

AD-A156 276


NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL DAMS
BADGER POND DAM (NH 0..1U) CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM
MA NEW ENGLAND DIV NOV 79


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 13/13

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A

AD-A156 276

MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN
BELMONT, NEW HAMPSHIRE

BADGER POND DAM
N.H. 00085

STATE NO. 21.02

PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT
NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM



DTIC
ELECTE
JUL 08 1985
S G

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

DTIC FILE COPY

NOVEMBER 1979

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

85 06 13 081

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NH 00085	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Badger Pond 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 November 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 50
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. 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, Merrimack River Basin Belmont, New Hampshire Tioga River		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The dam has a hydraulic height of 21 ft. and is 260 ft. long. The dam is in fair condition. Seepage near the downstream rockfill buttress and the north abutment are among major concerns. It is small in size with a high hazard classification. A major breach at spillway crest would probably result in the loss of 10 or more lives and could cause extensive property damage.		

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

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



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

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
NEDED

MAY 19 1980

Honorable Hugh J. Gallen
Governor of the State of New Hampshire
State House
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Dear Governor Gallen:

Inclosed is a copy of the Badger Pond 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 Water Resources Board, the cooperating agency for the State of New Hampshire. In addition, a copy of the report has also been furnished the owner, Mr. James Locke, Campton, New Hampshire 03223.

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 Water Resources Board for your cooperation in carrying out this program.

Sincerely,

Incl
As stated


MAX B. SCHEIDER
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Division Engineer

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
PHASE I INSPECTION REPORT

Identification No.: NH0085
Name of Dam: Badger Pond Dam
Town: Belmont
County and State: Belknap County, New Hampshire
Stream: Tioga River
Date of Inspection: September 7, 1979


BRIEF ASSESSMENT

Badger Pond Dam has a hydraulic height of 21 feet, is 18 feet wide at the crest, and is 260 feet long. It is a rockfill concrete-walled embankment with a concrete capped masonry spillway. The spillway is located in about the center of the dam and is 120 feet long. A change in alignment occurs in the spillway approximately 75 feet from the south abutment. The dam impounds Badger Pond and the discharge from the dam forms the Tioga River. The dam is located in central New Hampshire. Maximum storage capacity is about 510 acre-feet. Badger Pond Dam, at present, is used for conservation purposes. The pond is 0.2 mile in length with a normal pool surface area of about 20 acres.

The dam is in fair condition. Major concerns are: seepage near the downstream rockfill buttress and the north abutment; trees growing on the upstream and downstream slopes at the end of the dam, in the rockfill buttress at the north end of the dam, and near the downstream toe of the dam at both the north and south ends of the dam embankment; lack of vegetation, and, therefore, erosion protection on the crest of the embankment section at the south end of the dam; operability of the low-level outlet mechanisms and the partially blocked outlets, and deteriorated areas of concrete on the spillway, non-overflow sections, and control tower.

Based on small size and high hazard classification in accordance with Corps guidelines, the test flood ranges from $\frac{1}{2}$ to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Because of the potential loss of lives in event of a breach, the PMF was selected as the test flood. The test flood inflow, using the 'mountainous' guide curve and the PMF outflow from the Sargent Lake Dam inspection report, was determined to be 30,930 cfs (1933 csm). After routing, the test flood outflow was determined to be 30,580 cfs (1906 csm) at elevation 590.5' MSL. This test flood would overtop the dam by 7.5 feet (13.5 feet over spillway crest). The spillway capacity at top of dam is 4,760 cfs or 16 percent of the routed test flood discharge. A major breach at spillway crest would probably result in the loss of 10 or more lives and could cause extensive property damage. (See Section 5.1 f.)

The owner, Pascoe Roberts, should implement the results of the recommendations and remedial measures given in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 within one year after receipt of this Phase I Inspection Report.


Warren A. Guinan
Project Manager
N.H. P.E. 2339

This Phase I Inspection Report on Badger Pond 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.

Richard J. Di Bruno

RICHARD DIBUONO, MEMBER
Water Control Branch
Engineering Division

Aram M. Mahtesian

ARAMAST MAHTESIAN, MEMBER
Geotechnical Engineering Branch
Engineering Division

Carney M. Terzian

CARNEY M. TERZIAN, CHAIRMAN
Design Branch
Engineering Division

Accession For		
NTIS GRA&I	☒	
DTIC TAB	☐	
Unannounced	☐	
Justification		
By _____		
Distribution/		
Availability Codes		
Dist	Avail and/or Special	
A/1	23	CIV



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 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.....	
BRIEF ASSESSMENT.....	
REVIEW BOARD PAGE.....	
PREFACE.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
OVERVIEW PHOTO.....	vi
LOCATION MAP.....	vii


REPORT

SECTION


1	PROJECT INFORMATION.....	1-1
	1.1 General.....	1-1
	1.2 Description of Project.....	1-1
	1.3 Pertinent Data.....	1-3
2	ENGINEERING DATA.....	2-1
	2.1 Design.....	2-1
	2.2 Construction.....	2-1
	2.3 Operation.....	2-1
	2.4 Evaluation.....	2-1
3	VISUAL INSPECTION.....	3-1
	3.1 Findings.....	3-1
	3.2 Evaluation.....	3-3
4	OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES.....	4-1
	4.1 Procedures.....	4-1
	4.2 Maintenance of Dam.....	4-1
	4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities.....	4-1
	4.4 Description of Any Warning System in Effect.....	4-1
	4.5 Evaluation.....	4-1
5	HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS.....	5-1
	5.1 Evaluation of Features.....	5-1
6	STRUCTURAL STABILITY.....	6-1
	6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability.....	6-1
7	ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS & REMEDIAL MEASURES.....	7-1
	7.1 Dam Assessment.....	7-1
	7.2 Recommendations.....	7-1
	7.3 Remedial Measures.....	7-2
	7.4 Alternatives.....	7-2

APPENDICES


	<u>Designation</u>
VISUAL INSPECTION CHECK LISTS.....	A
ENGINEERING DATA.....	B
PHOTOGRAPHS.....	C
HYDROLOGY AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS.....	D
INFORMATION AS CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL INVENTORY OF DAMS.....	E



October 4, 1979
Figure 1 - Overview of Badger Pond Dam.



Reprinted by permission of the Department of Resources and Economic Development, Concord, N.H. 03301, and the copyright owners, The National Survey, Chester, VT. 05143. 6/18/79



MAP BASED ON STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE OFFICIAL HIGHWAY MAP.

Anderson-Nichols & Co., Inc.		U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND	
CONCORD NEW HAMPSHIRE		CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MASS.	
NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS			
BADGER POND DAM			
LOCATION MAP			
TIOGA RIVER		NEW HAMPSHIRE	
		SCALE: SEE BAR SCALE	
		DATE: NOVEMBER 1979	

NATIONAL DAM INSPECTION PROGRAM
PHASE 1 INSPECTION REPORT
BADGER POND DAM

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 New England Division of the Corps of Engineers has been assigned the responsibility of supervising the inspection of dams within the New England Region. Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc. has been retained by the New England Division to inspect and report on selected dams in the State of New Hampshire. Authorization and notice to proceed were issued to Anderson-Nichols under a letter of March 22, 1979 from John P. Chandler, Colonel, Corps of Engineers. Contract No. DACW33-79-C-0050, as changed, has been assigned by the Corps of Engineers for this work.

b. Purpose

- (1) To perform technical inspection and evaluation of non-Federal dams to identify conditions which threaten the public safety and thus permit correction in a timely manner by non-Federal interests.
- (2) To encourage and prepare the States to initiate quickly effective dam safety programs for non-Federal dams.
- (3) To update, verify and complete the National Inventory of Dams.

1.2 Description of Project

a. Location. Badger Pond Dam is located in the Town of Belmont, New Hampshire. Badger Pond Dam impounds flow from Badger Brook and Tioga River. After discharging at the damsite, the water course is the Tioga River which flows southwesterly through Belmont, approximately one mile downstream, and continues downstream for a distance of 2,500 feet from Belmont proper to where Pumping Station Brook joins the Tioga River. It then shifts westerly and flows a distance of approximately 5 miles before emptying into the Winnepesaukee River about 0.2 mile northeast of the boundary intersection among the Towns of Belmont, Northfield and Tilton. The Winnepesaukee River is a

major tributary in the Merrimack River Basin. Badger Pond Dam is shown on U.S.G.S. Quadrangle, Gilmanton, New Hampshire, with coordinates approximately at N 43° 27' 6", W 71° 28' 10", Belknap County, New Hampshire. (See Location Map Page vii.)

b. Description of Dam and Appurtenances. Badger Pond Dam is a concrete capped, dry-stone-masonry spillway with concrete walled, rockfill and masonry abutments. The spillway is 120 feet long and 18 feet wide. The upstream abutment walls are vertical. Approximately 100 feet from the south end of the dam is the control mechanism for the south abutment low-level outlet. The south abutment area adjacent to the spillway measures 11 feet by 11 feet in plan and contains gearing mechanism for controlling the low-level outlet and a gear mechanism maintenance pit. The concrete capped masonry spillway measures 120 feet in total length and has a change in alignment at approximately 75 feet from the south abutment. The north abutment is a vertical concrete wall 2 feet in width and approximately 55 feet in length. Both the north and south abutments and the spillway have lower dry stone masonry walls downstream.

c. Size Classification. Small (hydraulic height - 21 feet; storage - 510 acre-feet) based on storage (≥ 50 to < 1000 acre-feet) as given in the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams.

d. Hazard Classification. High hazard. A major breach would probably result in the loss of 10 or more lives and extensive property damage. (See Section 5.1 f.)

e. Ownership. The earliest recorded information concerning Badger Pond Dam does not indicate when the original structure was built. Belmont Hosiery Company in Belmont, New Hampshire, owned the dam and in 1929 did major repair and reconstruction work to it. Ownership passed to James Locke of Campton, New Hampshire at an unknown date and passed again to the present owner, Pascoe Roberts, at an unknown date.

f. Purpose of Dam. The dam was originally constructed to provide industrial water storage for Belmont Hosiery Company for use in their milling operations in Belmont. The impoundment is presently used for conservation and recreation purposes.

g. Design and Construction History. Little information was disclosed regarding the original design and construction of Badger Pond Dam. Information recovered from NHWRB files revealed design plans and specifications dated 1929 covering "extensive repairs, practically amounting to reconstruction of the dam." These were drawn by I. W. Jones & Company of Milton, New Hampshire.

h. Normal Operating Procedures. No written operational procedures exist for Badger Pond Dam.

- (1) The gate mechanism in the south abutment is rusted and does not appear to have been used for a number of years.
- (2) The gate mechanism for the north abutment low-level outlet has been bent and is in disrepair.

1.3 Pertinent Data

a. Drainage Area. The drainage area consists of 16 square miles (10,240 acres) of mountainous to rolling forested terrain. The normal pool has a surface area of 20 acres, which constitutes 0.2 percent of the watershed. Sawyer and Sargent Lakes are also present in the upstream drainage area on Badger Brook.

b. Discharge at Damsite

- (1) Outlet works (conduits): One 36" gated, riveted, steel pipe @ invert elevation 562' MSL. This pipe was assumed inoperable as the mechanism appeared rusted and unlubricated. One 2' x 2' gated, rock-walled low-level outlet @ invert elevation 564' MSL. This gate was assumed inoperable as the mechanism linkage was bent and rusted.
- (2) The maximum discharge at damsite is unknown. No records of past overtoppings were disclosed.
- (3) Ungated spillway capacity @ top of dam elevation - 4,760 cfs @ 583.0' MSL
- (4) Ungated spillway capacity @ test flood elevation - 16,070 cfs @ 590.5' MSL
- (5) Gated spillway capacity at top of dam elevation - not applicable
- (6) Gated spillway capacity at test flood elevation - not applicable
- (7) Total spillway capacity at test flood elevation - 16,070 cfs @ 590.5' MSL
- (8) Total project discharge at test flood elevation - 30,500 cfs @ 590.5' MSL

c. Elevation (ft. above NGVD of 1929; formerly called Mean Sea Level (MSL); see (6) below.)

- (1) Streambed at centerline of dam - 562 (downstream toe)
- (2) Maximum tailwater - unknown
- (3) Upstream portal invert diversion tunnel - not applicable

- (4) Recreation pool - 577.0
- (5) Full flood control pool - not applicable
- (6) Spillway crest - 577.0 (obtained from U.S.G.S. (Quadrangle sheet and assumed to be spillway elevation)
- (7) Design surcharge (original design) - unknown
- (8) Top Dam - 583.0
- (9) Test flood design surcharge - not applicable

d. Reservoir (miles)

- (1) Length of maximum pool - 0.2
- (2) Length of recreation pool - 0.2
- (3) Length of flood control pool - not applicable

e. Storage (acre-feet)

- (1) Recreation pool - 180
- (2) Flood control pool - not applicable
- (3) Spillway crest pool - 180
- (4) Test flood pool - 960
- (5) Top dam - 510

f. Reservoir Surface (acres)

- (1) Recreation pool - 20
- (2) Flood control pool - not applicable
- (3) Spillway crest - 20
- (4) Test flood pool - 65
- (5) Top of dam - 51

g. Dam

- (1) Type - concrete wall upstream, masonry wall downstream with rockfill
- (2) Length - 260'
- (3) Height - 21' structural height

- (4) Top width - 18'
- (5) Side Slopes - spillway upstream is vertical
- spillway downstream is approximately 2H:1V
- (6) Zoning - unknown
- (7) Impervious core - unknown
- (8) Cutoff - unknown
- (9) Grout curtain - unknown
- h. Diversion and Regulating Tunnel - not applicable
(See j. below.)
- i. Spillway
 - (1) Type - free overflow sloping spillway
 - (2) Length of weir - 120'
 - (3) Crest elevation - 577.0'
 - (4) Gates - none
 - (5) U/S Channel - Badger Pond. The banks are tree-lined.
 - (6) D/S Channel - Tioga River. Discharge from the dam flows southwesterly a distance of about one mile through Belmont proper and another 2,500 feet to where Pumping Station Brook joins. Three road bridge crossings exist between the dam and downstream of Belmont.
- j. Regulating Outlets. One 36" steel pipe functioned as a low-level outlet. This outlet is in the south abutment. The pipe has an invert elevation at 562' and exits at the dam toe. Rusting parts and the lack of lubrication indicate this low-level outlet has not been in operation for a lengthy yet unknown period of time. One 2' x 2' rock-walled outlet in the north abutment was assumed to have formerly been used as a low-level outlet for the reservoir. The control mechanism linkage for this outlet was bent and in serious disrepair. This gate mechanism also appears inoperable.

SECTION 2
ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 Design

No original design data were disclosed for Badger Pond Dam.

2.2 Construction

No original construction records were disclosed.

2.3 Operation

No engineering operational data were disclosed.

2.4 Evaluation

a. Availability. Little engineering data were disclosed for Badger Pond Dam. A search of the files of the New Hampshire Water Resources Board (NHWRB) revealed only a limited amount of recorded information. Correspondence with the owner by several methods proved unsuccessful. Therefore, it is possible that additional information on the dam may exist.

b. Adequacy. The final assessments and recommendations of this investigation are based on visual inspection and the hydrologic and hydraulic calculations.

c. Validity. Plans drawn by I. W. Jones Engineers of Milton, New Hampshire in 1929 for the reconstruction of Badger Pond Dam are generally consistent with the visual inspection.

SECTION 3 VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 Findings

a. General. Badger Pond Dam is a low dam which impounds a reservoir of small size. The watershed above the reservoir is rolling to steeply sloping and is heavily wooded. The Town of Belmont is about 0.7 mile downstream from the dam.

b. Dam. Badger Pond Dam is 21 feet high (hydraulic and structural height) and 260 feet long. (See Appendix C - Figure 2.) The central part of the dam is a concrete capped, stone masonry spillway section 120 feet long with a sloping spillway apron 18 feet wide inclined at approximately 2H:1V. The downstream edge of the spillway section is a dry masonry wall which is vertical in its lower part and curves over to meet the slope of the concrete apron in its upper part. (See Appendix C - Figure 3.) The upstream face of the spillway section, where it can be seen above the pond level, is faced with concrete. The surface of the concrete spillway is eroded exposing the coarse aggregate. (See Appendix C - Figure 4.) Two isolated areas on the sloped surface have spalled up to a depth of 2 inches. The concrete edges of the construction joints are eroded deeper than the inclined surface creating a "v" approximately 1 inch deep at each construction joint. Vertical training walls at either end of the spillway are undermined 3 to 4 inches where the walls have been in constant contact with water. (See Appendix C - Figure 5.) Some small brush is growing in the joints near the center of the concrete spillway. Steel stoplog supports in the crest are rusted and some are filled with silt. (See Appendix C - Figure 5.) The stoplog slots in the training walls are eroded near the crest of the spillway. From the north end of the spillway to the north abutment the dam consists of a concrete wall 54 feet long and 2 feet wide at the crest with a vertical upstream face inclined at approximately 2H:1V buttressed with rockfill against the downstream face. (See Appendix C - Figure 6.) Hairline cracks in both faces show efflorescence and are numerous. A concrete retaining wall on the upstream face retains the earth embankment at the north end of the north non-overflow gravity section. (See Appendix C - Figure 7.) Separation of the construction joint between the retaining wall and the gravity wall indicates that the retaining wall has moved laterally approximately 1 inch. The upstream face of the wall has a horizontal area of spalling and erosion to a maximum depth of 4 inches. A low-level outlet near the left end of the north spillway abutment was observed. (See Appendix C - Figure 8.) The gate operating mechanism has not been maintained and the vertical shaft below the operator is bent. (See Appendix C - Figure 9.) The gate operating mechanism does not appear operable.

The downstream exit of this outlet is an opening, 2 feet wide by 2 feet high, in the rockfill buttress. (See Appendix C - Figure 8.) Loose rockfill plugs the opening over approximately half its total height. Rust staining of the ground surface near the contact between the rockfill buttress and the north abutment indicates that seepage has discharged from that area at some time in the recent past; however, no water was discharging at the time of inspection. Many small trees are growing in the rockfill buttress and larger trees are growing immediately downstream of the toe of the rockfill buttress.

At the south abutment there is a vertical wall 2 feet wide at the upstream face of a short embankment section about 60 feet long and 11 feet wide at the crest. This wall has a vertical face upstream and a downstream face inclined at 1H:2V buttressed with a rockfill up to 5 feet below the crest at the downstream face. (See Appendix C - Figure 10.) Numerous hairline cracks on the downstream face are exhibiting efflorescence. A concrete, gated outlet structure was observed at the right end of the south abutment. The outlet consists of a 36-inch diameter steel pipe which is encased in a concrete headwall at its downstream end. (See Appendix C - Figure 11.) Large rocks have been thrown or placed in this pipe. (See Appendix C - Figure 12.)

A short section of earth embankment exists between the end of the vertical wall and the south abutment. No vegetation was growing on the crest of this embankment probably because of trespassing. Trees are growing on the upstream and downstream slopes of the embankment and on the natural ground near the downstream toe of the embankment.

c. Appurtenant Structures. A concrete control tower housing the gated outlet structure is integrated with the vertical concrete wall at the south abutment and adjacent to the south end of the spillway. (See Appendix C - Figure 13.) The concrete tower measures 11 feet wide by 11 feet long and supports a gate operating mechanism. A 2-foot by 2-foot gear mechanism maintenance pit allows access down to the low-level outlet. Flashboard slots were observed on the side of the concrete tower adjacent to the spillway. Holes along the spillway crest used to accommodate flashboard pins were observed, however, no pins were in place. No flashboards were in place at the time of inspection. The gate operating mechanism appears to be in fair condition, however, it is not lubricated. The gate appears not to have been operating for several years. The 36-inch diameter steel pipe on the downstream end is severely corroded. The downstream face of the control tower has numerous hairline cracks exhibiting efflorescence. (See Appendix C - Figure 11.) A portion of the concrete face immediately above the steel pipe is eroded to a depth of approximately 3 inches. Other areas around the pipe down to the tailwater surface are also eroded.

d. Reservoir Area. The watershed above the pond is gently to steeply sloping and heavily wooded. No buildings were observed on the shore of the reservoir. (See Appendix C - Figure 14.) No evidence of significant sedimentation in the reservoir was observed.

e. Downstream Channel. The bottom of the channel downstream of the dam is covered with boulders. Trees and brush overhang the channel and are growing in the channel in some places. (See Appendix C - Figure 15.)

3.2 Evaluation

Based on the visual inspection, Badger Pond Dam is in fair condition. Evidence that seepage has occurred in the recent past at the contact between the dam and the north abutment was observed (although no seepage was discharging at the time of the inspection). Such seepage could lead to a future stability problem if not corrected.

Trees are growing on the upstream and downstream slopes of the embankment section at the south end of the dam, in the rock-fill buttress at the north end of the dam, and near the downstream toe of the dam. If a tree blows over and its roots are pulled out or if a tree dies and its roots rot, seepage and erosion problems may result. The lack of vegetation on the crest of the embankment section at the south end of the dam results in low erosion resistance if the dam should be overtopped.

The concrete surface of the spillway, non-overflow section, and control tower are deteriorated and could lead to future instability if left uncorrected.

Trees overhanging the discharge channel may blow or drop over into the channel as a result of erosion during periods of high discharge at the damsite. These trees may obstruct flow in the channel and in the culverts downstream.

SECTION 4 OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 Procedures

No written maintenance procedures exist for Badger Pond Dam. The lake level is maintained by the uncontrolled spillway located near the center of the dam.

4.2 Maintenance of Dam

Mr. Pascoe Roberts, the owner, is responsible for the maintenance of the dam.

4.3 Maintenance of Operating Facilities

No formal maintenance was disclosed. The low-level outlet mechanisms are deteriorated. The operation of the low-level outlet mechanisms was not observed during the visual inspection. The stem handle for operating the north low-level outlet was in poor condition and appeared inoperable. The gate operating mechanism for operating the south low-level outlet was in fair condition.

4.4 Description of Any Warning System in Effect

No written warning system exists for the dam.

4.5 Evaluation

The present operational and maintenance procedures are inadequate to ensure that all problems encountered could be remedied within a reasonable amount of time.

SECTION 5
HYDROLOGIC/HYDRAULIC

5.1 Evaluation of Features

a. General. Badger Pond Dam is a rockfill embankment contained between concrete and masonry walls. The total length of the dam is 260 feet. The principal spillway is concrete capped dry-stone masonry. The spillway is uncontrolled and its total length is 120 feet with a change of alignment at about 75 feet from the south abutment. The reservoir level is controlled by the principal spillway. The low-level outlet mechanisms on the north and south abutments appeared to be inoperable. The drainage area consists of 16 square miles of mountainous terrain. Sawyer and Sargent Lakes are present in the upstream watershed. Discharge at the damsite forms the Tioga River.

b. Design Data. No hydrologic or hydraulic design data were disclosed.

c. Experience Data. The known flood of record occurred in 1936. In 1938, the earthen embankment at Sargent Lake Dam was breached upstream of Badger Pond Dam. The resulting flood wave passed over Badger Pond Dam and inundated State Route 106 to a depth of 2 feet just downstream.

d. Visual Observations. At the time of inspection, no visual evidence was noted of damage to the dam caused by excessive discharge.

e. Test Flood Analysis. Badger Pond Dam is classified as small in size having a hydraulic height of 21 feet and a maximum storage capacity of 510 acre-feet; the dam was determined to have a High Hazard Classification. Using the Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams, the test flood ranges from $\frac{1}{2}$ to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Because of the potential for loss of life in event of a breach, the PMF was selected as the test flood.

The test flood inflow for Badger Pond Dam combines two values. The PMF combines the outflow from Sargent Lake Dam plus the additional discharge from the Badger Pond Dam sub-drainage area. The outflow from Sargent Lake Dam, having a drainage area of 2.8 square miles, was determined to be 5,850 cfs. The additional discharge from the Badger Pond Dam sub-drainage area, having an area of 13.2 square miles, using the 'mountainous' guide curves, was determined to be 25,080 cfs. The total test flood inflow was 30,930 cfs (1933 csm). After routing, the test flood outflow was determined to be 30,500 cfs (1906 csm) at elevation 590.5' MSL, reflecting negligible surcharge storage effects on reducing peak runoff. The test flood analysis indicates that the dam embankment would be overtopped by approximately 7.5 feet during test flood conditions. The spillway capacity at top of dam is 4,760 cfs or 16 percent of the test flood. Assuming $\frac{1}{2}$ PMF discharge was 15,250 cfs, the dam would be overtopped by 4.3 feet at elevation 587.3' MSL.

f. Dam Failure Analysis. The impact of failure of the dam at both spillway (normal flow conditions) and at top of dam was assessed using the Guidance for Estimating Downstream Dam Failure Hydrographs issued by the Corps of Engineers. A breach at spillway crest would produce the greater downstream hazard and, therefore, was used in evaluating the hazard classification for Badger Pond Dam. A breach of Badger Pond Dam at spillway crest would result in a breach discharge of 4,880 cfs and result in the following stages in the downstream reaches and bridges. The antecedent condition is 0.5 foot at the reach sections and bridges.

Reach #1: From Badger Pond Dam to State Route 106 an increase in stage of 9.5 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. There would be no property damage.

At State Route 106 an increase in stage of 11.1 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. One private residence along State Route 106 would be inundated. The structure consists of a 6'H x 30' W box culvert. The road would be overtopped by 2 feet.

Reach #2: From State Route 106 to Hurricane Road an increase in stage of 10.5 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. There would be no property damage.

At Hurricane Road an increase in stage of 12.5 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. Three private residences, one laundry and one church adjacent to the Hurricane Road culvert would be inundated. Loss of 10 or more lives in this reach could occur. The culvert consists of a corrugated metal pipe arch with a span of 18.5 feet, and a rise of 12.5 feet. The road would be overtopped by 2.5 feet.

Reach #3: From Hurricane Road to the State Route 140 an increase in stage of 8.0 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. There would be no property damage.

At State Route 140 an increase in stage of 6.3 feet over the 0.5 foot antecedent condition would result. One mobile home adjacent to State Route 140 would be inundated. Loss of 3 lives in this reach could occur. The State Route 140 structure consists of a 12' H x 32' W box culvert. The road would not be overtopped.

Based on the above analysis, Badger Pond Dam was classified High Hazard.

SECTION 6
STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 Evaluation of Structural Stability

a. Visual Observations. The visual examination indicates the following evidence of potential problems:

- (1) Signs that seepage has occurred in the recent past near the contact between the downstream rockfill buttress and the north abutment.
- (2) Trees growing on the upstream and downstream slopes of the embankment section at the south end of the dam, in the rockfill buttress at the north end of the dam, and near the downstream toe of the dam at both the north and south ends of the dam.
- (3) Lack of vegetation and, therefore, erosion protection on the crest of the embankment section at the south end of the dam.
- (4) Deteriorated areas of concrete on the spillway, non-overflow sections and control tower.

In addition, the low-level outlets are partially blocked, and trees and brush overhang the discharge channel and are growing in the channel in some places.

b. Design and Construction Data. No original design and construction data are available.

c. Operating Records. No operating records pertinent to the structural stability of the dam are available.

d. Post-Construction Changes. A New Hampshire Water Resources Board inventory report dated July 17, 1934, indicates that the dam was "rebuilt." No other record of post-construction changes is available.

e. Seismic Stability. This dam is in Seismic Zone 2 and in accordance with the Phase I guidelines does not warrant seismic analysis.

SECTION 7
ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 Dam Assessment

a. Condition. The visual examination indicates that Badger Pond Dam is in fair condition. The major concerns with respect to the long-term integrity of the dam are:

- (1) Signs that seepage has occurred in the recent past near the contact between the downstream rockfill buttress and the north abutment.
- (2) Trees growing on the upstream and downstream slopes of the embankment section at the south end of the dam, in the rockfill buttress at the north end of the dam, and near the downstream toe of the dam at both the north and south ends of the dam.
- (3) Lack of vegetation on the crest of the embankment section at the south end of the dam.
- (4) Deteriorated areas of concrete on the spillway, non-overflow section and control tower.

b. Adequacy of Information. The information available is such that the assessment of this dam must be based primarily on the results of the visual inspection.

c. Urgency. The recommendations made in 7.2 and 7.3 should be implemented by the owner within one year after receipt of this Phase I report.

d. Need for Additional Investigation. The area immediately downstream of the toe of the dam should be inspected after the trees and brush have been cleared.

7.2 Recommendations. The owner should engage a Registered Professional Engineer to:

- (1) Investigate the recent seepage at the north abutment of the dam and design corrective measures, if needed.
- (2) Design procedures for clearing trees and brush from the embankment section of the dam, the downstream-toe area, and the rockfill buttress at the north end of the dam.
- (3) Design repairs to the deteriorated concrete.
- (4) Evaluate further the stability of the dam under overtopping because of the inadequate spillway.

- (5) Design repairs to the low-level outlet gate and discharge pipe.
- (6) Monitor crack in gravity wall.

The owner should carry out the recommendations of the engineer.

7.3 Remedial Measures

a. Operating and Maintenance Procedures. The owner should:

- (1) Establish grassy vegetation, or other erosion-resistant protection, on the crest of the embankment section at the south end of the dam.
- (2) Maintain the area within 25 feet downstream from the toe of the dam free of trees and brush.
- (3) Remove trees and brush from the downstream channel and for a distance of 25 feet on either side of the channel for a distance of 100 feet downstream of the dam or to limits of property whichever is the lesser distance.
- (4) Clear the partial blockage of the 36" low-level outlet.
- (5) Visually inspect the dam and appurtenant structures once a month.
- (6) Engage a Registered Professional Engineer to make a comprehensive inspection of the dam once a year.
- (7) Establish a surveillance program for use during and immediately after heavy rainfall and also a warning program to follow in case of emergency conditions.

7.4 Alternatives

No alternatives are recommended.

APPENDIX A
VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST

VISUAL INSPECTION CHECKLIST
PARTY ORGANIZATION

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH

DATE Sept. 7, 1979

TIME 1400

WEATHER Sunny, hot

W.S. ELEV.	U.S.	DN.S.
	<u>577.1</u>	<u>562.0</u>

PARTY:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. <u>Stephen Gilman (ANCo)</u> | 6. <u>Ken Stern (NHWRB)</u> |
| 2. <u>Gus Sharpy (ANCo)</u> | 7. _____ |
| 3. <u>Ken Stuart (ANCo)</u> | 8. _____ |
| 4. <u>Mehdi Miremadi (ANCo)</u> | 9. _____ |
| 5. <u>Ronald Hirschfeld (GEI)</u> | 10. _____ |

PROJECT FEATURE	INSPECTED BY	REMARKS
1. <u>Hydrology/Hydraulics</u>	<u>A. Sharpy/K. Stuart</u>	
2. <u>Structural Stability</u>	<u>S. Gilman</u>	
3. <u>Soils & Geology</u>	<u>R. Hirschfeld</u>	
4. _____		
5. _____		
6. _____		
7. _____		
8. _____		
9. _____		
10. _____		

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECKLIST

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH DATE Sept. 7, 1979
 PROJECT FEATURE Dike Embankment NAME R. Hirschfeld
 DISCIPLINE _____ NAME S. Gilman

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
<u>DIKE EMBANKMENT</u>	Short section between south abutment and left end of concrete and stone masonry dam
Crest Elevation	
Current Pool Elevation	
Maximum Impoundment to Date	
Surface Cracks	None observed
Pavement Condition	Not paved
Movement or Settlement of Crest	None observed
Lateral Movement	None observed
Vertical Alignment	Good
Horizontal Alignment	Good
Condition at Abutment and at Concrete Structures	Good
Indications of Movement of Structural Items on Slopes	None observed
Trespassing on Slopes	None observed
Sloughing or Erosion of Slopes or Abutments	None observed
Rock Slope Protection - Riprap Failures	None observed
Unusual Movement or Cracking at or Near Toes	None observed
Unusual Embankment or Downstream Seepage	None observed
Piping or Boils	None observed
Foundation Drainage Features	None observed
Toe Drains	None observed
Instrumentation System	None observed
Vegetation	Trees and brush growing on upstream and downstream slopes

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECKLIST

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH DATE Sept. 7, 1979

PROJECT FEATURE Outlet Works - Intake Structure NAME _____

DISCIPLINE _____ NAME _____

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
<u>OUTLET WORKS - INTAKE CHANNEL AND INTAKE STRUCTURE</u>	
a. Approach Channel	
Slope Conditions	Not applicable
Bottom Conditions	Not visible beneath lake surface
Rock Slides or Falls	None
Log Boom	
Debris	
Condition of Concrete Lining	
Drains or Weep Holes	None
b. Intake Structure	
Condition of Concrete	
Stop Logs and Slots	2 inches wide, 3 feet deep eroded near crest of spillway
Stoplog Support Holes in Crest	Rusted and some holes filled with silt

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECKLIST

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH DATE Sept. 7, 1979
 PROJECT FEATURE Control Tower NAME _____
 DISCIPLINE _____ NAME _____

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
<u>OUTLET WORKS - CONTROL TOWER</u>	
a. Concrete and Structural	
General Condition	Fair
Condition of Joints	No indication of movement
Spalling	Several isolated spots up to 3" deep
Visible Reinforcing	Only at one spall
Rusting or Staining of Concrete	Rusting only at imbedded items
Any Seepage or Efflorescence	Several areas on downstream face show wet effloresced areas
Joint Alignment	No indication of movement
Unusual Seepage or Leaks in Gate Chamber	None visible
Cracks	Numerous hairline cracks in downstream face where efflorescing visible
Rusting or Corrosion of Steel	
b. Mechanical and Electrical	
Air Vents	
Float Wells	
Crane Hoist	
Elevator	
Hydraulic System	
Service Gates	North abutment gate in poor condition; gate inoperable due to bent shaft and spring rack gear
Emergency Gates	South abutment gate in fair condition; gate mechanism has no operating handle and mechanism is badly rusted
Lightning Protection System	
Emergency Power System	
Wiring and Lighting System	

PERIODIC INSPECTION CHECKLIST

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH DATE Sept. 7, 1979

PROJECT FEATURE Outlet Works - Spillway Weir NAME _____
and Discharge Channel

DISCIPLINE _____ NAME _____

AREA EVALUATED	CONDITION
<u>OUTLET WORKS - SPILLWAY WEIR, APPROACH</u> <u>AND DISCHARGE CHANNELS</u>	
a. Approach Channel General Condition Loose Rock Overhanging Channel Trees Overhanging Channel Floor of Approach Channel	
b. Weir and Training Walls General Condition of Concrete Rust or Staining Spalling Any Visible Reinforcing Any Seepage or Efflorescence Drain Holes	Fair - surface eroded with loss of surface laitance None visible Two isolated areas where sloped face is spalled up to 2" None None visible on weir - several areas on end training walls None visible
c. Discharge Channel General Condition Loose Rock Overhanging Channel Trees Overhanging Channel Floor of Channel Other Obstructions	Right training wall - surface erosion where in contact with water. Base of wall undermined 3" - 4"

PROJECT Badger Pond Dam, NH

DATE Sept. 7, 1979

PROJECT FEATURE Reservoir

NAME K. Stuart

AREA EVALUATED	REMARKS
Stability of Shoreline	Good
Sedimentation	Not visible
Changes in Watershed Runoff Potential	None
Upstream Hazards	None
Downstream Hazards	State Route 106, Hurricane Road, Belmont proper, State Route 140
Alert Facilities	None posted
Hydrometeorological Gages	None
Operational & Maintenance Regulations	None posted

APPENDIX B
ENGINEERING DATA

M E M O

Date: September 10, 1979

To: Vernon A. Knowlton,
Chief Engineer

From: Ken Stern,
Water Resources Engineer

Subject: Badger Pond, No. 21.02, Belmont

*Handed In C.E. Report
MSK*

On September 7, 1979 I accompanied the Anderson-Nichols' inspection team.

The dam appears to be in good to fair condition. The dam appears stable but the original concrete workmanship was fair. Considering the fair starting condition the concrete has done reasonably well. The left abutment gate structure has one cold joint which has spalled and an area of efflorescence and spalling.

Vandals have partially blocked the outlet penstock at the left abutment with stones. These should not affect the pond drain function of this gate.

The old gate in the right abutment is inoperable. There is very minor seepage through it. There is an area downstream of the right stone and concrete retaining wall which is wet and rust colored. This area may be seepage or groundwater. There was no flow at the time of inspection.

The right earth dike is overgrown with trees. There are some trees growing near the stonework of the whole structure.

The extreme right retaining wall is in fair to poor condition. It has leaned towards the impoundment opening a one inch joint at the construction joint at the juncture with the gravity section abutment wall. The extreme right wall is also spalled at the water line.

Rusted flashboard pins 2 1/2" in diameter were found at the downstream toe.

The dam appears to be stable and our action can wait until the report is received.

KS:paf

Ken

NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER RESOURCES BOARD

INSPECTION REPORT

Town: Belmont Dam Number: 21.02
Name of Dam, Stream and/or Water Body: Belmont Pond
Owner: ~~John H. Roberts~~ ^{SOLD TO} PASCOE ROBERTS OF Telephone Number: 726-8988
Mailing Address: Belmont, N.H. 03228
Max. Height of Dam: 19 ft Pond Area: 1.000 Length of Dam: 150'
FOUNDATION: Concrete

OUTLET WORKS: overflow spillway and gate section.
3' ϕ Pond stream 1.5 x 1.5'

ABUTMENTS: Concrete
one minor crack at the rt abutment

EMBANKMENT: Earth

SPILLWAY: Length: 45' Freeboard: 4.5 ft

SEEPAGE: Location, estimated quantity, etc.

Changes Since Construction or Last Inspection:

None

Tail Water Conditions:

Fair Free flow

Overall Condition of Dam: Good

Contact With Owner: No

Date of Inspection: 5/24/78 Suggested Reinspection Date 1979

Class of Dam: Menace

Signature Arthur J. [unclear]

Date 5/24/78

COMMENTS:

1) Some erosion of concrete and
a crack at right abutment to be
repaired.

From Right Abutment
5/24/78



State of New Hampshire

WATER RESOURCES BOARD

37 Pleasant Street
Concord, N.H. 03301

TELEPHONE 271-0400

May 25, 1978

Mr. James Locke
Drawer E
Campton, New Hampshire 03228

Dear Sir:

Under the provisions of RSA Chapter 482, Sections 8 through 15, copy enclosed, on May 24, 1978, an engineer of the Water Resources Board inspected your dam in Belmont. This Dam, No. 21.02, is classified in the files of this Office as a menace structure and as such must be maintained in a manner not to endanger public safety nor become a dam in disrepair.

As a result of this inspection it was noted that an item of maintenance was in need of attention:

Some erosion of concrete and a crack at right abutment to be repaired.

Because this dam is classified as a menace structure, we require that you send us a proposed schedule of repairs. The actual work does not have to begin until the weather is better, but we need this schedule within thirty (30) days.

If you have any questions, please contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,

George McGee, Sr.

George M. McGee, Sr.,
Chairman

GMN:paf
Enc.

No. 14-523

RECEIPT FOR CERTIFIED MAIL—30 (plus postage)

SENT TO		POSTAGE OR DATE
STREET AND NO.		
P.O. STATE AND ZIP CODE		
OPTIONAL SERVICES FOR ADDITIONAL FEES		
RETURN	1. Shows to whom and date delivered	15c
RECEIPT	With delivery to addressee only	65c
SERVICES	2. Shows to whom, date and where delivered	35c
	With delivery to addressee only	85c
DELIVER TO ADDRESSEE ONLY		50c
SPECIAL DELIVERY (extra fee required)		
PS Form 3800 NO INSURANCE COVERAGE PROVIDED— (See other side)		
Apr. 1971 NOT FOR INTERNATIONAL MAIL GPO 1972 O-480-743		

27, 1976

Mr. Pascoe Roberts
Main Street
Campton, N. H. 03223

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Under the provisions of RSA Chapter 482, Sections 8 through 15, copy enclosed, on October 3, 1974, an engineer of the Water Resources Board inspected your dam on Badger Pond in Belmont. This Dam #21.02 is classified in the files of this office as a menace structure and as such must be maintained in a manner not to endanger public safety nor become a dam in disrepair.

As a result of this inspection it was noted that some of the concrete on the left side (as looking downstream) of the spillway is eroded. This shall be repaired to protect the safety of the structure.

Because this structure is classified as a menace structure, we require that you send us a proposed schedule of repairs within thirty (30) days. This work should be started as soon as weather permits.

If you have any questions, please contact us at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

George M. McGee, Sr.
Chairman

B-6

GMM/SCB:L

Enc.

cc: Board of Selectmen
Belmont N H

N. H. WATER RESOURCES BOARD
Concord, N. H. 03301

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT FORM

Town: Belmont Dam Number: 21.02
Inspected by: SCB Date: 3 Oct 19 74
Local name of dam or water body: _____
Owner: _____ Address: _____
Owner was was not interviewed during inspection.
Drainage Area: _____ sq. mi. Stream: _____
Pond Area: _____ Acre, Storage _____ Ac-Ft. Max. Head _____ Ft.
Foundation: Type _____, Seepage present at toe - Yes/No, No
Spillway: Type Overflow, Freeboard over perm. crest: _____,
Width _____, Flashboard height _____,
Max. Capacity _____ c.f.s.
Embankment: Type _____, Cover _____ Width _____,
Upstream slope _____ to 1; Downstream slope _____ to 1
Abutments: Type Concrete, Condition: Good, Fair, Poor
Gates or Pond Drain: Size 3' dia Capacity _____ Type Rollway H. T Type 3012
Lifting apparatus _____ Operational condition ?
Pond Drain 1.5' x 1.5' " " No
Changes since construction or last inspection: _____

Downstream development: _____
This dam would would not be a menace if it failed.
Suggested reinspection date: _____
Remarks: Some Concrete erosion on spillway

cond Good

NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER CONTROL COMMISSION
DATA ON DAMS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

LOCATION

Town Belmont : County Sullivan
Stream Ligget River
Basin-Primary Merrimack R. : Secondary Merrimack R.
Local Name Baden Dam
Coordinates—Lat. 43° 25' 13.000" : Long. 71° 25' 14.000"

STATE NO. 21-02

GENERAL DATA

Drainage area: Controlled.....Sq. Mi.: Uncontrolled..... Sq. Mi.: Total 15.77 Sq. Mi.
Overall length of dam 263.6 ft.: Date of Construction
Height: Stream bed to highest elev. 19 ft.: Max. Structure 16' ft.
Cost—Dam: Reservoir

DESCRIPTION

Waste Gates

Type
Number 1 : Size 1.5 ft. high x 1.5 ft. wide
Elevation Invert: Total Area 2.25 sq. ft.
Hoist

Waste Gates Conduit

Number: Materials
Size ft.: Length.....ft.: Area sq. ft.

Embankment

Type
Height—Max. ft.: Min. ft.
Top—Width: Elev. ft.
Slopes—Upstream on: Downstream on
Length—Right of Spillway: Left of Spillway

Spillway

Materials of Construction
Length—Total 45' ft.: Net ft.
Height of permanent section—Max. 16' ft.: Min. ft.
Flashboards—Type: Height ft.
Elevation—Permanent Crest: Top of Flashboard
Flood Capacity cfs.: cfs/sq. mi.

Abutments

Materials:
Freeboard: Max. 3' ft.: Min. ft.

Headworks to Power Devel.—(See "Data on Power Development")

OWNER Belmont Housing Co.

REMARKS

NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER CONTROL COMMISSION
DATA ON DAMS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

LOCATION

STATE NO. 21.02

Town Belmont : County Belknap
Stream Tioga River
Basin-Primary Merrimack RR : Secondary Winnepesaukee RR
Local Name Badger Reservoir
Coordinates—Lat. 43 25' + 13,000 : Long. 71 25' + 14,000

GENERAL DATA

Drainage area: Controlled.....Sq. Mi.: Uncontrolled.....Sq. Mi.: Total 15.99 Sq. Mi.
Overall length of dam 263.6 ft.: Date of Construction 1934
Height: Stream bed to highest elev. 18.65 ft.: Max. Structure 12.82 ft.
Cost—Dam : Reservoir

DESCRIPTION Rock fill concrete face

Waste Gates

Type
Number : Size ft. high x ft. wide
Elevation Invert : Total Area 2.05 sq. ft.
Hoist

Waste Gates Conduit

Number : Materials
Size ft.: Length ft.: Area sq. ft.

Embankment

Type
Height—Max. ft.: Min. ft.
Top—Width : Elev. ft.
Slopes—Upstream on : Downstream on
Length—Right of Spillway : Left of Spillway

Spillway

Materials of Construction Timber
Length—Total ft.: Net 45 ft.
Height of permanent section—Max. 14.58 ft.: Min. ft.
Flashboards—Type : Height 3' ft.
Elevation—Permanent Crest 732 : Top of Flashboard
Flood Capacity 655-820 cfs.: 51.2 51.2 cfs/sq. mi.

Abutments

Materials:
Freeboard: Max. ft.: Min. 3 ft.

Headworks to Power Devel.—(See "Data on Power Development")

OWNER Belmont Hoisier Co. Belmont N.H.

REMARKS Menace if in disrepair

**NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER CONTROL COMMISSION
DATA ON RESERVOIRS & PONDS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE**

LOCATIONAT DAM NO. 21.02Town Belmont : County BelknapStream Tiooga RiverBasin—Primary Merrimack R. : Secondary Belmont R. Winnipisaukee R.

Local Name

DRAINAGE AREAControlled Sq. Mi.: Uncontrolled Sq. Mi.: Total 15.99 15.99 Sq. Mi.**ELEVATION vs. WATER SURFACE AREA vs. VOLUME**


Point	Head Feet	Surface Area Acres	Volume Acre Ft.
(1) Max. Flood Height			
(2) Top of Flashboards			
(3) Permanent Crest		<u>14</u>	<u>179.5</u> <u>79.5</u>
(4) Normal Drawdown			
(5) Max. Drawdown			
(6) Original Pond	<u>600 USGS</u>		

Base Used: Coef. to change to U.S.G.S. Base


RESERVOIR CAPACITY

	Total Volume	Useable Volume
Drawdown	ft.	ft.
Volume	ac. ft.	ac. ft.
Acre ft. per sq. mi.		
Inches per sq. mi.		

USE OF WATER ConservationOWNER Belmont Mills Belmont N.H. Hosier Co. 7/26/39**REMARKS**Tabulation By C.F.O. Date 7/26/39




SECTION A-A



ELEVATION B-B


NOT



NOTE ALL ELEVATIONS ARE RELATIVE TO
ASSUMED SPILLWAY CREST 577.0 M.S.L.
(N.G.V.D.).

Anderson-Nichols & Co., Inc. CONCORD NEW HAMPSHIRE		US ARMY ENGINEER DIV. NEW ENGLAND CORPS OF ENGINEERS WALTHAM, MA	
NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED. DAMS			
BADGER POND DAM			
TIOGA RIVER		NEW HAMPSHIRE	
		SCALE NOT TO SCALE	
		DATE NOVEMBER 1979	

APPENDIX C
PHOTOGRAPHS




Anderson - Nichols & Co., Inc		U S ARMY ENGINEER DIV NEW ENGLAND	
CONCORD		CORPS OF ENGINEERS	
NEW HAMPSHIRE		WALTHAM, MA.	
NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF NON-FED.DAMS			
PHOTO INDEX			
TIOGA RIVER		NEW HAMPSHIRE	
		SCALE: NOT TO SCALE	
		DATE: NOVEMBER 1979	



September 7, 1979
Figure 2 - Looking at upstream face of dam from north abutment.



September 7, 1979
Figure 3 - View of downstream edge of spillway section.



September 7, 1979
Figure 4 - Looking at the concrete spillway and south abutment.



September 7, 1979
Figure 5 - View of north abutment vertical training wall.




September 7, 1979
Figure 6 - View showing downstream face of north abutment.




September 7, 1979
Figure 7 - Looking at vertical upstream face of north abutment.



September 7, 1979
Figure 8 - Downstream face of low-level outlet under
north abutment.



September 7, 1979
Figure 9 - North abutment gate operating mechanism
for low-level outlet.



September 7, 1979
 Figure 10 - Looking along crest of south abutment to
 control tower, spillway and north abutment.



September 7, 1979
 Figure 11 - View of 36-inch diameter steel low-level
 outlet pipe and south abutment control tower.



September 7, 1979
Figure 12 - Closeup view of 36" steel low-level outlet at south abutment.



September 7, 1979
Figure 13 - View of upstream face of south abutment and upstream face of control tower.




September 7, 1979
Figure 14 - Looking upstream at Badger Pond from crest
of dam.



September 7, 1979
Figure 15 - Looking downstream at channel from crest
of dam.

APPENDIX D
HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC COMPUTATIONS



NATIONAL PROGRAM OF INSPECTION OF
NON-FED DAMS

BADGER POND DAM
BELMONT, NEW HAMPSHIRE
REGIONAL VICINITY MAP
NOVEMBER 1979

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

ANDERSON-NICHOLS & CO., INC

CONCORD, NH

MAP BASED ON U.S.G.S. 15 MINUTE QUADRANGLE
SHEET. GILMANTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1957

JOB NO. 3273-13

BADGER POND DAM

SQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
 4 IN. SCALE

BREACH ANALYSIS (CONDITION #1)

DETERMINE DEGREE OF DOWNSTREAM HAZARD.

ASSUME WATER SURFACE AT TOP OF DAM = 583.0'

ASSUME MAXIMUM BREACH HEIGHT = 21.0'

$$Q_p = \frac{8}{27} W_b \sqrt{g} y_o^{3/2}$$

WHERE W_b = BREACH WIDTH

$$g = 32.2 \text{ FT/SEC}^2$$

$$y_o = 21.0'$$

@ BADGER POND DAM $W_b = 50' *$

$$Q_p = \frac{8}{27} (50) \sqrt{32.2} (21)^{3/2}$$

$$Q_p = 8090$$

* THE BREACH WIDTH WAS DETERMINED USING A FRACTION
 OF THE DAM WIDTH. THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER FELT THAT
 A BREACH COULD OCCUR ALONG THE SOUTH PORTION OF THE
 SPILLWAY AND SOUTH ABUTMENT.

JOB NO.

BADGER POND DAM

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

BREACH ANALYSIS (CONT.)TOTAL BREACH $Q = Q_p + \text{ADDITIONAL SPILLWAY DISCHARGE}$ ADDITIONAL SPILLWAY DISCHARGE: DISCHARGE OVER SPILLWAY OTHER
THAN BREACHED AREA

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

$$= Q = 2.7(80)(6)^{3/2}$$

$$= Q = 3174 \text{ cfs}$$

$$\text{TOTAL BREACH } Q = 8090 + 3174 = 11264 \text{ cfs}$$

$$\text{ANTECEDENT DISCHARGE} = 4762 \text{ cfs}^2$$

Δ FROM BADGER POND DAM RATING CURVE

JOB NO. _____

SQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 ..
1/4 IN. SCALEDOWNSTREAM HAZARD

APPROXIMATELY 5000 FEET DOWNSTREAM OF BADGER POND DAM IS THE TOWN OF BELMONT, N.H. THE OUTLET OF BADGER POND DAM IS THE TIOGA RIVER. THE TIOGA RIVER EXITS BADGER POND FLOWS OVER THE DAM AND APPROXIMATELY 600 FEET DOWNSTREAM FLOWS UNDER STATE ROUTE 106. APPROXIMATELY 3500 FEET DOWNSTREAM OF THIS CULVERT IS THE SECOND ROAD CROSSING NAMED HURRICANE ROAD IN BELMONT PROPER. APPROXIMATELY 1000 FEET DOWNSTREAM OF HURRICANE ROAD IS THE THIRD AND FINAL ROAD CROSSING NAMED STATE ROUTE 140. APPROXIMATELY 2500 FEET DOWNSTREAM OF THIS CROSSING THE TIOGA JOINS PUMPING STATION BROOK. A PROFILE OF THE TIOGA RIVER SHOWING THE LOCATION OF THE ABOVE CULVERTS AND THE LOCATION OF CROSS SECTIONS REPRESENTING THE REACHES IS SHOWN ON PAGE ____.

WITHIN REACH #2 (FROM STATE ROUTE 106 TO HURRICANE

JOB NO. _____

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37


38

39

DOWNSTREAM HAZARD (CONT.)

ROAD) THE TIOGA RIVER IS SPANNED BY A SMALL DAM. THIS STRUCTURE IS SO SMALL THAT ITS IMPOUNDMENT WILL HAVE A NEGLIGIBLE EFFECT ON RETARDING THE FLOOD WAVE FROM A BREACH OF BADGER POND DAM. THIS SMALL DAM IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 600' UPSTREAM OF THE HURRICANE ROAD CULVERT AND IS UNNAMED ON THE U.S.G.S. QUADRANGLE. THE HYDRAULIC CHARACTERISTICS WERE NOT ANALYZED IN COMPUTING THE DOWNSTREAM HAZARD OF BADGER POND DAM.

D-5



JOB NO. 3273-13

BADGER POND DAM

SQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
1/4 IN. SCALEANALYSES USING THE "PET" COMPUTER

ANDERSON-NICHOLS USES THE COMMODORE "PET" COMPUTER FOR ANALYSES OF WEIR STRUCTURES AND REPRESENTATIVE CROSS-SECTIONS OF STREAM REACHES. THESE ANALYSES REQUIRE THE INPUT IN THE FORM OF A SERIES OF POINTS AND THE CORRESPONDING "N" VALUE OR "C" VALUE TO DETERMINE Q VS. STAGE. THE PROGRAM FOR DETERMINING Q VS. STAGE USES THE MANNING'S FORMULA :

$$Q = K(A)(R)^{2/3}$$

$$\text{WHERE } K = \frac{1.49}{n} (s)^{1/2}$$

n = FRICTION VALUE OF CROSS-SECTION

s = SLOPE OF REACH

A AREA OF CROSS SECTION

R = HYDRAULIC RADIUS

D-7

JOB NO. 3273-13

BADGER POND DAM

QUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
/4 IN. SCALEANALYSES USING THE "PET"

THE FIRST ANALYSIS WAS PERFORMED ON SECTION #1
(THE REPRESENTATIVE SECTION IN REACH #1 ON THE TIOGA
RIVER. REACH #1 IS FROM BADGER POND DAM TO STATE RTE. 106)

<u>STAGE</u>	<u>Q</u>
3	430
6	1069
9	3806
12	9874
15	20305
18	36028
21	53392

THE SECOND ANALYSIS WAS PERFORMED ON SECTION #2 (THE
REPRESENTATIVE SECTION IN REACH #2 ON THE TIOGA RIVER.
REACH #2 IS FROM STATE RTE. 106 TO HURRICANE ROAD)

<u>STAGE</u>	<u>Q</u>
3	272
6	724
9	2382
12	5942
15	11994
18	21038
21	33557
24	41705

JOB NO. 3273-13


BADGER PONU DAM


SQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 3
1/4 IN. SCALEANALYSES USING THE "PET"

THE THIRD ANALYSIS WAS PERFORMED ON SECTION #3 (THE
REPRESENTATIVE SECTION IN REACH #3 ON THE TIOGA RIVER.
REACH #3 IS FROM HURRICANE ROAD TO STATE RTE. 140)

<u>STAGE</u>	<u>Q</u>
1.9	169
3.8	526
5.7	875
7.6	2972
9.5	6295
11.4	12364
13.3	20930
15.2	32295
17.1	46749
19.0	64626

D-9





JOB NO. _____

SQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
4 IN. SCALESTATE ROUTE 106 CONCRETE BOX CULVERT

DETERMINE CULVERT CAPACITY AT VARIOUS STAGES. CULVERT

FLOW UNTIL STAGE 6.0' (USE MANNING'S EQUATION $Q = K(A)(R)^{2/3}$ WHERE $K = \frac{1.49}{n} (S)^{1/2}$, "n" VALUE OF CULVERT = 0.025, S SLOPE

THROUGH CULVERT = .017, A: AREA, R: HYDRAULIC RADIUS) PRESSURE

FLOW THROUGH CULVERT FROM STAGE 6.0' UNTIL 9.5' (USE ORIFICE

EQUATION $Q = C_d \sqrt{2gH}$, WHERE C: COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE, $g = 32.2 \text{ FT/SEC}^2$, H: HEAD MEASURED FROM CENTER OF PRESSURE FLOW

AND WEIR FLOW FROM STAGE 9.5' AND UP (USE ORIFICE

EQUATION ABOVE AND WEIR EQUATION $Q = CLH^{3/2}$ WHEREC: WEIR COEFFICIENT OVER ROAD, L: LENGTH OF WEIR, H HEAD
MEASURED FROM TOP OF WEIR).

CULVERT SIZE 6'(H) X 30'(W)

STAGE VS. Q CHART FOLLOWS.

Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc.

Subject _____

 Sheet No. 12 of _____
 Date _____
 Computed _____
 Checked _____

JOB NO. _____

 SQUARES
 1/4 IN. SCALE


0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39


STATE ROUTE 106 COMPLETE BOX CULVERT (CONT.)


STAGE	Q _{ORIFICE}	Q _{W.P.}	Q _{TOTAL}	COMMENTS
3	1288		1288	
6	2576		2576	
9.5	2946		2946	
12	3467	1542	5009	L-150
15	4003	5031	9034	L-150
18	4476	4665	9141	L-150


D-13



D-14







JOB NO. _____

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30


HURRICANE ROAD PIPE ARCH

DETERMINE CULVERT CAPACITY AT VARIOUS STAGES. PIPE FLOW UNTIL
STAGE 10.7. AT 10.8 - 12.4, LOW FLOW THROUGH THE CULVERT AND WEIR
FLOW OVER HURRICANE ROAD. AT 12.5 - 16.0 PRESSURE FLOW THROUGH
THE CULVERT AND WEIR FLOW OVER HURRICANE ROAD.

STAGE (HW)	RW/D	Q_{CULVERT}	Q_{WEIR}	Q_{TOTAL}	COMMENTS
7	0.56	155		155	
9	0.71	1100		1100	
10.7	0.86	1400		1400	
10.8	0.86	1410	9	1419	L = 110'
12	0.96	1600	1081	2681	L = 270'
12.5	1.00	1740	1858	3598	L = 285'
14	1.12	2000	5422	7422	L = 335'
15	1.20	2080	8065	10145	L = 335'
16	1.28	2300	11036	13336	L = 335'

CULVERT 12.5'D X 18.5'B, ROAD ELEV. = 532.7 C-2.7 (WEIR)
CULVERT CAPACITY FROM "HANDBOOK OF STEEL DRAINAGE & HIGHWAY
CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTS" NOMOGRAPH P. 165

D-18



BRIDGE FOND VAM
CONCRETE WATER
HURRICANE ROAD LAURET
THE FACE

BREACH CONDITION #1 (1224 CS)

BREACH CONDITION #2 (4063 CS)

ANTECEDENT CONDITION #1 (4762 CS)

ANTECEDENT CONDITION #2
(STAGE 12.0 IN REAR)

HURRICANE ROAD

ELEV.
IN
FEET
(max)

300


200


DISTANCE IN FEET

100

0

7-19





22-22

JOB NO. _____

 SQUARES
 1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

STATE ROUTE 140 CONCRETE BOX CULVERT

DETERMINE CULVERT CAPACITY AT VARIOUS STAGES CULVERT FLOW

UNTIL STAGE 12.0' (USE MANNING'S EQUATION $Q = K(A)(R)^{2/3}$)

WHERE $K = \frac{1.49}{n} (S)^{1/2}$, $n = .025$, S = SLOPE THROUGH CULVERT = .010.

A = AREA, R = HYDRAULIC RADIUS). PRESSURE FLOW THROUGH CULVERT

FROM STAGE 12.0' UNTIL 13.4' (USE ORIFICE EQUATION $Q = C_d A \sqrt{2gh}$,

WHERE C_d = COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE, $g = 32.2 \text{ ft/sec}^2$, H = HEAD

MEASURED FROM CENTROID) PRESSURE FLOW AND WEIR FLOW FROM

STAGE 13.4' AND UP (USE ORIFICE EQUATION AND WEIR EQUATION

$Q = C_d L H^{3/2}$ WHERE C_d = COEFFICIENT OF DISCHARGE, L = LENGTH OF

WEIR, H = HEAD MEASURED FROM TOP OF WEIR)

CULVERT SIZE = 12' (H) X 36" (W)

STAGE 16.5' (MINOR FLOW)

Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc.

Subject _____

Sheet No. 23 of _____

Date _____

Computed LS

Checked W


JOB NO.


QUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30
4 IN. SCALE

STATE ROUTE 140 CONCRETE BOX CULVERT (CONT)

STAGE	Q _{ORIFICE}	Q _{WEIR}	Q _{TOTAL}	COMMENTS
3	1384		1384	
6	3984		3984	
9.5	7765		7765	
12	7967		7967	
16	7796	1635	9431	L=150
20	9224	6613	15837	L=150

D-24





D-26

JOB NO. 8273-13BADGER POND DAMSQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

BREACH ANALYSIS (CONDITION #2)

UNDER BREACH ANALYSIS CONDITION #1 IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE INCREASE IN FLOOD STAGE FROM ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS TO BREACH CONDITIONS DOES NOT INCREASE THE DEGREE OF HAZARD DOWNSTREAM. UNDER CONDITION #1, THE ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS ALONE ENDANGER SEVEN HOMES IN THE TOWN OF BELMONT, NH.

UNDER BREACH ANALYSIS CONDITION #2, A DIFFERENT SET OF FLOOD CONDITIONS WILL EXIST. WITH THIS ANALYSIS IT IS ASSUMED THAT THE ANTECEDENT CONDITIONS WILL ALLOW FLOW OVER THE DAM APPROXIMATELY EQUAL TO THAT ON THE INSPECTION DATE. THE ANTECEDENT STAGE AT THE DOWNSTREAM COVERTS AND REACHES SHALL BE 0.5 FOOT. THE PEAK FAILURE OUTFLOW (Q_p) FOR CONDITION #2 FOLLOWS.

JOB NO. 3273-13BADGER POND DAMSQUARES 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29
1/4 IN. SCALEBREACH ANALYSIS (CONDITION #2) CONT.

ASSUME WATER SURFACE AT TOP OF SPILLWAY = 577.0'

ASSUME MAXIMUM BREACH HEIGHT = 15.0'

$$Q_p = 8/27 W_b \sqrt{g} y_o^{3/2}$$

WHERE W_b = BREACH WIDTH

$$g = 32.2 \text{ FT/SEC}^2$$

$$y_o = 15.0'$$

@ BADGER POND DAM $W_b = 50'$

$$Q_p = 8/27 (50) \sqrt{32.2} (15)^{3/2}$$

$$Q_p = 4883 \text{ CFS}$$

TOTAL BREACH $Q = 4883 \text{ CFS}$ ANTECEDENT Q @ DAM = 0 CFS

D-28

JOB NO. _____

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

BREACH ANALYSIS SUMMARY

WITH AN INCREASED STAGE AS THE RESULT OF A DAM BREACH
AT BADGER POND DAM, THE FOLLOWING STRUCTURES ARE AFFECTED.

CONDITION #1

ON STATE ROUTE 106 1 RESIDENCE ON DOWNSTREAM SIDE OF ROAD
ADJACENT TO HURRICANE ROAD CULVERT 4 RESIDENCES, 1 LAUNDRY
ON UPSTREAM SIDE OF CULVERT AND 1 RESIDENCE,
1 CHURCH ON DOWNSTREAM OF CULVERT
ADJACENT TO STATE ROUTE 140 2 RESIDENCES

CONDITION #2

ON STATE ROUTE 106 1 RESIDENCE ON DOWNSTREAM SIDE OF ROAD
ADJACENT TO HURRICANE ROAD CULVERT 2 RESIDENCES, 1 LAUNDRY
ON UPSTREAM SIDE OF CULVERT AND 1 RESIDENCE,
1 CHURCH ON DOWNSTREAM OF CULVERT.
ADJACENT TO STATE ROUTE 140 1 RESIDENCE

D-29

JOB NO. 3273

BADGER POND DAM

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS

DRAINAGE AREA: 16 SQUARE MILES

HAZARD CLASSIFICATION: HIGH

TEST FLOOD RANGE: $\frac{1}{2}$ PMF $\Rightarrow$ PMF

CHOSEN TEST FLOOD: PMF

STEP 1. DETERMINE PEAK INFLOW Q_p , USING "PRELIMINARY GUIDANCE FOR ESTIMATING MAXIMUM PROBABLE DISCHARGES IN PHASE I DAM SAFETY INVESTIGATIONS, MARCH, 1976". THE PMF WILL BE CALCULATED USING A COMBINED VALUE. THE PMF COMBINES THE OUTFLOW FROM SARGENT LAKE DAM PLUS THE ADDITIONAL DISCHARGE FROM THE BADGER POND DAM SUB-DRAINAGE AREA. THE SLOPE FOR THE SUB-DRAINAGE AREA IS 175 FT/MI; THE "MOUNTAINOUS CURVE" WILL BE USED. THE DRAINAGE AREA OF THE SUB-AREA IS

JOB NO. _____

 SQUARES
 1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS (CONT.)

13.2 SQUARE MILES. USING THESE VALUES A 1900 CSM RATE

IS DETERMINED FOR THE SUB AREA THE PMF FOR THE SUB-AREA =

$13.2 (1900) = 25080$ CFS. OUTFLOW FROM SARGENT LAKE = 5850 CFS

PEAK INFLOW (Q_p) = 30930, STAGE = 590.6^a

NORMAL STORAGE = 180 ACRE-FT, STAGE = 577.0, SURFACE AREA = 20 ACRES

STAGE 580.0 = SURFACE AREA = 45 ACRES

STAGE 600.0 = SURFACE AREA = 85 ACRES

USING THE "FRUSTUM OF THE PYRAMID" TO FIND STORAGE

ESTIMATES FOR THESE ADDITIONAL POINTS


$$V = \frac{1}{3} H (b_1 + b_2 + \sqrt{b_1 b_2})$$


$$V = \frac{1}{3} 3 (20 + 45 + \sqrt{20 \cdot 45})$$

$$V = 98.5 \text{ ACRE-FT}$$

$$\text{@ STAGE 580.0 STORAGE} = 98.5 + 180 = 278.5 \approx 280 \text{ ACRE-FT.}$$

^a FROM BADGER POND DAM RATING CURVE





D-33

JOB NO.

SQUARES
4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS (CONT.)

$$V = \frac{1}{3} H (b_1 + b_2 + \sqrt{b_1 b_2})$$

$$V = \frac{1}{3} (20) (45 + 85 + \sqrt{45 \cdot 85})$$

$$V = 1279.0 \text{ SAY } 1280 \text{ ACRE FEET}$$

$$\text{@ STAGE } 600.0 \text{ STORAGE} = 1280 + 280 = 1560 \text{ ACRE-FT.}$$

$$1010 - 180 = 830 \text{ ACRE-FT.}$$

$$830 \text{ AC-FT} \cdot \frac{1}{16 \text{ MI}^2} \cdot \frac{1 \text{ MI}^2}{640 \text{ AC-FT}} \cdot \frac{12 \text{ IN}}{\text{FT}} = 0.97 \text{ INCH RUNOFF} = \text{STOR } 1$$

$$Q_{P_2} = Q_{P_1} \left(1 - \frac{\text{STOR } 1}{19} \right) = 30930 \left(1 - \frac{0.97}{19} \right)$$

$$Q_{P_2} = 29350 \text{ CFS}$$

DETERMINE SURCHARGE HEIGHT TO PASS Q_{P_2} OF 29350 Q_{P_2} DISCHARGE DETERMINES ELEVATION 590.3

$$\text{@ } 590.3 \text{ STORAGE} = 980 \text{ ACRE FEET}$$

$$980 - 180 = 800 \text{ ACRE-FT.}$$

$$800 \text{ AC-FT} \cdot \frac{1}{16 \text{ MI}^2} \cdot \frac{1 \text{ MI}^2}{640 \text{ AC-FT}} \cdot \frac{12 \text{ IN}}{\text{FT}} = 0.91 \text{ INCH RUNOFF} = \text{STOR } 2$$

D-34

JOB NO. _____

SQUARES
1/4 IN. SCALE

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

TEST FLOOD ANALYSIS (CONT.)

AVERAGE STOR 1 & STOR 2

STOR 1 = 0.97

STOR 2 = 0.94

AVERAGE = 0.955" OR 0.08 FT. RUNOFF

$$0.08 \text{ FT} \cdot \frac{16 \text{ MI}^2}{1} \cdot \frac{640 \text{ AC}}{\text{MI}^2} = 819 \text{ ACRE-Feet}$$

$$819 \text{ AC-FT} + 180 \text{ AC-FT} = 999 \text{ AC-FT}$$

$$999 \text{ AC-FT OF STORAGE} \Rightarrow 590.5$$

TEST FLOOD = PMF


TEST FLOOD DISCHARGE = 30500 CFS

TEST FLOOD ELEVATION = 590.5'

TOP OF DAM = 583.0 THEREFORE DAM EMBANKMENT WOULD
BE OVERTOPPED BY ABOUT 7.5 FEET DURING TEST FLOOD
CONDITIONS.

THE BRILLWAY CAPACITY AT TEST FLOOD CONDITIONS = 16071 CFS

D-35



BARGE POND DAM
STORAGE-ELEVATION

605

595

ELEV.
IN
FEET

535

535

0

400

800

1200

1600

STORAGE IN ACRE FEET

J-36

APPENDIX E
INFORMATION AS
CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL
INVENTORY OF DAMS

NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME

DATE
FILMED
-8