}{T_p} \quad T_b = 2.67 T_p$$

q_p = PEAK RATE OF RUNOFF - CFS

A = DRAINAGE AREA - sq. mi.

Q = TOTAL RUNOFF - INCHES

T_p = TIME IN HOURS FROM START OF RISE TO PEAK

T_b = TIME BASE OF HYDROGRAPH IN HOURS

$$149 = \frac{484(0.14)(9.5)}{T_p}$$

T_p = 4.3 HOURS

T_b = 2.67 (4.3) = 11.5 HOURS

THE ABOVE HYDROGRAPH IS FOR SEYMOUR NO. 3
WATERSHED. ROUTED OUTFLOW FROM SEYMOUR NO. 4
MUST BE ADDED TO GET TOTAL INFLOW.

BY...D.A.S.....DATE...1/28/80...

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS


SHEET NO...13...OF...25...

CKD BY...S.L...DATE...1/28/80...

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO...049-07...

SUBJECT...SEYMOUR NO. 3 - INFLOW HYDROGRAPH - 1/2 PMF



PEAK INFLOW = 190 CFS

BY DLS DATE 1/28/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

CONSULTING ENGINEERS

SHEET NO. 14 OF 25

CHKD. BY SL DATE 1/28/80


JOB NO. 049-07

SUBJECT: SEYMOUR NO. 3 DAM - FLOOD ROUTING - 1/2 PMF

WITH FLASHBOARDS

TIME HOURS	ΔT HOURS	AVERAGE RATE OF INFLOW Q1 AT ΔT	AVERAGE INFLOW ACRE- FEET ΔT	TRIAL RES. STORAGE EL. END OF ΔT	AVERAGE RATE OF OUTFLOW Q2 SEC. FT.	AVERAGE OUTFLOW FOR ΔT ACRE- FEET	INCREMENTAL STORAGE, AS ACRE- FEET	TOTAL STORAGE ACRE- FEET	RESERVOIR ELEVATION END OF ΔT
0		0			0			0	
1	1	18	1.5	453.0	0	0	1.5	1.5	453.1
2	1	55	4.5	453.4	13	1	3.5	5.0	453.4
3	1	95	7.9	453.7	40	3	4.9	9.9	453.7
4	1	145	12.0	454.2	85	5	7.0	16.9	454.3
5	1	181	15.0	454.6	120	9	6.0	22.9	454.7
6	1	186	15.4	454.8	145	12	3.4	26.3	454.9
7	1	172	14.2	454.9	165	14	0.2	26.5	455.0
8	1	154	12.7	454.8	165	14	-1.3	25.2	454.9
9	1	135	11.2	454.7	153	13	-1.8	23.4	454.7
10	1	111	9.2	454.6	138	12	-2.8	20.6	454.5
11	1	87	7.2	454.4	120	10	-2.8	17.8	454.3
12	1	66	5.5	454.2	85	8	-2.5	15.3	454.1
14	2	54	4.5	454.0	75	6	-1.5	13.8	454.0
16	2	48	4.0	453.9	63	5	-1.0	12.8	454.0

BY SL DATE 1/28/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO 15 OF 25
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY DLS DATE 1/28/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO 049-07
SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - Flood Routing - 1/2 PMF



BY.....SL... DATE...1/11/80...

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

SHEET NO...16... OF...25...

CKD BY...DL... DATE...1/12/80...

CONSULTING ENGINEERS

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO...049-07...

SUBJECT...SEYMOUR NO.3 - Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs...

S = Reservoir storage at time of failure = Storage at Spillway Level + Freeboard Storage

$$S = \left[67,000,000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{1 \text{ acre-ft}}{325,851 \text{ gal}} \right] + \left[13 \text{ acres} \times 3 \text{ ft} \right]$$

$$S = 205.6 \text{ acre-ft} + 39 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$S = 244.6 \text{ use } 245 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$Q_{p1} = \text{Peak Failure Outflow} = \frac{8}{27} W_b \sqrt{g} Y_o^{3/2}$$

W_b = Breach Width = 40% of dam length at mid height

$$W_b = (0.4)(500) = 200 \text{ ft}$$

Y_o = Total height from river bed to pool level at failure = 42 ft

$$Q_{p1} = \frac{8}{27} (200) (\sqrt{32.2}) (42)^{3/2} = 91,529 \text{ say } 91,500 \text{ cfs}$$

SECTION NO. 1 (SEYMOUR NO. 2 DAM)

$$V_1 = 317 \text{ acre-ft} \quad H_1 = 13.8 \text{ ft.}$$

V_1 is greater than $1/2$ of S

Water discharging at a rate equal to Q_{p1} would empty Seymour No. 3 in approximately 2 min. Therefore, it can be assumed that the water will fill Seymour No. 2 with very little outflow during the time period.

Assumption: 1) The water level in Seymour No. 2 will rise to a point 10 feet above the spillway elevation.

BY.....S.H... DATE...1/11/80... ROALD HAESTAD, INC. SHEET NO...17... OF...25...
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS
 CKD BY DLS DATE 1/23/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO..Q.49.-Q.7.....
 SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydragraphs.

Continued:

Thus $H = 10 \text{ ft}$

$Q_{p2} = 33,000 \text{ cfs}$

SECTION NO 2: (Seymour No 1 Spillway)

$Q_{p2} = 33,000 \text{ cfs}$

$H_2 = 12.7 \text{ ft}^{\checkmark}$

$V_2 = 127 \text{ acre-ft}$

$Q_{p3}(\text{TRIAL}) = Q_{p2} (1 - V_2/s)$

$Q_{p3}(\text{TRIAL}) = 33,000 \text{ cfs} (1 - 127/245)$

$Q_{p3}(\text{TRIAL}) = 15,895 \text{ cfs}$

$H_3 = 8.9 \text{ ft}$

$V_3 = 78 \text{ acre-ft}$

$V_{ave} = \frac{V_3 + V_2}{2} = \frac{78 + 127}{2} = 102.5 \text{ acre-ft}$

$Q_{p3} = Q_{p2} (1 - V_{ave}/s)$

$Q_{p3} = 33,000 \text{ cfs} (1 - 102.5/245)$

$Q_{p3} = 19,195 \text{ cfs}$

$H_3 = 9.7 \text{ ft}$

OVERTOPS SEYMOUR NO. 1 BY 7.7'

SECTION NO 3:
 (SEE FIGURE 5A)

Reach Length = 1,050 ft

$Q_{p3} = 19,195 \text{ cfs}$

$H_3 = 12.5 \text{ ft}$ (Area)₃ = 1,040 sq ft

$V_3 = (\text{Area})_3 \times \text{Length}$

$V_3 = [1,040 \text{ ft}^2 \times 1,050 \text{ ft}] \times \frac{1 \text{ acre-ft}}{43,560 \text{ ft}^3} = 25.07 \text{ use } 25 \text{ acre-ft}$

BY SL DATE 1/11/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 18 OF 25
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS
 CKD BY DL DATE 1/21/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 049-07
 SUBJECT SEYMOUR R. NO. 3 - Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs

V_3 is less than $1/2$ of S $\therefore$ Reach is O.K.

$$Q_{P4}(\text{TRIAL}) = Q_{P3} (1 - V_3/S)$$

$$Q_{P4}(\text{TRIAL}) = 19,195 \text{ cfs} (1 - 25/245)$$

$$Q_{P4}(\text{TRIAL}) = 17,236 \text{ cfs}$$

$$H_4 = 12.0 \text{ ft} \quad (\text{Area})_4 = 960 \text{ sq ft}$$

$$V_4 = (\text{Area})_4 \times \text{Length}$$

$$V_4 = \left[960 \text{ ft}^2 \times 1,050 \text{ ft} \right] \times \frac{1 \text{ acre-ft}}{43,560 \text{ ft}^3} = 23.14 \text{ use } 23 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$V_{ave} = \frac{V_4 + V_3}{2} = \frac{23 + 25}{2} = 24 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$Q_{P4} = Q_{P3} (1 - V_{ave}/S)$$

$$Q_{P4} = 19,195 \text{ cfs} (1 - 24/245)$$

$$Q_{P4} = 17,315 \text{ cfs} \quad H_4 = 12.2 \text{ ft}$$

SECTION NO. 4:

Reach Length = 2,600 ft

$$Q_{P4} = 17,315 \text{ cfs}$$

$$H_4 = 11.0 \text{ ft} \quad (\text{Area})_4 = 1,150 \text{ sq ft}$$

$$V_4 = (\text{Area})_4 \times \text{Length}$$

$$V_4 = \left[1,150 \text{ ft}^2 \times 2,600 \text{ ft} \right] \times \frac{1 \text{ acre-ft}}{43,560 \text{ ft}^3} = 68.64 \text{ use } 69 \text{ acre-ft}$$

V_4 is less than $1/2$ of S $\therefore$ Reach is O.K.

$$Q_{P5}(\text{TRIAL}) = Q_{P4} (1 - V_4/S)$$

$$Q_{P5}(\text{TRIAL}) = 17,315 \text{ cfs} (1 - 69/245)$$

$$Q_{P5}(\text{TRIAL}) = 12,440 \text{ cfs}$$

BY.....SL... DATE...1/11/80... ROALD HAESTAD, INC. SHEET NO...19... OF...25...
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
CKD BY...PLS... DATE...1/21/80... 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO...049-07...
SUBJECT...SEYMOUR...NO...3... Estimating...Downstream...Dam...Failure...Hydrographs..

$$Q_{P5}(\text{TRIAL}) = 12,440 \text{ cfs}$$

$$H_5 = 9.6 \text{ ft} \quad (\text{Area})_5 = 900 \text{ sq ft}$$

$$V_5 = (\text{Area})_5 \times \text{Length}$$

$$V_5 = \left[900 \text{ ft}^2 \times 2,600 \text{ ft} \right] \times \frac{1 \text{ acre-ft}}{43,560 \text{ ft}^3} = 53.7 \text{ use } 54 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$V_{ave} = \frac{V_5 + V_4}{2} = \frac{54 + 69}{2} = 61.5 \text{ acre-ft}$$

$$Q_{P5} = Q_{P4} (1 - V_{ave}/S)$$

$$Q_{P5} = 17,315 \text{ cfs} (1 - 61.5/245)$$

$$Q_{P5} = 12,970 \text{ cfs}$$

$$H_5 = 9.8 \text{ ft}$$

BY DLS DATE 1/10/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS


SHEET NO. 20 OF 25

CKD BY SL DATE 1/14/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-08


SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 2 - SPILLWAY CAPACITY W/O Flashboards



BY DLS DATE 1/17/80 **ROALD HAESTAD, INC.** SHEET NO. 21 OF 25
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS
 CKD BY SL DATE 1/14/80 37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708 JOB NO. 049-08
 SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 2 - STORAGE CAPACITY

WATER SURFACE AREA ASSUMED CONSTANT
 AT 23.0 ACRES. DEPTH OF SURCHARGE STORAGE
 IS EXPECTED TO BE SMALL.

HEIGHT ABOVE SPILLWAY - FEET	STORAGE CAPACITY ACRE - FEET
1	23
2	46
3	69
4	92
5	115



BY DLS DATE 1/7/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS


SHEET NO. 22 OF 25

CKD BY SL DATE 1/14/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-09

SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 1 - SPILLWAY DISCHARGE CURVE



BY SL DATE 1/8/80

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

SHEET NO. 23 OF 25


CONSULTING ENGINEERS

CKD BY PLS DATE 1/11/80

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-09

SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 1 - Area - Capacity Curve



BY...DLS...DATE...1/10/80...

ROALD HATSTAD, INC.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

SHEET NO. 24 OF 25

CKD BY...SL...DATE...1/14/80...

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-07



SUBJECT...SEYMOUR NO. 3 - FLOOD ROUTING

SECTION NO. 3 (See Figure #4)

SCALE: 1" = 200' HOR.
1" = 50' VERT.

$n=0.04$
 $L=1050$
 $S=0.027$

D	W _P	A	R	S	V	Q
3	40	53	1.33	0.027	7.4	392
8	130	416	3.20	0.027	13.3	5533
13	225	1166	5.18	0.027	18.3	21,338
18	335	2404	7.18	0.027	22.7	54,571
23	835	5529	6.62	0.027	21.5	118,874



BY.....SA... DATE 1/11/80...

ROALD HAESTAD, INC.

SHEET NO. 25 OF 25...

CONSULTING ENGINEERS

CKD BY PLS DATE 1/21/80...

37 Brookside Road - Waterbury, Conn. 06708

JOB NO. 049-07.....

SUBJECT SEYMOUR NO. 3 - Downstream Flood Routing.....

SECTION NO 4: (Field Surveyed)



Scale: 1" = 40' Horiz
1" = 10' Vert.

$L = 2,600\text{ ft}$
 $S = 0.021$
 $n = 0.04$

HOUSE


ROAD

<u>D</u>	<u>Wp</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>Q</u>
1	18	9	0.50	0.021	3.4	31
3	23	49	2.13	0.021	8.9	436
5	100	169	1.69	0.021	7.7	1,301
7	150	411	2.74	0.021	10.6	4,357
10	190	897	4.72	0.021	15.2	13,634
13	235	1,483	6.31	0.021	18.4	27,287



AREA - sq ft

FIGURE 5



APPENDIX E

INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN
THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS

NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
424 TRAPELO ROAD
WALTHAM MASSACHUSETTS 02154

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
NEDED-E

APR 21 1980

Mr. Stanley J. Pac, Commissioner
Department of Environmental Protection
State of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Dear Commissioner Pac:

Forwarded herewith for your information and use is a copy of the Phase I Inspection Report on the Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam. This inspection was performed in accordance with Public Law 92-367 under the direction of the Corps of Engineers. Copies of the finished report have been forwarded to the Governor and the owner. We thank you for your cooperation and assistance in carrying out this program and hope this report will help you to develop an effective dam safety program.

Sincerely,

JOE B. FRYAR
Chief, Engineering Division

Incl
As stated

This Phase I Inspection Report on Seymour Reservoir No. 3 Dam has been reviewed by the undersigned Review Board members. In our opinion, the reported findings, conclusions, and recommendations are consistent with the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, and with good engineering judgment and practice, and is hereby submitted for approval.

Carney M. Terzian

CARNEY M. TERZIAN, MEMBER
Design Branch
Engineering Division

Richard J. DiBuono

RICHARD DIBUONO, MEMBER
Water Control Branch
Engineering Division

Aramast Mahtesian


ARAMAST MAHTESIAN, CHAIRMAN
Geotechnical Engineering Branch
Engineering Division

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

Joe B. Fryar

JOE B. FRYAR
Chief, Engineering Division


FIGURE 2



SECTION A-A
Scale 1:100



ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED	
VERTICAL PROFILES OF DAMS AND ELEVATIONS	
SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM	
DATE	1964
BY	J. E. B. J.
CHECKED BY	J. E. B. J.
APPROVED BY	J. E. B. J.



AD-A144 325

NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL DAMS
SEYMOUR RESERVOIR NUM. (U) CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM
MA NEW ENGLAND DIV FEB 80

22

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 13/13

NL




END

DATE


FILED

9 84

DTIC



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



INVENTORY OF DAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

STATE	COUNTY	DIST.	CORNER	NAME	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
VT	WINDHAM	1		PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR NO. 3 DAM	4126.7	7505.4	08 FEB 60		


POPULATION NAME	NAME OF RESERVOIR	REPORT DATE
PLYMOUTH RESERVOIR NO. 3		DAY MO YR
RIVER ON STREAM	NEAREST DOWNSTREAM CITY-TOWN-VILLAGE	
0.10 IN REMP SAND HOUR	PIKE BRIDGE	1
		1000

TYPE OF DAM	YEAR COMPLETED	PURPOSES	STORAGE CAPACITY (AC FT)	HYDROELECTRIC CAPACITY (KW)	IRREGULAR CAPACITIES (AC FT)	DIST	OWN	FED R	PHV/FED	SCS A	VER/DATE
4275	1910	S	42	42	245	206	RED	N	N	N	

REMARKS	
2000 GALLONS PER MINUTE COMPLETED 1902	
DESIGN	CONSTRUCTION
7300	24
55000	
770	
NAVIGATION LOCKS	

OWNERS	ENGINEERING BY	CONSTRUCTION BY
ALBANY HYDRAULIC CO	CLARENCE HAIN ASSOCIATE	CLARENCE HAIN AND SONS
DESIGN	CONSTRUCTION	OPERATION
CT DEP	CT DEP	CT DEP
INSPECTION BY	INSPECTION DATE	AUTHORITY FOR INSPECTION
WALDO HAINSTAD INC.	2-1-74	PL 92-367

REMARKS



SECTION 10000 OF
THE
STATE OF
NEW YORK
COUNTY OF
SARATOGA

10000