-- ANY LAKE DAM--

PHASE I INSPECTION / EVALUATION REPORT



Dam Name:Any Lake DamNational ID No.:MA11111Owner:MA Dept of Conservation ResearchTown:Hindsdale, MassachusettsConsultant:Eng. Corp., Inc.Date of Inspection:June 1, 2021



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Phase I Inspection / Evaluation Report details the inspection and evaluation of Any Lake Dam located in Hinsdale, Massachusetts. The inspection was performed on June 1, 2021 by Eng Corp,Inc. of Boston, Massachusetts.

Any Lake Dam is classified as a **Large**, **High Hazard Potential** (**Class I**) dam. The dam was found tobe in **Poor** condition with the following major deficiencies:

- The existing spillway does not have the adequate hydraulic capacity to safely pass the spillway design flood (1/2 Probable Maximum Flood) without overtopping the earth embankment.
- The downstream slope of the embankment may be susceptible to erosion or a downstream failure considering the steepness of the slope and loose/soft zones identified from previously conducted subsurface explorations.
- Seepage along the downstream toe of the embankment was observed when the lake was at the winter pool elevation.
- Heavily wooded areas were observed on the left and right abutments, the embankment left of the spillway, and the areas along the downstream toe.
- The upstream slope contains large scarps over most of the embankment length.

There have been no dam safety related modifications at the dam since the last inspection on October 31, 2001.

Eng Corp recommends the following actions be taken to address the major deficiencies observed or foundat the dam during this inspection and evaluation:

- Increase the hydraulic capacity of the spillway to safely pass the spillway design flood without overtopping the earth embankment dam.
- Modify the embankment to increase the stability and control seepage. Recommended modifications include clearing and grubbing woody vegetation, repairing the large scarps on the upstream slope, construct a drainage blanket and toe drain, and flatten the downstream slope to 3H:1V.
- Lengthen the low-level outlet works, raise the manhole for the valve at the embankment crest, and install a new manhole for the valve near the downstream end of the existing outlet pipe.
- Perform a detailed inspection of the low-level outlet pipe and existing outlet pipe intake structure and make any necessary repairs.
- Perform additional modifications and repairs to improve the safety, maintenance, and operation of the dam including: leveling the area downstream of the embankment toe to facilitate mowing, clearing trees from the existing spillway channel, and constructing a timber bridge across the spillway to carry lawn mowing equipment to the left abutment.

Dam Evaluation Summary Detail Sheet

1. NID ID:	MA11111		4. Inspection Date:	June 1, 2021	
2. Dam Name:	Any Lake D	am	5. Last Insp. Date:	June 1, 2019	
3. Dam Location:	Hinsdale, N	IA	6. Next Inspection:	June 1, 2023	
7. Inspector:	Jonathan Q	. Public, P.E.	·	•	
8. Consultant:	Eng Corp, I	nc.			
9. Hazard Code:	High	9a. Is Hazard Code Cha	nge Requested?:	No	
10. Insp. Frequency:	2 Years	11. Overall Physical Cor	ndition of Dam:	POOR	
12. Spillway Capacit	y (% SDF)	50-90% of the SDF			
E1. Design Methodo	logy:	3	E7. Low-Level Discharg	je Capacity:	3
E2. Level of Mainten	ance:	3	E8. Low-Level Outlet P	hysical Condition:	4
E3. Emergency Actio	on Plan:	4	E9. Spillway Design Flo	ood Capacity:	2
E4. Embankment Se	epage:	2	E10. Overall Physical C	ondition of the Dam:	2
E5. Embankment Co	ondition:	2	E11. Estimated Repair	Cost:	\$884,500
E6. Concrete Condit	ion:	5			

Evaluation Description

E1: DESIGN METHODOLOGY

- 1. Unknown Design no design records available
- 2. No design or post-design analyses
- 3. No analyses, but dam features appear suitable
- 4. Design or post design analysis show dam meets most criteria
- 5. State of the art design design records available & dam meets all criteria

E2: LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE

- 1. Dam in disrepair, no evidence of maintenance, no O&M manual
- 2. Dam in poor level of upkeep, very little maintenance, no O&M manual
- 3. Dam in fair level of upkeep, some maintenance and standard procedures
- 4. Adequate level of maintenance and standard procedures
- 5. Dam well maintained, detailed maintenance plan that is executed

E3: EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN

- 1. No plan or idea of what to do in the event of an emergency
- 2. Some idea but no written plan
- 3. No formal plan but well thought out
- 4. Available written plan that needs updating
- 5. Detailed, updated written plan available and filed with MADCR, annual training

E4: SEEPAGE (Embankments, Foundations, & Abutments)

- 1. Severe piping and/or seepage with no monitoring
- 2. Evidence of monitored piping and seepage
- 3. No piping but uncontrolled seepage
- 4. Minor seepage or high volumes of seepage with filtered collection
- 5. No seepage or minor seepage with filtered collection

E5: EMBANKMENT CONDITION (See Note 1)

- 1. Severe erosion and/or large trees
- 2. Significant erosion or significant woody vegetation
- 3. Brush and exposed embankment soils, or moderate erosion
- 4. Unmaintained grass, rodent activity and maintainable erosion

5. Well maintained healthy uniform grass cover E6: CONCRETE CONDITION (See Note 2)

- 1. Major cracks, misalignment, discontinuities causing leaks,
- seepage or stability concerns
- 2. Cracks with misalignment inclusive of transverse cracks with no misalignment but with potential for significant structural degradation
- 3. Significant longitudinal cracking and minor transverse cracking
- 4. Spalling and minor surface cracking
- 5. No apparent deficiencies

E7: LOW-LEVEL OUTLET DISCHARGE CAPACITY

- 1. No low level outlet, no provisions (e.g. pumps, siphons) for emptying pond
- 2. No operable outlet, plans for emptying pond, but no equipment
- 3. Outlet with insufficient drawdown capacity, pumping equipment available
- 4. Operable gate with sufficient drawdown capacity

5. Operable gate with capacity greater than necessary

- E8: LOW-LEVEL OUTLET PHYSICAL CONDITION
 - 1. Outlet inoperative needs replacement, non-existent or inaccessible
 - 2. Outlet inoperative needs repair
 - Outlet operable but needs repair
 - 4. Outlet operable but needs maintenance
 - 5. Outlet and operator operable and well maintained

E9: SPILLWAY DESIGN FLOOD CAPACITY

- 1. 0 50% of the SDF or unknown
- 2. 50-90% of the SDF
- 90 100% of the SDF 3.
- 4. >100% of the SDF with actions required by caretaker (e.g. open outlet)
- 5. >100% of the SDF with no actions required by caretaker

E10: OVERALL PHYSICAL CONDITION OF DAM

- 1. UNSAFE Major structural, operational, and maintenance deficiencies exist under normal operating conditions
- 2. POOR Significant structural, operation and maintenance deficiencies are clearly recognized under normal loading conditions
- 3. FAIR Significant operational and maintenance deficiencies, no structural deficiencies. Potential deficiencies exist under unusual loading conditions that may realistically occur. Can be used when uncertainties exist as to
- 4. SATISFACTORY Minor operational and maintenance deficiencies. Infrequent hydrologic events would probably result In deficiencies.
- GOOD No existing or potential deficiencies recognized. Safe performance is expected under all loading including SDF

Estimation of the total cost to address all identified structural, operational, maintenance deficiencies. Cost shall be developed utilizing standard estimating guides and procedures

Changes/Deviations to Database Information since Last Inspection

- - critical parameters

 - E11: ESTIMATED REPAIR COST

PREFACE

The assessment of the general condition of the dam reported herein was based upon available data and visual inspections. Detailed investigations and analyses involving topographic mapping, subsurfaceinvestigations, testing and detailed computational evaluations were beyond the scope of this report unless reported otherwise.

In reviewing this report, it should be realized that the reported condition of the dam was based on observations of field conditions at the time of inspection, along with data available to the inspection team.

It is critical to note that the condition of the dam depends on numerous and constantly changing internal and external conditions and is evolutionary in nature. It would be incorrect to assume that the reported 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.

Ionathon Q. Public

Jonathon Q. Public, PE Massachusetts License No.: 12345 License Type: Civil Senior Civil EngineerEng Corp, Inc.

> PROFESSION ENGENEERS SEAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECU	JTIVE	SUMMA	ARYi
PREFA	CE		
SECTIO	ON 1		
1.0	DESC	CRIPTIO	N OF PROJECT1
	1.1	General 1.1.1 1.1.2 1.1.3	Authority
	1.2	Descript 1.2.1 1.2.2 1.2.3 1.2.4 1.2.5 1.2.6 1.2.7	tion of Project
	1.3	Pertinen 1.3.1 1.3.2 1.3.3 1.3.4 1.3.5 1.3.6 1.3.7 1.3.8	t Engineering Data
	1.4	Summar	ry Data Table6
SECTIO	ON 2		
2.0	INSP	ECTION	,
	2.1	Visual I 2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.1.4 2.1.5	nspection
	2.2	Caretak	er Interview10
	2.3	Operatio 2.3.1 2.3.2	on and Maintenance Procedures

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

	2.4	Emergency Warning System	12
	2.5	Awareness of Potential Dam Related Safety Hazards at, near, and on Dams	12
	2.6	Hydrologic/Hydraulic Data	13
	2.7	Structural and Seepage Stability2.7.1Embankment Structural Stability2.7.2Structural Stability of Non-Embankment Structures2.7.3Seepage Stability	14 14 15 15
SECTI	ON 3		16
3.0	ASSE	SSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
	3.1	Assessments	16
	3.2	Studies and Analyses	17
	3.3	Recurrent Maintenance Recommendations.	17
	3.4	Minor Repair Recommendations	18
	3.5	Remedial Modification Recommendations	18
	3.6	Alternatives	18
	3.7	Opinion of Probable Construction Costs	19

TABLES

5	
1.1	Summary Data Table
ES	

FIGURES

Figure 1:	Locus Plan
Figure 2:	Aerial Photograph
Figure 3:	Drainage Area
Figure 4:	Site Sketch

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Photographs
Appendix B:	Inspection Checklist
Appendix C:	Previous Reports and References
Appendix D:	Definitions

SECTION 1

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

1.1 General

1.1.1 Authority

Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation retained Eng Corp, Inc. (Eng Corp) to perform a visual inspection and develop a report of conditions for the Any Lake Dam in the Town of Hinsdale, Berkshire County, Massachusetts. This inspection and report were performed in accordance with MGL Chapter 253, Sections 44-50 of the Massachusetts General Laws as amended by Chapter 330 of the Acts of 2002.

1.1.2 Purpose of Work

The purpose of this investigation was to inspect and evaluate the present condition of the dam and appurtenant structures in accordance with 302 CMR10.07 to provide information that will assist in both prioritizing dam repair needs and planning/conducting maintenance and operation.

The investigation was divided into four parts: 1) obtain and review available reports, investigations, and data previously submitted to the owner pertaining to the dam and appurtenant structures; 2) perform a visual inspection of the site; 3) evaluate the status of an emergency action plan for the site and, 4) prepare and submit a final report presenting the evaluation of the structure, including recommendations and remedial actions, and opinion of probable costs.

1.1.3 Definitions

To provide the reader with a better understanding of the report, definitions of commonly used terms associated with dams are provided in Appendix D. Many of these terms may be included in this report. The terms are presented under common categories associated with dams which include: 1) orientation; 2) dam components; 3) size classification; 4) hazard classification; and 5) miscellaneous.

1.2 Description of Project

1.2.1 Location

Any Lake Dam is located in the Town of Hinsdale in Berkshire County, Massachusetts about two miles east of the town center. The center of the dam is located at latitude 42.43611° North and longitude -73.08250° West (WGS 84 datum) as determined from Google Earth. From the center of Hinsdale, take Route 8 (South Street) south to Middlefield Road. Take a left and follow the road to Smith Road, on the left. Follow Smith Road and at a sharp right turn in the road, take a left onto a dirt road. The dirt road leads to the dam.

The Any Lake drainage area is located within the towns of Hinsdale and Peru, Massachusetts. The discharge from Any Lake forms Bennett Brook, a tributary of the Housatonic River. The location of Any Lake Dam is shown in Figure 1. An aerial photograph of the dam is provided as Figure 2.

1.2.2 Owner/Caretaker

See Table 1.1 for current owner and caretaker data (names and contact information).

1.2.3 Purpose of the Dam

The dam was constructed around 1875 by Crane and Company to store water for manufacturing operations. In 1969, ownership of the dam was transferred from Crane and Company to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Any Lake is currently used for recreational purposes and has a number of private residences and summer camps located along the lake shoreline.

1.2.4 Description of the Dam and Appurtenances

Any Lake Dam consists of three major components; the east and west earth embankments, the overflow spillway, and the outlet structure (see Figure 4).

The upstream slope of the east and west earth embankments have variable slopes steeper than 1H:1V near the right abutment to a flatter slope near the overflow spillway of about 2.5H:1V. The upstream slopes of the embankments have 6- to 12-inch-thick layer of riprap consisting of cobbles and boulders except for the portion of the embankment from approximately Sta. 10+75 (east of the spillway) to the left (looking downstream) abutment.

The west embankment (west of the spillway) is approximately 1200 feet long with a surveyed crest elevation of 1586.4 feet (NAVD 88). The west embankment contains two straight sections connected by a short curved section as depicted in Figure 4. From the right abutment, the embankment travels in an easterly direction and turns approximately 45-degrees towards the southeast and towards the spillway and east abutment, left of the spillway. The east embankment, located east of the spillway is approximately 225 feet long and has a surveyed crest elevation of 1586.9 feet. The maximum height of about 32 feet as measured from the crest to the invert of the low-level outlet.

The upstream slope of the west embankment is grassed approximately 1 foot below the crest and above the riprap slope. The east embankment (left of the overflow spillway) has significant tree growth, very steep slopes and no riprap protection. The crests of the embankments are generally 10 to 15 feet wide. The east embankment has forest debris, and the west embankment has a well vegetated grassy cover. The west embankment crest does have evidence of vehicle traffic from maintenance equipment although no significant tire ruts, depressions or unvegetated areas were observed. Vehicular traffic is limited to operations and maintenance vehicles by a locked gate at the right abutment.

Although the original as-built drawings are not available, an 1871 drawing provided in the 1978 Phase I Inspection Report indicates that the embankment slopes were originally designed to be 3H:1V upstream and 2H:1V downstream. Based on our field observations, portions of the upstream and downstream slopes are significantly steeper than shown on the 1871 drawing indicating that the dam was not built as it was originally designed. The drawing also indicates that the dam has a puddle core implying hydraulically placed fill. According to a trace of an original drawing by Hollingsworth (Ref. 37), the core of the embankment may contain a line of continuous piling toed into the natural soil below the dam. Subsurface investigations, performed by others, have not encountered a line of piling nor have they encountered a distinct core material. The material encountered in the core was similar to the material found throughout the embankment except the core material was looser as reported in Ref. 34. In 1985, a stability berm and a toe drain were constructed along the downstream slope of the embankment between approximately Station 3+20 and Station 6+40. The surveyed crest elevation of the stability berm ranges from approximately El. 1574 to El. 1576, and the berm side slopes are approximately 2H:1V. The toe drain consists of two separate sections constructed on opposite sides of the low-level outlet discharge channel to collect seepage and direct it toward the discharge channel.

The low-level outlet structure is located near Sta. 5+00 and is the primary outlet for the dam. The outlet consists of a 24-inch-diameter pipe with two butterfly valves, one located near the center of the dam crest and one located near the downstream end of the pipe. The valve near the dam crest is used as the primary control for regulating the lake pool and is accessed through a manhole at the dam crest. The valve near the downstream end of the outlet pipe was installed in 1988 and is exposed near the end of the outlet pipe. Based on available information, the original outlet pipe is cast iron, but an 8-foot-long downstream extension installed in 1988 is ductile iron. Based on the trace of an original drawing by Hollingsworth (Ref. 37), the original outlet pipe consists of 12-foot-long sections of cast iron pipe supported by stone or brick masonry footings spaced at 12 feet on-center, and the pipe appears to be relatively level from inlet to outlet. The outlet pipe intake structure is not visible from the embankment crest, but, based on the Hollingsworth trace (Ref. 37), the intake structure is expected to be a stone masonry structure similar to the original outlet structure, except that the intake structure is covered by a steel or cast-iron grate. A portion of the original outlet structure is visible, but the outlet structure has been modified to include a concrete headwall and wing walls constructed from precast concrete blocks.

An approximately 75-foot-wide broad crested overflow spillway is located about 225 feet from the left abutment between approximately Sta. 12+00 and Sta. 12+75. The spillway channel is approximately 3.5 feet deep and is bounded on both sides by stone masonry training walls. The bottom of the spillway channel is covered with grass, but the top of a stone masonry cutoff wall/control structure is visible along the embankment crest centerline spanning between the training walls. As-built details of the buried portions of the training and cutoff walls are not known. The trace by Hollingsworth (Ref. 37) shows spillway details and dimensions, but the spillway location and spillway depth shown on the Hollingsworth trace are not consistent with the visible portions of the existing spillway.

1.2.5 Operations and Maintenance

Any Lake Dam is owned by DCR. The Anytown State Forest is responsible for operation and maintenance of the dam. Mr. Steve Dough, Supervisor for the Anytown State Forest is the primary caretaker. Operation and maintenance activities are described in Section 2.3 below.

1.2.6 DCR Size Classification

Any Lake Dam has a height of dam of approximately 32 feet and a maximum storage capacity at the top of the dam of 3872 acre-feet. Refer to Appendix D for definitions of height of dam and storage. Therefore, in accordance with Department of Conservation and Recreation Office of Dam Safety classification, under Commonwealth of Massachusetts dam safety rules and regulations stated in 302 CMR 10.00 as amended by Chapter 330 of the Acts of 2002, Any Lake Dam is classified as a **large** size dam.

1.2.7 DCR Hazard Potential Classification

Any Lake Dam is located upstream of the sparsely populated areas in Hinsdale and Dalton, Massachusetts. The discharge from the dam flows in a southerly direction and then travels north westerly towards the potentially inundated areas in Hinsdale about 5 miles downstream of the dam. The Town of Dalton is located further downstream, about 8 miles downstream of the dam on the East Branch of the Housatonic River. Although Any Lake Dam is located within a rural area, it appears that a failure of the dam will likely cause loss of life and serious damage to homes, secondary highways, public utilities, and a railroad in the towns of Hinsdale, Peru, and Dalton. Therefore, in accordance with Department of Conservation and Recreation classification procedures, under Commonwealth of Massachusetts dam safety rules and regulations stated in 302 CMR 10.00 as amended by Chapter 330 of the Acts of 2002, Any Lake Dam should be classified as a **High Hazard (Class I)** potential dam. The hazard potential classification recommendation is consistent with the hazard potential classification on record with the Office of Dam Safety for Any Lake Dam.

1.3 Pertinent Engineering Data

1.3.1 Drainage Area

The drainage area for Any Lake Dam is approximately 4.17 square miles and extends through the communities of Hinsdale and Peru. The drainage area was delineated and measured using a digital USGS 7.5-minute topographic map in AutoCAD. Most of the drainage area for Any Lake is undeveloped, wooded, and swampy, but a number of small homes and summer camps are located around the perimeter of the lake. The dam's drainage area is presented in Figure 3. There are no dams or significant bodies of water located upstream of the Any Lake.

1.3.2 Reservoir

See Table 1.1 for data about normal, maximum, and spillway design flood (SDF) reservoir volumes. The reservoir volumes were calculated based on surface areas measurements determined from a bathymetric survey of the reservoir. The reservoir has an irregular shape with a maximum length of about 1.5 miles and a maximum width of about 0.75 miles. The lake is divided into a northern and southern areas divided by the Route 143 Bridge.

1.3.3 Discharges at the Dam Site

Reportedly, no records of discharges at the site are maintained.

1.3.4 General Elevations (feet, NAVD 88)

A.	Top of Dam:	
	East Embankment	1586.4
	West Embankment	1586.9
B.	Spillway Design Flood Pool	1587.1
C.	Normal Pool	1582.3
D.	Spillway Crest	1582.3
E.	Upstream Water Elev. at Time of Inspection	1581.1
F.	Downstream Water Elev. at Time of Inspection	none during inspection
G.	Streambed at Toe of the Dam	1553.9
H.	Low Point along Toe of the Dam	1553.8 at outlet channel

1.3.5 Main Spillway

	A.	Туре	grassed lined broad-crested weir
	B.	Weir Length (feet)	74 +/-
	C.	Weir Crest Elevation (feet)	1582.3
	D.	Upstream Channel Elevation (feet)	1580.3
	E.	Downstream Channel Elevation (feet)	1557.8
	F.	Downstream Outlet Invert or Channel Bottom E	lev. 1553.9
1.3.6 Outlet Structure		Structure	
	A.	Туре	Low-level outlet pipe
	B.	Pipe Invert	Upstream: Unknown
		-	Downstream: 1553.9
	C.	Pipe Size	24-inch diameter
	D.	Valve type	(2) Butterfly valves
	E.	Downstream Water Elevation	1554.3 feet +

1.3.7 Design and Construction Records and History

The original design and construction information for the dam is not available. Based on reports from previous investigations, the dam was constructed around 1875 by Crane and Company to store water for manufacturing operations. In 1969, ownership of the dam was transferred from Crane and Company to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Based on information provided to us from previous investigations, the following modifications have been made to the dam since ownership was transferred to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

• In the spring of 1984, a small slough and cracking were reported near the top of the downstream slope in the vicinity of the low-level outlet, and in early 1985, increased seepage with "soil particle movement" was observed downstream of the low-level outlet. To improve the downstream slope stability and control seepage in the vicinity of the low-level outlet, a stabilization berm and toe drain were constructed in 1985. For details of repairs, refer to plans prepared by Haley and Aldrich, Inc. (Ref. 32).

• Based on a document labeled "Any Lake Dam, (Summary of Known/ Recorded Events)" contained in Ref. 39, a visual inspection of the dam in 1988 revealed that the existing valve controlling the low-level outlet was inoperable. Construction documents were not available to Eng Corp, but it was reported elsewhere that based on the 1988 inspection the following repairs were made to the low-level outlet in 1988/1989:

- The outlet pipe was extended 8 feet beyond the downstream end of the existing pipe and a new butterfly valve was installed within the pipe extension.
- The original butterfly valve near the centerline of the dam crest was repaired.
- A concrete headwall was installed at the outlet pipe outfall and precast concrete block wing walls were installed on both sides of the outlet pipe outfall.
- Riprap was placed in the outlet discharge channel.
- In the 1978 dam inspection report (Ref. 35), it was reported that the gatehouse covering the access for the low-level outlet valve was destroyed by a fire in 1977, but based on

photographs from 1985, the gatehouse was re-built. Since 1985, the gatehouse over the shaft has been replaced by a circular concrete cover with a locking hatch. Documentation of the gatehouse demolition and resulting shaft or valve modification was not available to us.

1.3.8 Operating Records

Operating records that include inspection checklists, mowing schedules, gate operation logs, and periodic monitoring reports are maintained in a three-ring binder located at the maintenance park maintenance garage. The records are maintained by the superintendent and updated on a regular basis after activity at the dam is completed.

1.4 Summary Data Table

See Table 1.1 Summary Data Table

1.1 Summary Data Table

Required Phase I Report Data	Data Provided by the Inspecting Engineer
National ID #	MA11111
Dam Name	Any Lake Dam
Dam Name (Alternate)	no applicable
River Name	Bennetts Brook
Impoundment Name	Ashmere Lake
Hazard Class	High
Size Class	Large
Dam Type	Eastern Embankment
Dam Purpose	Recreational
Structural Height of Dam (feet)	32
Hydraulic Height of Dam (feet)	27.5
Drainage Area (sq. mi.)	4.17
Reservoir Surface Area (acres)	312
Normal Impoundment Volume (acre-feet)	2076
Max Impoundment Volume ((top of dam) acre-feet)	3872
SDF Impoundment Volume* (acre-feet)	3971
Spillway Type	Broad crested overflow spillway
Spillway Length (feet)	74+/-
Freeboard at Normal Pool (feet)	5
Principal Spillway Capacity* (cfs)	1210
Auxiliary Spillway Capacity* (cfs)	0
Low-Level Outlet Capacity* (cfs)	50
Spillway Design Flood* (flow rate - cfs)	1/2 PMF / 4,144 cfs
Winter Drawdown (feet below normal pool)	2.5
Drawdown Impoundment Vol. (acre-feet)	1382
Latitude	42.43611°
Longitude	73.08250°
City/Town	Hinsdale
County Name	Berkshire
Public Road on Crest	No
Public Bridge over Spillway	No
EAP Date (if applicable)	EAP is available at park headquarters, undated
Owner Name	Dept. of Conservation and Rec
Owner Address	251 Causeway Street
Owner Town	Boston, MA 02114-2104
Owner Phone	(555) 123-4567
Owner Emergency Phone	(555) 234-5678
Owner Type	DCR - Water Resources
Caretaker Name	Steve Dough / Supervisor. State Forest
Caretaker Address	426 Main Street
Caretaker Town	Anvtown. MA
Caretaker Phone	(555) 123-4567
Caretaker Emergency Phone	(555) 234-5678
Date of Field Inspection	11/11/2008
Consultant Firm Name	Eng Corp. Inc.
Inspecting Engineer	Jonathan Q. Public. P.E.
Engineer Phone Number	(123) 555-1212

*In the event a hydraulic and hydrologic analysis has not been completed for the dam, indicate "No H&H" in this table, recommendation section shall include specific recommendation to hire a qualified dam engineering consultant to conduct analysis to determine spillway adequacy in conformance with 302 CMR 10.00.

SECTION 2

2.0 INSPECTION

2.1 Visual Inspection

Any Lake Dam was inspected on June 1, 2021 by Jonathon Q. Public, PE and Julie S. Doe, PE of Eng Corp, Inc. At the time of the inspection, the weather was sunny to party cloudy and the temperature was around 40°F. Photographs to document the current conditions of the dam were taken during the inspection and are included in Appendix A. The level of the impoundment was 1576.8 feet, approximately 5.5 feet below the crest of the spillway. Underwater areas were not inspected. A copy of the inspection checklist is included in Appendix B.

2.1.1 General Findings

In general, Any Lake Dam was found to be in poor condition due to extensive vegetative growth, the existence of several seepage areas, steep embankment slopes, and inadequate slope protection. The specific concerns are identified in more detail in the sections below:

2.1.2 Dam

- Abutments
 - Trees and brush are growing along the upstream and downstream face of the left abutment. There are about 15 trees both slopes varying from ~4 inch to ~2 feet in diameter. At the right abutment, there is thick tree and brush growth starting at the upstream and downstream toes. More significant tree growth was observed approximately 20 feet from the left and right side of the dam.
 - A public boat ramp is located immediately adjacent to the dam's right abutment. The dam and boat ramp are accessed via a dirt road from Smith Road in Hinsdale. Vehicle access to the dam crest is through a locked gate adjacent to the boat ramp.
 - The left and right abutments appear sound with no evidence of erosion, seepage or cracking.

Upstream Slope

The condition of the upstream slope varies significantly along the length of the embankment. Photographs A1 to A3 and A6 to A11 show the embankment upstream slope.

- Brush and six large trees (~1 to ~2 ft in diameter) were observed growing on the upstream slope between the right abutment and the embankment. The roots of the trees were not visible. Two of the six trees appeared to be dead. The brush was about 2 ft tall and covered the entire slope in this area. No riprap was observed in this area. See Photograph A1.
- The embankment slope from the right abutment to about Sta. 10+75 was covered with riprap. The riprap on the lower slope consisted of 6 to 12 inches in diameter cobble and boulder. The upper slope consisted of flat stone riprap 3 to 6 inches

thick with a maximum width of up to about 18 inches. See Photograph A9. Above the riprap, the slope was covered with grass and low-cut brush.

- The riprap on the upstream slope near the low-level outlet consisted of boulders 3 to 5 feet in diameter. An area approximately 8-foot wide was not covered with adequate riprap protection. See Photograph A10.
- From about Sta. 10+75 to the left side of the spillway no riprap was observed. The slope in this area is covered with grass and low-cut brush and contains several erosion scarps including a 3-foot high erosion scarp. See Photographs A6 and A11.
- No riprap was observed on the upstream slope of the left embankment, from spillway to the left abutment. This embankment is heavily wooded with trees and brush. There are approximately 20 trees on the slope and the size of the tree growth ranges from several inches to greater than 12 inches in diameter on upstream slope. Only a few of the trees appear to be dead. The roots visible above the ground surface appeared to be as large as 4 inches in diameter. The brush was approximately 2.5 ft high and covered about 25% of the slope. See Photographs A7 and A8.
- Crest

The embankment crest elevation varies slightly along its length from about El. 1586 to El. 1587 and the width varies from about 10 to 15 feet. Photographs A1 to A8 show the various views of the dam crest.

- The right embankment crest is grass covered and appears to be in good condition. Minor rutting was observed in the crest, but no significant erosion was observed. See Photographs A1 through A6.
- The left embankment crest was poorly maintained, not vegetated or protected, and covered with sticks and leaves. The left crest was relatively level and no significant rutting or erosion was observed. See Photographs A7 through A8.
- Downstream Slope

The downstream slope of the embankments are relatively steep (2H:1V or steeper). No signs of slope movement, erosion, or animal burrows were observed. Photographs A1, A2, A4, A5, A7, A8, and A12 show the downstream slope and toe area.

- The downstream embankment slope near the right abutment is heavily wooded with trees and brush. There are approximately 15 trees on the slope (most start at the toe or just downstream of the toe) and the size of the tree growth ranges from several inches to greater than 12 inches in diameter. Only a few of the trees appear to be dead. The roots visible above the ground surface appeared to be as large as 3 inches in diameter. The brush was approximately 1.5 ft high and covered about 60% of the lower part of the slope and beyond the toe. See Photograph A1.
- The right embankment downstream slope is generally covered with grass and low cut brush. See Photographs A4, A5, and A12.
- No seepage was observed on the downstream slope, but wet, soft areas were observed along the embankment toe at the curved section. From about Sta. 6+25

to Sta. 7+25, wetland flagging on the embankment slope may indicate that seepage occurs in this area when the lake level is at normal pool.

- The left embankment downstream slope is heavily wooded with trees and brush. The size of the tree growth ranges from several inches to greater than 12 inches in diameter. There are approximately 12 trees on the slope and the size of the tree growth ranges from several inches to greater than 12 inches in diameter. All of the trees appear to be living and no roots are visible. The brush was approximately 1.5 ft high and covered about 60% of the slope. See Photographs A7 and A8.
- Several soft and wet areas with standing water were observed along the toe of the right embankment, however, no seepage flow was observed at the time of our inspection with the lake at the winter pool level. Note that previous inspection reports, prepared by others, reported visible seepage flow during normal pool levels.
- The toe drain system was not inspected. The outlet for the toe drains could not be located, but we observed two cleanouts for the toe drains on opposite sides of the low-level outlet channel.
- Instrumentation

There are no instruments installed at the dam.

- 2.1.3 Appurtenant Structures
 - Primary Spillway

During the inspection the lake elevation was approximately 5 feet below the spillway crest. Photographs A6 and A13 to A16 show the spillway structure.

- The spillway approach was covered with reeds and the spillway channel was covered with grass and low-cut brush. No riprap or erosion protection was visible in the spillway channel, excluding the stone masonry crest.
- An erosion area was observed in the downstream spillway channel. See Photograph A13.
- The transition from the spillway to the channel is abrupt, relatively narrow, and heavily wooded.
- The stone masonry training walls were generally intact, but the mortar was generally in poor condition or missing. Brush was observed at several locations growing between the masonry training wall joints.
- Low-Level Outlets

The low-level outlet is used as the primary outlet for controlling the lake pool. The upstream end of the outlet pipe and the intake structure were underwater and not visible at the time of our visit. The downstream end of the low-level outlet was visible for inspection. The visible portions of the outlet structure are shown in Photographs A17 and A18.

• The outlet pipe was flowing approximately one-third to half full during the inspection.

- The butterfly valve at the embankment crest was protected by a locked manhole and was not accessible. See Photograph A3.
- In general, the headwall and concrete wing walls at the downstream end of the outlet pipe appeared to be in good condition and the remaining portions of the original stone masonry outlet structure appeared stable. See Photograph A17.
- The visible portions of the outlet pipe and downstream butterfly valve appeared to be in good condition. The controls for the valve were not accessible and valve was not operated during the inspection.
- The discharge channel for the outlet pipe was lined with riprap near the end of the pipe and no visible signs of channel deterioration were observed.
- Fallen trees blocked the channel downstream of the outlet and may impede flow during periods of significant discharge.

2.1.4 Downstream Area

- The downstream toes of the left and right embankments are heavily wooded. The thick woods start near the toe at the right abutment and just past the crest at the left abutment.
- Wet and soft areas were observed along the embankment toe at the curved section, and along the toe of the right embankment.
- The left embankment downstream slope is heavily wooded with trees and brush. The size of the tree growth ranges from several inches to greater than 12 inches in diameter on upstream and downstream slopes as described in Section 2.1.2. See Photographs A7 and A8.

2.1.5 Reservoir Area

- The impoundment is located within a primarily rural area with private properties located along parts of the impoundment shoreline. The shoreline of the impoundment is primarily wooded. The slopes along the perimeter of the pond are flat to moderate, therefore it is believed that the potential for landslides impacting the lake elevation is remote.
- The reservoir is orientated in a north-south direction, flowing towards the south and has an irregular shape with several coves around the perimeter. The lake is divided by the Route 143 Bridge. The bridge passes over a concrete box culvert with open area 7 feet wide and 8.25 feet high with an invert elevation 1578.25 feet. The low point of the road surface is at elevation 1589 feet, approximately.
- As indicated on available documents, the impoundment is approximately 15 feet at its deepest areas with an average depth of approximately 10 feet.

2.2 Caretaker Interview

The Anytown State Forest is responsible for operation and maintenance of the dam. Mr. Steve Dough, Supervisor for the Anytown State Forest is the primary caretaker and was interviewed during the inspection on June 1, 2021. Information provided by Mr. Dough has been incorporated into this report.

Mr. Dough indicated that he has concerns regarding the erosion and loss of riprap along the upstream slope of the right embankment. Mr. Dough also indicated that it is difficult to access the low-level outlet control during the winter months due to the accumulation of snow and ice.

Mr. Dough also indicated that:

- The dam is mowed twice a year,
- A winter drawdown is implemented,
- There is current discussion regarding the appropriate normal pool elevation,
- Recent modifications include the installation of toe drain along a portion of the dam, and
- Records are maintained at the maintenance building.

2.3 Operation and Maintenance Procedures

The operation and maintenance (O&M) manual for Any Lake Dam was reviewed during the inspection. The latest revision of the O&M manual was dated March 11, 2006. The manual includes the following information; project description and history; a schedule of inspection, operation and maintenance requirements; detailed gate and low-level outlet operating and maintenance instructions; dam inspection procedures and checklist forms; training requirements; and record keeping procedures. Operating and maintenance records are maintained in a three-ring binder located at the maintenance building and at the Anytown State Forest headquarters.

The dam and the appurtenant features are observed on a monthly basis by the dam caretaker. The dam is also inspected prior to, during, and after significant storm events. The observations are recorded on a formal checklist documenting the condition of the crest, upstream and downstream slopes, spillway, outlet structures, and subsurface drains. Copies of the completed checklists are stored in the maintenance building near the dam. The original checklists are stored at the Anytown State Forest headquarters in Anytown.

Refresher training of the caretakers is performed on every three years by ENG CORP engineers and the Anytown State Forest supervisors. Training of new caretakers is performed as needed. The program includes formal training of the operation, maintenance, and inspection procedures for the dam.

2.3.1 Operational Procedures

The gate controlling flow through the low-level outlet is typically opened throughout the year to meet minimum flow requirements. Flashboards are typically installed in May and typically removed mid-September. The lake is drawn down 28 to 32 inches during the winter months.

2.3.2 Maintenance of Dam and Operating Facilities

The embankments are mowed approximately twice per year in the late spring and late summer or as needed. Growth of trees and brush are maintained each spring. The embankment is maintained by filling ruts and depressions, and loamed and seeded each spring or as needed. Animal control measures are implemented each spring and fall.

The gates are lubricated and operated on a monthly basis. The flashboards are repaired as needed after they are removed in the fall each year. Debris is removed from the upstream, downstream and crest of the spillway on a weekly basis. Missing or dislodged riprap is replaced as needed throughout the year.

2.4 Emergency Warning System

Copies of the emergency action plan (EAP) for the dam are kept at the Anytown State Forest Park headquarters and at the dam maintenance building. The latest revision of the EAP was dated April 26, 2006 and reportedly updated on an annual basis.

The EAP reviewed during the inspection contained the following information:

- Dam owner/operator contact information;
- Notification procedures and flowchart;
- Warning procedures;
- Identification of emergency equipment, manpower, and material;
- Dam location and dam failure inundation maps (sunny day and flood cases); and
- Addresses and telephone numbers of potentially impacted downstream residents.

Copies of the latest EAP were reportedly submitted to the appropriate state and local emergency management agencies, and fire and police departments for the potentially impacted downstream communities.

The Anytown State Forest trains their people involved with the implementation of the EAP to ensure that they are familiar with the elements of the plan, the availability of equipment, and their responsibilities and duties under the plan on an annual basis. Training for emergencies and EAP exercises are also performed on an annual basis. During the EAP drill, people on the Notification Flowchart are contacted to verify names and telephone numbers. As each person or agency is contacted, they are asked if they know where their copy of the Emergency Action Plan is kept and if they know what their responsibilities are in the event of an emergency. After the drill, the EAP is reportedly updated as needed and redistributed as necessary.

A siren is reported to be located in the downstream area to notify downstream people of sudden releases from the dam. The siren is tested on an annual basis.

2.5 Awareness of Potential Dam Related Safety Hazards at, near, and on Dams

Any Lake Dam is located within Anytown State Forest and has many visitors each day as hikers, bikers, swimmers, and boaters. We noted the following potential safety hazards at, near, and on the dam:

- There are no warning signs, buoys, or barriers by the spillway to warn boaters or swimmers.
- There are potential fall hazards at the spillway training walls and the low-level outlet headwall.

Because of the good sight lines from the low-level outlet control to the outlet discharge, we expect that operators can and will check for people near the discharge and can warn them of the limited discharge that will be expected when the outlet is open. We recommend installing the following public safety upgrades:

- Add fencing along the top of the low-level outlet discharge headwall and along the spillway training walls.
- Add upstream a warning sign or signs at the primary spillway describing the fall hazard to boaters and swimmers.

This dam appears to be a low head dam such that under certain conditions a potentially dangerous submerged hydraulic roller can form immediately downstream from the dam spillway.

Implementation of any recommendations may require local, state, or federal permits as well as securing property rights if subject areas are not owned by the dam owner. Securing such permits and/or land rights is the sole responsibility of the dam owner.

The dam owner is reminded that the Dam Safety Regulations <u>302 CMR Section 10.13: Liability</u> (<u>1</u>), states: The owner shall be responsible and liable for damage to property of others or injury to persons, including but not limited to, loss of life resulting from the operation, failure of or misoperation of a dam.

2.6 Hydrologic/Hydraulic Data

Any Lake Dam is classified as a Large size, high hazard (Class I) potential dam and in accordance with MGL 302 CMR 10.00, the spillway design flood is the ½ Probable Maximum Flood (½ PMF). Previous hydrologic and hydraulic studies completed for Any Lake Dam were completed by GEI in 2005, (Ref. 22) and Eng Corp. in 2006 (Ref. 21). An analysis was performed in conjunction with this inspection report to update the 2005 analysis to revise and update the probable maximum precipitation (PMP) values, drainage areas, delineation of subwatersheds, and the elevation datum (NAVD 88).

The probable maximum precipitation (PMP) used to determine the ½ PMF was based on procedures in National Weather Service's Hydrometeorological Report No. 51 and 52. The total PMP was estimated to be 36.0 inches for the watershed occurring over a 72-hour period.

The dam's drainage area was delineated using a digital 7.5-minute USGS topographic map in AutoCAD. The area was measured to be approximately 4.17 square miles (compared to 4.4 square miles in the 2005 study). Any Lake accounts for approximately 11.6 percent (or 0.48 square miles) of the total area. The total watershed was subdivided into two subwatersheds separated by the bridge/outlet on Route 143. The upper or north portion of the lake was measured to be 1.27 square miles and the lower portion, south of the Route 143 Bridge and outlet was measured to be 2.90 square miles.

The rainfall-runoff and reservoir routing for the ½ PMF design storm was performed using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Hydraulic Engineering Center (HEC) Hydraulic Modeling System (HMS) model and procedures described in Section 4, Hydrology (NEH-4) of the SCS National Engineering Handbook. The elevation datum is NAVD88. Previous analyses were performed using the DEM datum and the NGVD datum. The results from the most recent analysis performed in conjunction with this inspection report are summarized below:

A.	Spillway Design Flood (SDF) Return Period:	1⁄2 PMF
B.	Precipitation (inches) and methodology:	HMR 51/52
C.	SDF Inflow (cfs):	4144
D.	SDF Outflow (cfs):	3994
E.	Principal Spillway Capacity (cfs):	1210
F.	Auxiliary Spillway Capacity (cfs):	not applicable
G.	Low-level Outlet Capacity (cfs):	50
H.	Percentage of the SDF that can be safely	
	routed without overtopping:	30
I.	SDF Peak Reservoir Elevation (feet):	1587.1
J.	Maximum Depth of Overtopping for SDF (feet):	0.7
K.	Duration of Overtopping for SDF (hours):	6.5

Based on the results of our analyses, the spillway cannot safely pass the design flood and the dam will likely be overtopped during the $\frac{1}{2}$ PMF. The duration of overtopping is estimated to be 6.5 hours with a maximum estimated depth of overtopping equal to 0.7 feet. Overtopping of the earth embankment crest and downstream slope would likely result in a breach of the dam.

2.7 Structural and Seepage Stability

2.7.1 Embankment Structural Stability

Based on the visual observations made during the inspection, the stability of the upstream and downstream slopes of the embankment are in poor condition. The right embankment upstream slope contained large scarps over most of the length. The downstream slopes are relatively steep at 2H: 1V or steeper. The left embankment contains significant tree growth. Several soft and wet areas with standing water were observed along the toe of the right embankment. A possible slope movement was observed in the bench near the low-level outlet.

During the inspection it was noted the downstream slope of the stability berm right of the outlet and the right groin were soft with evidence of water near the surface. This condition has also been reported in previous inspection reports and was reportedly the cause of a slough failure left of the outlet in 1984 which led to the construction of the stability berm. This indicates that the phreatic surface is at or just below the surface of the slope and may cause slope stability issues or failure of the embankment, especially during periods of elevated lake levels.

A review of previous observations, analyses, and reports by others, regarding stability, is summarized below:

- Stability problems have been observed by others. In 1985, sloughing of the downstream slope was observed near Sta. 5+00, and to increase the embankment stability, a stabilizing berm was constructed along a portion of the embankment toe as described in Section 2.5.1 of this report. In 2003, Pare Engineering Corporation (Ref. 24) reported signs of possible sloughing of the stability berm near the low-level outlet.
- Subsurface investigations performed in the embankment in 1985 and 2003 (Ref. 33, Ref. 34, Ref. 27, and Ref. 28) indicated that soil conditions are similar throughout the embankment. The subsurface investigations did not find evidence of a low permeability core material to control seepage through the embankment nor did they find evidence of a free draining downstream shell.
- Low SPT N-values and drilling records on several boring logs presented by Haley and Aldrich (Ref. 32) and Root Engineering (Ref. 27) indicate that loose or soft zones are present in the embankment. The locations of all loose/soft zones are not known, and there is potential for soft zones to exist that may jeopardize the stability of the embankment during higher impoundments.

Based on our evaluation and the evaluations by others, it is our opinion that during periods of high-water impoundments the embankment may become unstable and increased seepage through embankment and foundation could result in internal erosion and a piping failure of the embankment. As noted above, the embankment may be susceptible to a downstream slope failure during a seismic event because of the steep downstream slope and loose embankment zone.

A detailed stability analysis of the embankment has not been performed and should be performed for the load conditions required in accordance with 302 CMR 10.00 as recommended in Section 3 of this report.

2.7.2 Structural Stability of Non-Embankment Structures

A structural stability analysis of the spillway has not been performed nor is required based on the relatively flat upstream and downstream slopes. The visual inspection of the spillway indicated that the structural stability is satisfactory with no visible signs of instability, movement or erosion. As previously noted, the spillway cannot safely pass the spillway design flood without overtopping the earth embankments.

2.7.3 Seepage Stability

Wet, soft areas were observed along the downstream embankment toe at the curved section although no visible signs of seepage were observed. From about Sta. 6+25 to Sta. 7+25, wetland flagging on the embankment slope may indicate that seepage occurs in this area when the lake level is at normal pool.

Several soft and wet areas with standing water were observed along the toe of the left and right embankment. At the time of our visit, the lake level had been lowered to the winter pool level and no seepage flow was observed in this area. Based on inspection reports prepared by others, visible seepage flow is more likely to occur at normal pool levels.

A soft, wet area was observed during the inspection on the downstream slope of the stability berm right of the outlet and near the right groin. This condition has been reported in previous inspections and reportedly the cause of the sloughing failure in 1984. The stability berm was subsequently constructed to remediate the sloughing and instability of the embankment. A review of historical data indicates that the phreatic surface is at or near the downstream face of the dam. During elevated lake levels and flood events the seepage condition may increase and quickly lead to failure or eventual failure of the embankment.

The embankment is relatively homogenous and does not have a system to safely collect, filter, and channel seepage that passes through the dam and the foundation. As a result, the dam has a potential for internal erosion due to seepage. Due to the steep downstream slope and the presence of loose zones in the embankment, Any Lake Dam may be susceptible to a downstream slope failure during a seismic event.

There is no instrumentation installed at the dam to measure seepage. A detailed seepage analysis of the right or left embankments has not been performed.

SECTION 3

3.0 ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Assessments

In general, the overall condition of Any Lake Dam is **Poor**. The dam was found to have the following deficiencies:

- The existing spillway does not safely pass the spillway design flood (SDF) of ¹/₂ Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) without overtopping of the embankment as required by Commonwealth of Massachusetts Regulations 302 CMR 10.00 for an existing dam. Overtopping the Any Lake Dam embankment is likely to cause significant erosion that would lead to a breach failure of the dam.
- 2. Due to loose zones in the embankment and seepage in the downstream slope, the embankment is likely to become unstable at high pool impoundments.
- 3. The embankment may be susceptible to a downstream slope failure during a seismic event because of the steep downstream slope and loose embankment zones.
- 4. The embankment is relatively homogenous and does not have a system to safely collect, filter, and channel seepage that passes through parts of the dam and the dam foundation. As a result, the dam has a potential for internal erosion due to seepage.
- 5. The left and right abutments, the embankment left of the spillway, and the areas along the downstream toe are heavily wooded. Large trees could be uprooted during a storm event leaving cavities in the slope. These potential cavities and potential cavities left from tree roots can provide shortened flow paths for embankment seepage with the potential for internal erosion and embankment failure.
- 6. The upstream slope contains large scarps over most of the embankment length. Continued erosion of the upstream embankment can result in shortened seepage paths resulting in increased seepage in the downstream slope, decreased embankment stability, and internal erosion.
- 7. The downstream slope is relatively steep at 2H: 1V and difficult to maintain. Based on reports by others, undesirable vegetation has previously been observed growing on the downstream slope of the dam, and in our opinion, difficulty of maintaining the downstream slope may contribute to reduced maintenance.
- 8. There are no detailed stability and seepage analyses of the left and right embankments for the load conditions required in accordance with 302 CMR 10.14.

Previously identified deficiencies and major recommendations from prior inspection reports are summarized in the table below. The table also presents the present condition or resolution of the deficiencies and recommendations.

Previously Identified Deficiency	Resolution or Current Condition
Repair upstream riprap slope.	Unresolved, scarp and erosion increasing.
Remove heavy vegetation and trees.	Unresolved, vegetation on left abutment, toe, and groin areas spreading.
Flatten the downstream embankment slopes to prevent erosion and increase stability.	Unresolved, no apparent change since last inspection.

Previously Identified Deficiency	Resolution or Current Condition
Address the apparent deficiencies with the toe	Unresolved and appears to be unchangedsince
drain.	last inspection.
Increase the discharge capacity to	Unresolved, no apparent change since last
accommodate the spillway design flood.	inspection.
Remove vegetation and debris from spillway	This recommendation was resolved in May,
	2005.

The following recommendations and remedial measures generally describe the recommended approach to address current deficiencies at the dam. Prior to undertaking recommended maintenance, repairs, or remedial measures, the applicability of environmental permits needs to be determined for activities that may occur within resource areas under the jurisdiction of local conservation commissions, MADEP, or other regulatory agencies.

3.2 Studies and Analyses

The following studies or analyses are recommended to evaluate concerns and comply with current regulations.

- 1. Perform stability and seepage analysis upon the narrow section of the embankment at the bend in the embankment and at the primary outlet, as well as along the previously reinforced sections. Based upon the result of these analyses, embankment repairs including widening of the embankment, the construction of stability berms, installation of blanket drains, or the construction of a core wall may be necessary. The stability analysis should be performed in accordance with current state requirements and evaluate the structure under normal and extreme operating conditions taking into affect ice loading.
- 2. Evaluate the capacity and integrity of the erodible overflow channel based upon current conditions. Perform a stability analysis upon the training walls for the overflow spillway and perform any necessary repairs. Evaluate alternatives to increase the discharge capacity through the structure.

3.3 Recurrent Maintenance Recommendations

The activities presented below should be untaken on a regular basis or yearly basis by the owner/caretaker. Typically these activities do not require an engineering design. It is recommended that the owner/caretaker perform the following modifications and repairs to improve the safety, maintenance, and operation of the dam including:

- 1. Control and prevent further growth of unwanted vegetation.
- 2. Perform regular monitoring and inspection of the dam, especially in areas of suspected movement and seepage. Continue monitoring seepage along the downstream slope, toe and areas. Consider installing a means of measuring flow may be necessary along the existing toe drain.
- 3. Trap and remove rodents form the embankment and the immediate downstream areas.

3.4 Minor Repair Recommendations

The following recommendations to improve the overall condition of the dam but do not alter the current design of the dam. The recommendations may require design by a professional engineer and construction by a contractor experienced in dam construction or repair.

- 1. Install piezometers and inclinometers to monitor and map the phreatic surface to determine the impact on the overall stability and integrity of the structure.
- 2. Level the area downstream of the embankment toe to facilitate mowing, clearing trees from the existing spillway channel, constructing a timber bridge across the spillway to carry lawn mowing equipment to the left abutment.
- 3. Regrade and reshape the upstream slope, install filtered slope protection, and place additional riprap on the upstream embankment slope for erosion protection from wave and ice action.
- 4. Install public safety fences and signs as described in Section 2.5.

3.5 Remedial Modification Recommendations

- 1. Modify the embankment and spillway to safely pass the ½ PMF without overtopping the dam. Proposed modifications include raising the embankment crest, modifying the existing spillway by creating a more efficient spillway configuration, replacing the existing stone masonry training walls with reinforced concrete training walls, lowering the spillway crest to the normal pool elevation, and improving the spillway channel immediately downstream of the embankment.
- 2. Modify the dam embankment to increase the embankment stability and control seepage. Modifications include repairing the upstream slope, constructing a drainage blanket and toe drain, and placing common fill to flatten the downstream slope to 3H:1V.
- 3. Remove trees, brush, roots, and stumps on the embankment within 15 feet of the left abutment or right abutment, along the entire upstream slope, along the entire downstream slope, and on the downstream area within 15 feet of the downstream toe. The stumps and larger roots should be removed with the pool lowered, and any minor holes filled with approved compacted fill. If removing any of the larger stumps could impact the structural integrity of the dam, they should be cut down to six inches below the embankment surface and covered with compacted approved fill. Plant grass anywhere the embankment does not have grass cover.

3.6 Alternatives

The following alternatives are presented based upon a conceptual review of the concerns. Additional studies and or considerations may indicate that the options presented below are not suitable for the conditions specific to this dam and dam site.

Alternatives for improving the stability of the structure may include the implementation of one or more of the following:

- Construction of additional stability berms
- Installation of a blanket and tope drain system
- Construction of a cut off wall

• Installation of an upstream blanket

Alternative for increasing the discharge capacity of the dam include the following:

- Increase the storage within the reservoir by lowering the normal pool or raising the height of the earth embankments.
- Creating a deeper channel through the overflow spillway with the invert or top of boards set to regulate flows at the winter drawdown elevation.
- Increase the existing overflow spillway discharge by adding a concrete lining to improve the flow characteristics.
- Install a new spillway to safely pass the spillway design flood with minimum freeboard.
- Create an emergency spillway by armoring the embankment, or portion of the embankment, to prevent erosion and to allow overtopping during significant floods.

3.7 Opinion of Probable Construction Costs

The following conceptual opinions of probable costs have been developed for the recommendations and remedial measures noted above. The costs shown herein are based on a limited investigation and are provided for general information only. This should not be considered an engineer's estimate, as construction costs may be less or considerably more than indicated.

Recurrent Maintenance Recommendations

1. Control and prevent vegetation	\$3,000 to \$5,000 per year
2. Regular monitoring and inspection, seepage	\$10,000 to \$15,000 per year
3. Rodent Control	\$2,000 to \$4,000 per year
sub-total	\$15,000 to \$24,000 per year
10 % Contingency	\$1,500 to \$24,000 per year
Total	\$16,500 to \$26,400 per year

Minor Repair Recommendations

1. Install piezometers and inclinometers	\$10,000 to \$15,000
2. Level, clear toe area, construct spillway bridge	\$25,000 to 45,000
3. Regrade, reshape, repair upstream slope	\$15,000 to \$25,000
4. Install warning signs and fences at dam	\$1,000 to \$3,000
sub-total	\$46,000 to \$83,000
10 % Contingency	\$4,600 to \$8,300
Total	\$50,600 to \$91,300

Remedial Modification Recommendations

1. Modify spillway to safely pass ½ PMF		\$100,000 to \$150,000
2. Modify embankments		\$350,000 to \$450,000
3. Remove trees and brush		\$75,000 to \$150,000
4. Engineering and Design		\$55,000 to \$70,000
5. Permitting		\$15,000 to \$25,000
	sub-total	\$595,000 to \$845,000
	10 % Contingency	\$59,500 to \$84,500
	Total	\$654,500 to \$929,500

FIGURES



M:\DRAFTING\2007\070042MA DCR\070042-01_SiteLocation





M:\DRAFTING\2007\070042MA DCR\070042-03_Drainage Area



070042-02 JAM 03/11/08

APPENDIX A Photographs



Photo A1 – Panorama composite - Right abutment from embankment crest*



Photo A2 – Embankment from right embankment



Photo A3 – Panorama composite – Crest and upstream slope from ~Sta. 5+50 toward right abutment*



Photo A4 – Panorama composite – Crest and downstream slope from ~Sta. 7+00 toward right abutment*





Photo A5 – Crest and upstream slope from ~Sta. 9+00 towards embankment bend



Photo A6 – Panorama composite – Crest and upstream slope from ~Sta. 9+00 toward left abutment*

Any Lake Dam

Inspection Photos



Photo A7 - Composite panorama - Left embankment from spillway toward left abutment*



Photo A8 – Composite panorama – Left embankment from left abutment*



Photo A9 – Typical riprap and scarp on upstream slope



Photo A11 – Upstream slope from ~Sta. 10+75 toward spillway



Photo A10 – Upstream slope near low-level outlet



Photo A12 – Downstream slope from ~Sta. 10+75 toward spillway

Any Lake Dam



Photo A13 – Composite panorama – Spillway from downstream channel looking upstream*



Photo A14 – Spillway from right training wall



Photo A15 – Spillway from left training wall



Photo A16 – Downstream end of spillway & spillway channel looking downstream from spillway



Photo A17 – Panorama composite – Downstream slope and low-level outlet discharge structure*



Photo A18 – Low-level outlet downstream control valve

*Note: Distortions and color or light irregularities in panorama composite photos are due to discontinuities between individual photographic images used to create composite panoramas.

APPENDIX B Inspection Checklist

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION CHECKLIST

NAME OF DAM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1
REGISTERED: YES NO	NID ID #: MA11111
STATE SIZE CLASSIFICATION: Large	STATE HAZARD CLASSIFICATION: High
	CHANGE IN HAZARD CLASSIFICATION REQUESTED?: No
DAM LOCATION I	NFORMATION_
CITY/TOWN: Hinsdale	COUNTY: Berkshire
DAM LOCATION: near Lake Road	ALTERNATE DAM NAME: <u>no applicable</u>
USGS QUAD.: Pittsfield East	LAT.: 42.43611° LONG.: 73.08250°
DRAINAGE BASIN: Housatonic	RIVER: Bennetts Brook
IMPOUNDMENT NAME(S): Ashmere Lake	
GENERAL DAM I	NFORMATION
TYPE OF DAM: Eastern Embankment	OVERALL LENGTH (FT): 1475
PURPOSE OF DAM: Recreational	NORMAL POOL STORAGE (ACRE-FT): 2076
YEAR BUILT: 1875	MAXIMUM POOL STORAGE (ACRE-FT): 3872
STRUCTURAL HEIGHT (FT): 32	EL. NORMAL POOL (FT): 1582.0
HYDRAULIC HEIGHT (FT): 27.5	EL. MAXIMUM POOL (FT): 1587.1
FOR INTERNAL MADCR USE ONLY	
FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION REQUIRED: YES NO	CONDITIONAL LETTER: YES NO

NAME OF DAM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #:	1-2-132-1		
INSPECTION DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #:	MA11111		
	INSPECTION SUMN	<i>MARY</i>		
DATE OF INSPECTION: June 1, 2021	DATE OF PREVIO	OUS INSPECTION:	June 1, 2019	
TEMPERATURE/WEATHER: 40 deg. F, Sunny to part cloudy	ARMY CORPS PH	HASE I: YES	□ NO If YES	S, date August 1978
CONSULTANT: Eng Corp, Inc.	PREVIOUS DCR	PHASE I: 🗹 YES	□NO If YES	S, date 2019
BENCHMARK/DATUM: NAVD 88				
OVERALL PHYSICAL CONDITION OF DAM: <u>POOR</u>	DATE OF LAST F	REHABILITATION:	1989 (Low-level out	let valve)
SPILLWAY CAPACITY: 50-90% of the SDF			Ŷ	
EL. POOL DURING INSP.: 158.1	EL. TAILWATER	DURING INSP.:	1557.8	
PERS	SONS PRESENT AT IN	ISPECTION		
NAME	TITLE/POSITION	REPRES	SENTING	
Jonathon Q. Public, P.E. Senio	or Civil Engineer	Eng Cor	p, Inc.	
Mr. Steve Dough Supe	rvisor/dam tender	Anytown	n State Forest	
F	VALUATION INFORM	AATION		
Click on box to select E-c	code	<u>AAHON</u>		Click on box to select E-code
E1) TYPE OF DESIGN 3		E8) LOW-LEVEL	OUTLET CONDITION	N 4
E2) LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE 3		E9) SPILLWAY D	ESIGN FLOOD CAPA	CITY 2
E3) EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN 4		E10) OVERALL PH	YSICAL CONDITION	N 2
E4) EMBANKMENT SEEPAGE 2		E11) ESTIMATED I	REPAIR COST	\$884,500
E3) EMBANKMENT CONDITION 2 E6) CONCRETE CONDITION 5		BRIDGE NEA	R DAM	NO
E7) LOW-LEVEL OUTLET CAPACITY 3				
NAME OF INSPECTING ENGINEER: Jonathan Q. Public,	Р.Е.	SIGNATURE:	Jonathon Q. Public	

NAME OF DAM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>
INSPECTION DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>
OWNER:ORGANIZATION NAME/TITLEDept. of Conservation and RecNAME/TITLEDCR - Water ResourcesSTREET251 Causeway StreetTOWN, STATE, ZIPBoston, MA 02114-2104PHONE(555) 123-4567EMERGENCY PH. #(555) 234-5678FAX(555) 345-6789EMAILlakedam@something.comOWNER TYPEDCR - Water Resources	CARETAKER:ORGANIZATION NAME/TITLE STREETAnytown State ForestSTREET426 Main StreetTOWN, STATE, ZIP PHONEAnytown, MAPHONE(555) 123-4567EMERGENCY PH. #(555) 234-5678FAX(555) 345-6789EMAILlakedam@something.com
PRIMARY SPILLWAY TYPE Broad crested overflow spillway SPILLWAY LENGTH (FT) 74+/-	SPILLWAY CAPACITY (CFS) 1,210
AUXILIARY SPILLWAY TYPE none	AUX. SPILLWAY CAPACITY (CFS) 0
NUMBER OF OUTLETS 1	OUTLET(S) CAPACITY (CFS) 50
TYPE OF OUTLETS low-level outlet pipe	TOTAL DISCHARGE CAPACITY (CFS) 1,260
DRAINAGE AREA (SQ MI) 4.17	SPILLWAY DESIGN FLOOD (PERIOD/CFS) 1/2 PMF / 4,144 cfs
HAS DAM BEEN BREACHED OR OVERTOPPED VES	NO IF YES, PROVIDE DATE(S) 1984, Partial downstream slope
FISH LADDER (LIST TYPE IF PRESENT)	
DOES CREST SUPPORT PUBLIC ROAD? YES NO	IF YES, ROAD NAME:
PUBLIC BRIDGE WITHIN 50' OF DAM? YES INO	IF YES, ROAD/BRIDGE NAME: MHD BRIDGE NO. (IF APPLICABLE)

NAME OF D	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>			
INSPECTION	J DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>			
		EMBANKMENT (CREST)			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	1. SURFACE TYPE	Primarily grass covered; 10' + wide; dirt left of overflow spillway	X		
	2. SURFACE CRACKING	None observed.	X	1	
	3. SINKHOLES, ANIMAL BURROWS	None observed.	X		
CREST	4. VERTICAL ALIGNMENT (DEPRESSIONS	None observed - Minor rusting noted left of the low-level outlet		Х	Х
	5. HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT	Good - no evidence of misalignment	Х		
	6. RUTS AND/OR PUDDLES	Minor vehicle depressions		Χ	
	7. GRASS COVER CONDITION	Grassed throughout, well maintained to ~2 inch length	Х		
	8. WOODY VEGETATION (TREES/BRUSH)	Overgrown with large trees on left embankment, but none on crest			Х
	9. ABUTMENT CONTACT	Good - no evidence of seepage or leakage, drainage		Х	-
					┢
ADDITIONA	L COMMENTS: 7, 8 - Trees and brush cover the	e left embankment and should be cut, grubbed, and the slope regraded and planted with	grass co	over.	
	Trees and brush are also establi	shed at the right abutment contacts and should be removed and grubbed.	;		

NAME OF DA	NAME OF DAM: Any Lake Dam STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1				
INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	-		
		EMBANKMENT (D/S SLOPE)			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	1. WET AREAS (NO FLOW)	Wet area on lower 1/4 of slope over limited area near Sta. 7+00 (at alignment change)		X	
	2. SEEPAGE	No seepage observed	Х		
	3. SLIDE, SLOUGH, SCARP	None observed	Х		
D/S	4. EMBABUTMENT CONTACT	Numerous trees and brush		Χ	Х
SLOPE	5. SINKHOLE/ANIMAL BURROWS	None observed	Х		
	6. EROSION	None observed	Х		
	7. UNUSUAL MOVEMENT	None observed	Х		
	8. GRASS COVER CONDITION	Grass cover well established & mowed, some brush mixed with grass, but also cut	Х		
	9. WOODY VEGETATION (TREES/BRUSH)	Trees and Brush on Left Embankment and by Right Abutment.		Χ	Х
	~				
ADDITIONA	L COMMENTS: 1 - Most of the main embankme	ent surface was dry, probably because of the downstream berm drain and the low level of t	he		
	lake. However the bottom 1/4 of	f a ~ 20 ft, length of the dam was wet near the alignment change. Larger wet areas are likely	v		
	during the higher summer pool.		5		
	4, 8, 9 - Trees and brush cover	the left embankment and should be cut, grubbed, and the slope regraded and planted with	grass		
	cover. Trees and brush are also	established at the right abutment contacts and should be removed and grubbed.	~		

NAME OF DA	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1	_		
INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	-		
		EMBANKMENT (U/S SLOPE)			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	1. SLIDE, SLOUGH, SCARP	Numerous scarps at top of riprap		x	x
	2. SLOPE PROTECTION TYPE AND COND.	See Note 2		Х	Χ
	3. SINKHOLE/ANIMAL BURROWS	None observed	Х		
U/S	4. EMBABUTMENT CONTACT	Numerous trees and brush		Х	Χ
SLOPE	5. EROSION	Scarps from wave or ice action			
	6. UNUSUAL MOVEMENT	None observed	Χ		
	7. GRASS COVER CONDITION	Grass, trees, and brush above and through riprap material	Χ	Х	Х
	8. WOODY VEGETATION (TREES/BRUSH)	Trees and brush on Left Embankment and by Right Abutment.		Х	Χ
ADDITIONAL	L COMMENTS: 1,2,5 - Riprap covers the upstre	am slope of the main dam from about 2 feet below the dam crest to below the water line fr	om		
	the right (west) abutment to abo	but Station 10+75. The riprap is typically about 6 to 12 inches in size except near the low-l	evel	0.0	
	outlet alignment where several	large 3- to 5-toot boulders have been placed. There is an 8- to 10-toot wide area near Stati	$\frac{\text{on } 5+}{2}$	-00	
	which is missing riprap. The are	ea east or right of Station 10+/5 with no riprap has more erosion with one area having a \sim	s-toot	-	
	high erosion scarp. Areas of ero	ssion should be repaired. Kiprap should be extended to the spillway.			
	7, 8 - Trees and brush cover the	left embankment and should be cut, grubbed, and the slope regraded and planted with gra	ISS CO	ver.	
	rees and brush are also establi	sned at the right adultment contacts and should be removed and grubbed.			

NAME OF DA	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1			
INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	_		
		INSTRUMENTATION			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	1. PIEZOMETERS	Unable to locate			
	2. OBSERVATION WELLS	Unable to locate			
	3. STAFF GAGE AND RECORDER	None			
INSTR.	4. WEIRS	None			
	5. INCLINOMETERS	None			
	6. SURVEY MONUMENTS	None			
	7. DRAINS	Two cleanouts observed but could not locate outfalls			
	8. FREQUENCY OF READINGS	Not applicable			
	9. LOCATION OF READINGS	Not applicable			
	~				
ADDITIONA	L COMMENTS:				

NAME OF DA	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>	_		
INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	_		
		DOWNSTREAM AREA			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	1. ABUTMENT LEAKAGE	None observed		X	
	2. FOUNDATION SEEPAGE	Standing water and saturated subgrade in areas downstream of embankment toe		Х	
	3. SLIDE, SLOUGH, SCARP	None observed		Х	
D/S	4. WEIRS	None observed		Х	
AREA	5. DRAINAGE SYSTEM	Two drain cleanouts observed. No outfalls were seen.		Х	
	6. INSTRUMENTATION	None observed		Х	
	7. VEGETATION WITHIN 15 FT	Heavily wooded, clear for 10'+ right of bend, trees extend to toe of slope left of bend		Х	
	8. ACCESSIBILITY	No access to area left of the outlet channel, access from right abutment for area		Х	Х
		right of the outlet channel			
	9. DOWNSTREAM HAZARD DESCRIPT	FION Several residences, local and state roads, utilities			
	10. DATE OF LAST EAP UPDATE	EAP is available at park headquarters, undated			
ADDITIONAI	L COMMENTS: 7 - Trees and brush within	15 ft of downstream toe should be removed and grubbed. The area should be planted with gr	ass.		

INSPECTION DATE: <u>lune 1, 2021</u> NID ID #: <u>MAII III</u> MISCELLANEOUS AREA INSPECTED CONDITION OBSERVATIONS I. RESERVOIR DEPTH (AVG) I. ft. + max depth, 10 ft. + average I. RESERVOIR SLOPES OBSERVATIONS I. RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate; no sides observed; residential f vacation development surrounds much of reservoir Unpaved road to main embankment. S. SECURITY DEVICES MISC. ACCESS ROADS ID ACCESS ROADS ID ACCESS ROADS ID ACCESS ROADS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on DATE: D. AVAILABILITY OF EAPLAST UPDATE YES NO DATE: D. AVAILABILITY OF CASH MANUAL YES NO DATE: D. AVAILABILITY OF CASH MANUAL YES NO DATE: D. AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: D. AVAILABILITY OF OXM MAN	NAME OF DA	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1
MISCELLANEOUS AREA INSPECTED CONDITION OBSERVATIONS RESERVOIR DEPTH (AVG) I5 ft. + max depth, 10 ft. + average RESERVOIR SHORELINE Wooded, residential houses RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate, no sildes observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir Unpaved road to main embankment and creat is passable to the spillway. No access for maintenance to the left embankment. S. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or baoys. Grate on inlet pipe. T. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES NO WHAT: 9. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF DEAPLAST UPDATE YES NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF Q&M MANUAL YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE: 	INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>
AREA INSPECTED CONDITION OBSERVATIONS I. RESERVOIR DEPTH (AVG) 15 ft. + max depth, 10 ft. + average 2. RESERVOIR SHORELINE Wooded, residential houses 3. RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate; no slides observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir Unpaved road to main embankment and crest is passable to the spillway. No access for maintenance to the left embankment. 5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES No 9. AVAILABILITY OF DEADS YES NO 10. AVAILABILITY OF DEADR CALCS YES NO 11. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL YES NO 12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL YES NO 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PATE:			MISCELLANEOUS
I. RESERVOIR DEPTH (AVG) 15 ft. + max depth, 10 ft. + average 2. RESERVOIR SHORELINE Wooded, residential houses 3. RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate; no slides observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir MISC. 4. ACCESS ROADS 5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES 11. AVAILABILITY OF GAM MANUAL YES 12. AVAILABILITY OF O& MANUAL YES 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: YES	AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS
2. RESERVOIR SHORELINE Wooded, residential houses 3. RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate; no slides observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir MISC. 4. ACCESS ROADS SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES NO 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES NO 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO 11. AVAILABILITY OF GAM MANUAL YES NO 12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL YES NO 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE:		1. RESERVOIR DEPTH (AVG)	15 ft. + max depth, 10 ft. + average
3. RESERVOIR SLOPES Moderate; no slides observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir MISC. 4. ACCESS ROADS Unpaved road to main embankment and crest is passable to the spillway. No access for MISC. 4. ACCESS ROADS maintenance to the left embankment. 5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS ✓ YES 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES 11. AVAILABILITY OF DAM MANUAL ✓ YES 12. AVAILABILITY OF OAM MANUAL ✓ YES 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE ✓ YES 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED ✓ YES 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED ✓ YES ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		2. RESERVOIR SHORELINE	Wooded, residential houses
MISC. Unpaved road to main embankment and crest is passable to the spillway. No access for maintenance to the left embankment. 5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS ♥ YES 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS ♥ YES 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS ♥ YES 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE ♥ YES 12. AVAILABILITY OF 0&M MANUAL ♥ YES 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE ♥ YES 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED ♥ YES 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED ♥ YES ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		3. RESERVOIR SLOPES	Moderate; no slides observed; residential / vacation development surrounds much of reservoir
MISC. 4. ACCESS ROADS maintenance to the left embankment. 5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS VES NO WHAT: 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS VES NO DATE: 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS VES NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE VES NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL VES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE VES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED VES NO PURPOSE:			Unpaved road to main embankment and crest is passable to the spillway. No access for
5. SECURITY DEVICES Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest. 6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES NO 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES NO 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO 12. AVAILABILITY OF OM MANUAL YES NO 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO 14. COMMENTS: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:	MISC.	4. ACCESS ROADS	maintenance to the left embankment.
6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe. 7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES NO 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES NO 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO 12. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO 14. COMMENTS: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		5. SECURITY DEVICES	Locks on low-level outlet control valve chamber. Locked gate for access to crest.
7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam. 8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS YES NO WHAT: 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES NO DATE: 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF 0&M MANUAL YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE:		6. WATER PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION	No Signs, barriers, or buoys. Grate on inlet pipe.
8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS ✓ YES NO WHAT: 9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS ✓ YES ✓ NO DATE: 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS ✓ YES ✓ NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE ✓ YES ✓ NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL ✓ YES ○ NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE ✓ YES ○ NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED ○ YES ✓ NO PURPOSE:		7. LAND-SIDE PUBLIC HAZARDS & PROTECTION	No fall hazard prevention structures. No high risk of falls at dam.
9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS YES NO DATE: 10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF 0&M MANUAL YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE:		8. VANDALISM OR TRESPASS	✓ YES NO WHAT:
10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS YES NO DATE: 11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE YES NO DATE: 12. AVAILABILITY OF 0&M MANUAL YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE:		9. AVAILABILITY OF PLANS	YES NO DATE:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		10. AVAILABILITY OF DESIGN CALCS	YES NO DATE:
12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL YES NO DATE: 13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE YES NO DATE: 14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED YES NO PURPOSE:		11. AVAILABILITY OF EAP/LAST UPDATE	YES NO DATE:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		12. AVAILABILITY OF O&M MANUAL	YES NO DATE:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		13. CARETAKER/OWNER AVAILABLE	YES NO DATE:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		14. CONFINED SPACE ENTRY REQUIRED	YES NO PURPOSE:
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:			
	ADDITIONA	L COMMENTS:	

NAME OF DA	AM: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: 1-2-132-1			
INSPECTION DATE: June 1, 2021		NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	_		
		PRIMARY SPILLWAY			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
	SPILLWAY TYPE	uncontrolled spillway with seasonal 12-inch high flashboards			
	WEIR TYPE	broad crested weir, grass-lined channel			
	SPILLWAY CONDITION	satisfactory			
SPILLWAY	TRAINING WALLS	no evidence of concrete deterioration, spalling, or effloresence			
	SPILLWAY CONTROLS AND CONDITION	uncontrolled spillway, flashboards not installed during inspection			
	UNUSUAL MOVEMENT	none observed			
	APPROACH AREA	gradual slope; grassed and reed covered			
	DISCHARGE AREA	no erosion or undercutting observed			
	DEBRIS	minor amount of vegetation and debris in discharge area			
ADDITIONA	L COMMENTS:				

NAME OF DA	M: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>	_		
INSPECTION	DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	_		
		AUXILIARY SPILLWAY			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
SPILLWAY	SPILLWAY TYPE WEIR TYPE SPILLWAY CONDITION TRAINING WALLS SPILLWAY CONTROLS AND CONDITION UNUSUAL MOVEMENT APPROACH AREA DISCHARGE AREA DEBRIS	Not Applicable to this Dam			
ADDITIONAI	COMMENTS:				

DATE: June 1, 2021	NID ID #: MA11111 OUTLET WORKS Image: Mail Contract of the second seco			
	OUTLET WORKS			
CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
ТҮРЕ	16 inch cast-iron pipe	X		
INTAKE STRUCTURE	Not observed	X		
TRASHRACK	Not observed	X		
PRIMARY CLOSURE	Valve within a locked vault, not observed	X		
SECONDARY CLOSURE	Butterfly valve at outfall			
CONDUIT	16 inch cast-iron pipe	Х		
OUTLET STRUCTURE/HEADWALL	24-inch diameter cast iron or ductile iron pipe	Х		
EROSION ALONG TOE OF DAM	None observed	Х		
SEEPAGE/LEAKAGE	None observed			
DEBRIS/BLOCKAGE	None observed	Х		
UNUSUAL MOVEMENT	None observed	Х		
DOWNSTREAM AREA	None observed	X		
MISCELLANEOUS	Some orange staining observed in the channel believed to be from toe drain		x	x
	discharge, but actual source was not observed			
COMMENTS:				
	CONDITION TYPE INTAKE STRUCTURE TRASHRACK PRIMARY CLOSURE SECONDARY CLOSURE CONDUIT OUTLET STRUCTURE/HEADWALL EROSION ALONG TOE OF DAM SEEPAGE/LEAKAGE DEBRIS/BLOCKAGE UNUSUAL MOVEMENT DOWNSTREAM AREA MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS:	CONDITION OBSERVATIONS TYPE 16 inch cast-iron pipe INTAKE STRUCTURE Not observed TRASHRACK Not observed PRIMARY CLOSURE Valve within a locked vault, not observed SECONDARY CLOSURE Butterfly valve at outfall CONDUIT 16 inch cast-iron pipe OUTLET STRUCTURE/HEADWALL 24-inch diameter cast iron or ductile iron pipe EROSION ALONG TOE OF DAM None observed SEEPAGE/LEAKAGE None observed DBBRIS/BLOCKAGE None observed MISCELLANEOUS Some orange staining observed in the channel, believed to be from toe drain discharge, but actual source was not observed	CONDITION OBSERVATIONS of period TYPE 16 inch cast-iron pipe X INTAKE STRUCTURE Not observed X TRASHRACK Not observed X PRIMARY CLOSURE Valve within a locked vault, not observed X SECONDARY CLOSURE Butterfly valve at outfall T CONDUIT 16 inch cast-iron pipe X QUTLET STRUCTURE/HEADWALL 24- inch diameter cast iron or ductile iron pipe X SECONDARY CLOSURE None observed X EROSION ALONG TOE OF DAM None observed X SEEPAGE/LEAKAGE None observed X DUNUSULAL MOVEMENT None observed X DOWNSTREAM AREA None observed X MISCELLANEOUS Some orange staining observed in the channel, believed to be from toe drain X COMMENTS:	CONDITION OBSERVATIONS OPE Performance TYPE 16 inch cast-iron pipe X X INTAKE STRUCTURE Not observed X X TRASHRACK Not observed X X PRIMARY CLOSURE Butterfly valve at outfall X X CONDUIT 16 inch cast-iron pipe X X OUTLET STRUCTURE/HEADWALL 24-inch diameter cast iron or ductile iron pipe X X EROSION ALONG TOE OF DAM None observed X X SEEPAGE/LEAKAGE None observed X X DUNUSUAL MOVEMENT None observed X X DOWNSTREAM AREA None observed in the channel, believed to be from toe drain X MISCELLANEOUS Some orange staining observed in the channel, believed to be from toe drain X COMMENTS:

NAME OF DA	M: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>	-		
INSPECTION DATE: June 1, 2021		NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	-		
	CONC	RETE/MASONRY DAMS (CREST)			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
CREST	TYPE SURFACE CONDITIONS CONDITIONS OF JOINTS UNUSUAL MOVEMENT HORIZONTAL ALIGNMENT VERTICAL ALIGNMENT	Not Applicable to this Dam			
ADDITIONAI	COMMENTS:				

NAME OF DA	M: Any Lake Dam	STATE ID #: <u>1-2-132-1</u>	_		
INSPECTION DATE: June 1, 2021		NID ID #: <u>MA11111</u>	_		
	CONCRETE/M	ASONRY DAMS (DOWNSTREAM FACE)			
AREA INSPECTED	CONDITION	OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
D/S FACE	TYPE SURFACE CONDITIONS CONDITIONS OF JOINTS UNUSUAL MOVEMENT ABUTMENT CONTACT LEAKAGE	Not Applicable to this Dam			
ADDITIONAI	COMMENTS:		<u>+</u>		

D #: MA11111 IS (UPSTREAM FACE) OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
IS (UPSTREAM FACE) OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
OBSERVATIONS	NO ACTION	MONITOR	REPAIR
t Applicable o this Dam			
	o this Dam	o this Dam	o this Dam

APPENDIX C Previous Reports and References

PREVIOUS REPORTS AND REFERENCES

The following is a list of reports that were located during the file review, or were referenced in previous reports.

- 1. Any Lake Dam Any Town, Emergency Action Plan, ENC COM, Boston, April 2003.
- 2. Department of Environmental Management, Office of Dam Safety, Memorandum, Lake Dam, R. David Cark; December 4, 1997.
- 3. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Memo; October 4, 1990.
- 4. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Operation Plan; October 4, 1990.

5. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Operation Plan; September 24, 1990.

- 6. Department of Environmental Management, Letter, March 2, 1989.
- 7. Department of Environmental Management, Memo, Emergency Service Contract; April 28, 1989.

8. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Memo-Site Visit; April 21, 1989.

- 9. Department of Environmental Management, Emergency Work Authorization, Any Lake Dam; May 3, 1989.
- 10. Department of Environmental Management, Letter, October 20, 1988.
- 11. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Emergency Conditions; October 20, 1988.
- 12. Department of Environmental Management, Any Lake Dam, Letter, October 20, 1988.
- 13. Department of Environmental Management, Memo, Any Lake Dam, October 17, 1988.
- 14. Department of Environmental Management Waterways Division, Any Lake Dam, Itemized Proposal with Special Provisions for Proposed Repairs and Modifications to the Dam Embankment at Any Lake Dam; September 10, 1985.

The following technical references were utilized during the preparation of this report and the development of the recommendations presented herein.

- 15. United States Department of Agriculture (2005), National Resource Conservation Service, "Soil Survey – Berkshire County, Massachusetts", September 2005.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (2003), Hydraulic Engineering Center "Hydraulic Modeling System Version 3.1.0"; May 28, 2003.
- United States National Weather Service (1982). "Application of Probable Maximum Precipitation Estimates, United States East of the 105th Meridian," NOAA Hydrometeorological Report No. 52, prepared by E. M. Hansen, L. C. Schreiner, and J. T. Riedel.

- 18. United States Army Corps of Engineers (1979), "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspections of Dams". Washington, DC, 1979.
- United States National Weather Service (1978). "Probable Maximum Precipitation Estimates, United States East of the 105th Meridian," Hydrometeorological Report No. 51, prepared by L. C. Schreiner and J. T. Riedel.
- 20. Mockus, V. (1972). "National Engineering Handbook, Section 4, Hydrology", 1972, National Soil Conservation Service.

The following references, specific to Any Lake Dam, were utilized during the preparation of this report and the development of the recommendations presented herein.

- 21. ENG CORP (2006). "Any Lake Dam Inspection/Evaluation Report" June 2006.
- 22. GEI Consultants, Inc. (2005). "Phase II Inspection Report Any Lake Dam, Hinsdale, Massachusetts", December 2005.
- 23. Sackett Survey Services, Inc. (2005). "Topographic Plan of Any Lake Dam, Town of Hinsdale, Berkshire County, Massachusetts," Prepared by Sackett Survey Services, Inc., Pittsfield, Massachusetts, dated October 24, 2005, (one sheet).
- 24. PARE (2003). "Department of Conservation and Recreation Office of Dam Safety, DCR Owned Dam Inspection/Evaluation Report".
- 25. Bellisle, J.M. (2003). "Department of Conservation and Recreation Office of Dam Safety, DCR Owned Dam Inspection/Evaluation Report." Report for September 25, 2003 inspection of Any Lake Dam (ID 1-2-132-1), Prepared for Department of Conservation and Recreation Office of Dam Safety by Pare Engineering Corporation Norwood, Massachusetts.
- 26. Sackett Survey Services, Inc. (2002). "Topographic Plan of Any Lake Dam, Town of Hinsdale, Berkshire County, Massachusetts," Prepared by Sackett Survey Services, Inc., Pittsfield, Massachusetts, (one sheet).
- 27. Root, M.J. (2002). "Boring Logs: Any Lake Dam," Letter Report to Department of Environmental Management Department of Dam Safety, Root Engineering, Springfield, Vermont, May.
- 28. Root, M.J. (2002). "Soil Testing, Any Lake Dam-Hinsdale," Letter Report to Office of Dam Safety of Department of Environmental Management, Root Engineering, Springfield, Vermont, June.
- 29. Clark, R. D. (2001). "Any Lake Dam 1-2-263-2, Notice of Inspection," Report for July 20, 2001 inspection of Any Lake Dam (ID 1-2-132-1), Prepared by Department of Environmental Management Office of Dam Safety.
- 30. "Lake Management Plan, Any and Plunkett Lakes Hinsdale, MA", dated March 2000.
- 31. Jennings, T. E. (1999). "Department of Environmental Management Office of Dam Safety, DEM Owned Dam Inspection/ Evaluation Report," Report for April 29, 1999 inspection of Any Lake Dam (ID 1-2-132-1), Prepared for Department of Environmental Management Office of Dam Safety by Baystate Environmental Consultants Inc., East Longmeadow, Massachusetts.

- 32. Haley and Aldrich, Inc. (1985). "Proposed Repairs to Lake Any Dam, Hinsdale, Massachusetts," (three sheets), July.
- LeCount, P.L. (1985). "Test Boring and Piezometer/Observation Well Data, Lake Any Dam (MA00223), Hinsdale, Massachusetts," Report to Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management, Haley & Aldrich Inc., Boston, MA.
- 34. LeCount, P. L. (1985). "Evaluation of Data and Hydrologic/Hydraulic Analysis, Lake Any Dam (MA00223), Hinsdale, Massachusetts," Report to Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Management, Haley & Aldrich Inc., Boston, Massachusetts.
- 35. O'Brien, E. (1978). "Any Lake Dam MA00223, Phase I Inspection Report, National Dam Inspection Program," Report for June 22, 1978 inspection of Any Lake Dam, Prepared for the New England Division of the Corps of Engineers by Tippetts,-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton.
- 36. Maisner, W. P. (1968). "Plan of Land Showing Ownership in Vicinity of Any Lake Hinsdale and Peru, Mass.," (one sheet).
- 37. Hollingsworth, C.W. (1939). Trace of Any Lake Dam plans, sections, and details, February 9.
- 38. Department of Conservation and Recreation. "Any Lake, MA00223, Correspondence," File folder provided by Department of Conservation and Recreation.
- 39. Department of Conservation and Recreation. "Any Lake Dam, MA00223, Designs and Field Notes," File folder provided by Department of Conservation and Recreation.

APPENDIX D Definitions -

COMMON DAM SAFETY DEFINITIONS

For a comprehensive list of dam engineering terminology and definitions refer to 302 CMR10.00 Dam Safety, or other reference published by FERC, Dept. of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation, or FEMA. Please note should discrepancies between definitions exist, those definitions included within 302 CMR 10.00 govern for dams located within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Orientation

Upstream – Shall mean the side of the dam that borders the impoundment.

Downstream – Shall mean the high side of the dam, the side opposite the upstream side.

<u>Right</u> – Shall mean the area to the right when looking in the downstream direction.

<u>Left</u> – Shall mean the area to the left when looking in the downstream direction.

Dam Components

Dam - Shall mean any artificial barrier, including appurtenant works, which impounds or diverts water.

<u>Embankment</u> – Shall mean the fill material, usually earth or rock, placed with sloping sides, such that it forms a permanent barrier that impounds water.

<u>Crest</u> – Shall mean the top of the dam, usually provides a road or path across the dam.

<u>Abutment</u> – Shall mean that part of a valley side against which a dam is constructed. An artificial abutment is sometimes constructed as a concrete gravity section, to take the thrust of an arch dam where there is no suitable natural abutment.

<u>Appurtenant Works</u> – Shall mean structures, either in dams or separate therefrom, including but not be limited to, spillways; reservoirs and their rims; low-level outlet works; and water conduits including tunnels, pipelines, or penstocks, either through the dams or their abutments.

<u>Spillway</u> – Shall mean a structure over or through which water flows are discharged. If the flow is controlled by gates or boards, it is a controlled spillway; if the fixed elevation of the spillway crest controls the level of the impoundment, it is an uncontrolled spillway.

Size Classification

(as listed in Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 302 CMR 10.00 Dam Safety)

Large – structure with a height greater than 40 feet or a storage capacity greater than 1,000 acre-feet.

Intermediate – structure with a height between 15 and 40 feet or a storage capacity of 50 to 1,000 acre-feet.

Small – structure with a height between 6 and 15 feet and a storage capacity of 15 to 50 acre-feet.

<u>Non-Jurisdictional</u> – structure less than 6 feet in height or having a storage capacity of less than 15 acre-feet.

Hazard Classification

(as listed in Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 302 CMR 10.00 Dam Safety)

<u>High Hazard (Class I)</u> – Shall mean dams located where failure will likely cause loss of life and serious damage to home(s), industrial or commercial facilities, important public utilities, main highway(s) or railroad(s).

<u>Significant Hazard (Class II)</u> – Shall mean dams located where failure may cause loss of life and damage to home(s), industrial or commercial facilities, secondary highway(s) or railroad(s), or cause the interruption of the use or service of relatively important facilities.

Low Hazard (Class III) – Dams located where failure may cause minimal property damage to others. Loss of life is not expected.

General

 $\underline{\text{EAP}} - \underline{\text{Emergency Action Plan}}$ – Shall mean a predetermined (and properly documented) plan of action to be taken to reduce the potential for property damage and/or loss of life in an area affected by an impending dam failure.

<u>O&M Manual</u> – Operations and Maintenance Manual; Document identifying routine maintenance and operational procedures under normal and storm conditions.

Normal Pool – Shall mean the elevation of the impoundment during normal operating conditions.

<u>Acre-foot</u> – Shall mean a unit of volumetric measure that would cover one acre to a depth of one foot. It is equal to 43,560 cubic feet. One million U.S. gallons = 3.068 acre feet.

<u>Height of Dam (Structural Height)</u> – Shall mean the vertical distance from the lowest portion of the natural ground, including any stream channel, along the downstream toe of the dam to the lowest point on the crest of the dam.

<u>Hydraulic Height</u> – means the height to which water rises behind a dam and the difference between the lowest point in the original streambed at the axis of the dam and the maximum controllable water surface.

<u>Maximum Water Storage Elevation</u> – means the maximum elevation of water surface which can be contained by the dam without overtopping the embankment section.

<u>Spillway Design Flood (SDF)</u> – Shall mean the flood used in the design of a dam and its appurtenant works particularly for sizing the spillway and outlet works, and for determining maximum temporary storage and height of dam requirements.

<u>Maximum Storage Capacity</u> – The volume of water contained in the impoundment at maximum water storage elevation.

<u>Normal Storage Capacity</u> – The volume of water contained in the impoundment at normal water storage elevation.

Condition Rating

<u>Unsafe</u> – Major structural*, operational, and maintenance deficiencies exist under normal operating conditions.

<u>Poor</u> – Significant structural*, operation and maintenance deficiencies are clearly recognized for normal loading conditions.

<u>Fair</u> – Significant operational and maintenance deficiencies, no structural deficiencies. Potential deficiencies exist under unusual loading conditions that may realistically occur. Can be used when uncertainties exist as to critical parameters.

<u>Satisfactory</u> – Minor operational and maintenance deficiencies. Infrequent hydrologic events would probably result in deficiencies.

<u>Good</u> – No existing or potential deficiencies recognized. Safe performance is expected under all loading including SDF.

* Structural deficiencies include but are not limited to the following:

- Excessive uncontrolled seepage (e.g., upwelling of water, evidence of fines movement, flowing water, erosion, etc.)
- Missing riprap with resulting erosion of slope
- Sinkholes, particularly behind retaining walls and above outlet pipes, possibly indicating loss of soil due to piping, rather than animal burrows
- Excessive vegetation and tree growth, particularly if it obscures features of the dam and the dam cannot be fully inspected
- Deterioration of concrete structures (e.g., exposed rebar, tilted walls, large cracks with or without seepage, excessive spalling, etc.)
- Inoperable outlets (gates and valves that have not been operated for many years or are broken)