

RECEIVED

FEB 24 2014

CITY OF SILVERTON PUBLIC WORKS

Water Resources Department

North Mall Office Building 725 Summer Street NE, Suite A Salem, OR 97301-1271 503-986-0900 FAX 503-986-0904

February 18, 2014

Gerald Fisher, Public Works Director City of Silverton 306 S Water Street Silverton, OR 97381

Re: Silver Creek Dam (S-66) – Inspection Summary

This dam was inspected on September 4, 2013. I performed the inspection with you and engineering intern Chuck Williams. A group of legislative support personnel were also there, and your hospitality and support for the dam safety program was much appreciated. The Water Resources Department conducts these routine inspections to identify safety, maintenance or operational issues that may affect dam integrity. Dams are assigned a hazard rating based on downstream hazard to people and property, not on the condition of the dam. Silver Creek is classified as a high hazard dam, inspected annually.

The results of this inspection are illustrated and described in the following photos and text. This inspection includes recommendations to keep the dam safe and properly working.

Results of Inspection:



Spillway control section

There is nothing apparent that would affect capacity of the emergency spillway. The spillway is clear of obstructions and shows no signs of erosion that might affect its safely passing flood flows. The reservoir level was 423.4 feet on the staff gage when inspected. Minimum recent freeboard was 13 feet, which is very good.



Spillway discharge channel

The stilling basin and base of spillway were repaired last year, and the repairs should bring the energy dissipation function to near its designed condition. As of this inspection, these repairs were not yet tested by a high flow event.



Spillway drain

Spillway drains three and six were the only two drains with significant flow for this inspection. These are the drains that most commonly flow. Flow from drain three was 9 gallons per minute, and flow from drain six was 6 gallons per minute. All flow was clear.



Concrete loss between spillway slabs

As was first observed during the 2012 inspection, a hammer strike on the concrete spillway slab results in hollow sounds, especially around a few of the joints. There is also delamination and exfoliation cracking around a few of the joints, as shown in the photo above. We discussed the need for a few core holes through the slabs while we were on site, in order to determine the cause of the isolated voids under the slabs.



Crest and upstream face

The embankment shows no signs of settlement, instability, or internal erosion. The crest is wide and shows no signs of settlement. This dam has a well maintained cover of grass and other non woody vegetation. The grass cover on the dam now effectively reduces surface erosion and provides very little cover for burrowing animals. Over the last three years, maintenance of the embankment has been superior.



Low level conduit discharge and toe drains

The conduit did not close completely during this inspection. In review of the inspection files, the 2001 OWRD inspection, the report included the following. "To gain access to the 42" diameter outlet conduit through the dam, city personnel installed a cofferdam across the stilling basin and pumped the accumulated water into the downstream channel. The biggest obstacle during the inspection was the amount of leakage (estimated 2 cfs) that traveled down the pipe and into the stilling basin. It was necessary to use three portable pumps to effectively drain the stilling basin and thus expose the downstream invert of the 42" outlet conduit." This situation has not seemed to change much. At some point this leak should be addressed.

There are many toe drains on this dam, and there flows were measures as follows:

Drain 1-25 gpm

Drain 2 - drip

Drain 3 - drip

Drain 4 - 10 gpm

Drain 5 - drip

Drain 6 - 1 gpm

Drain 7 - missing

Drain 8 - 3 gpm

Drain 9 - 1 gpm

The flow was 20 gallons per minute on the right side of the conduit discharge box, but I believe most of this was from the drains above it. There was just a trickle flowing from the left side of the discharge box. The flow rates are not greatly different from those measured between 2001 and 2010. The water from all toe drains dam was clean and the flow does not appear to be increasing based on the results of our previous inspections.



Discussion of dam safety at Silver Creek dam

We had a very good discussion of issues facing dam owners with legislative staff at the dam. The main issues are access to the dam and monitoring. Access to the dam from the south does not yet exist. The Emergency Action Plan is current as of January 2009. Overall, this dam has been well maintained and operated, and its condition has improved over the last three years.

Recommendations in order of priority:

- 1) Continue excellent vegetation management that makes the dam easy to inspect for potential changes in seepage.
- 2) Continue progress and secure access by road to the main dam embankment (probably from the south).
- 3) Investigate the small voids under the discharge spillway slabs.
- 4) Continue to work towards remote monitoring of the dam.
- 5) Investigate leakage through the low level conduit.

A copy of the field inspection sheet for this dam is attached. Thanks again for meeting with us. Please let me know if you have any questions about this inspection, and if there is a general time you prefer for the next inspection.

Sincerely,

Keith Mills, P.E., Dam Safety Engineer

Wills

(503) 986-0840

C: Mike McCord, Watermaster District 16 Dam Safety File S-66



Dam Safety Inspection Form

State of Oregon Water Resources Department 725 Summer Street NE, Suite A Salem, Oregon 97301-1271 (503) 986-0900

File #:	ft. Storage:	16
I. Dam	Earth Rock Concrete Other	Rating
Up. Slope	Vegetation, Animals, Erosion, Wave Action, Depression, Whirlpool adjacent	4
Crest	Width, Surfacing, Vegetation, Trampling, Depression, Cracks, Breaching	5
Down. Slope	Vegetation, Animals, Erosion, Seepage, Leak (muddy), Bulge, Depression Slide	5
R. Abutment	Vegetation, Animals, Erosion, Seepage, Leak (muddy)	761
L. Abutment	Vegetation, Animals, Erosion, Scepage, Leak (muddy)	5
Toe	Vegetation, Erosion, Seepage, Leak (muddy), Boil	4
Seepage/leak flo	w Right gpm Center gpm Left gpm Other gpm (use comment)	509-6
Auxiliary dike (s		
Comments:		
II. Reservoir	Pool elevation: 4234 Point of Reference:	Rating
Minimum freebo		4
Floating Debris/	CARD.	4
Landslides/Erosi		-
Log Boom	Not needed ☐ Present ☐ Needed ☐ Deterioration ☐ Ineffective	-
Comments:	M	
III. Toe Drains		
Flow (gpm) Damage	0 0 99pm 0 0 69pm	
Sediment		
Rating	4 4 4 4 4	
Toe	25 gpm drip drip 10 gpm drip 1 gpm 3 gp 20 gpm L 0.5 gpm.	9 m 191

Reviewed by dam safety engineer: NA IV. Conduit Control: Trickle tube Inlet gate Submerged	☐ Yes ☐ No	
Inlet gate	Manual Valve Power Valve other	Rating
Trash Rack Submerged	Submerged	
Control/Stem	☐ Clean ☐ Greased ☐ Irregular	
Valve(s) cycling Frozen unknown		
Diameter: Material	Condition 5 05 mergel	-X
Outlet Structure	Pressurized Leaking gpm	-
Secondary outlet Yes No Type	Diameter in.	
Comments: * Mends to	> he drawl	
V. Spillway		
		Rating
Approach Channel Clear Trees/bru	n in capacity	-
	None In place operational deteriorated	
	V Clear Trees/brush Deakage Deadcutting	
	10/1/20/10	
Comments:	minents below)	
Comments.		
VI. Access and Security		Rating
Vehicle access Public road	all weather road dirt road cross country	3
Fencing, signage Remote		4-
On Site Dam Tender/Contact Yes No N	Name: Phone:	
	Completed at dam (dated 2009) None	
Comments: SOUTH SIDE	INACTES IBLE BY VEHICLE	
Comments:		
	land JaiNT INSP 31d HORIZONTHE	
3 A HORIZATER SOINT & 184 VERTI	CAL, 2nd fixer 22NTAL @ RIGHT GIRE,	11
	4 A SOVE 4th MORIZINTAL JOINS CENTRA	