

Water Resources Department

725 Summer St NE, Suite A Salem, OR 97301 (503) 986-0900 Fax (503) 986-0904

February 11, 2022

Bart Stepp, City Engineer City of Silverton 306 S. Water Street Silverton, OR 97381

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

This dam was inspected on August 26, 2021. The inspection was performed by Civil Engineering Specialist Arden Babb and District 16 Watermaster Greg Wacker. The Water Resources Department conducts routine inspections of the dams' exterior surfaces to identify conditions that might affect the safety of the dam. Dams are assigned a hazard rating based on downstream hazard to people and property, not on the condition of the dam. Silver Creek Dam is classified as a high hazard dam. High hazard dams are typically inspected every year.

Summary: Results of the inspection are summarized in the table below. Detail regarding the inspection can be found in the following photos and text. Where work is needed, additional information can also be found in the section below. Any aspects of the dam that did not present a dam safety concern are not discussed in this letter.

Category	Inspected	Result
Access	\boxtimes	Adequate
Reservoir	×	Adequate
Spillway	×	Adequate
Seepage/Leakage	×	Adequate
Conduit	×	Adequate
Embankment	\boxtimes	Maintenance
Instrumentation/Monitoring	×	Adequate
Emergency Action Plan	×	Adequate

Details & Recommendations:

This inspection did not include a review of the design drawings and specifications for this dam. This inspection also did not include a review of data collected by instrumentation on the dam.

The reservoir level was 423.8 feet at the time of the inspection. The minimum freeboard was 10 feet, which is excellent.

Spillway:

There were some large logs on the edge of the spillway discharge channel. Based on reports from staff onsite, these should wash downstream during the next heavy flow. Please monitor this area to ensure it does not become blocked.



Logs on edge of discharge channel

Seepage:

The normal seepage for this dam was observed during the inspection. There have been no significant changes in this area during the past few years. Please continue to monitor this area for any changes in flow, coloration, or sediment discharge. Because of this additional seepage, it is important to keep the weirs and toe drains clean and functioning properly. They looked great during the inspection.



Typical seepage observed at reinforced area





All the weirs were clean and functioning properly at the time of the inspection

Embankment

Minor maintenance is needed on the upstream side of the embankment. Some brush has grown up that should be managed to prevent habitat for burrowing animals and to enable proper inspection of the dam face. Please keep the embankment to a cover of low grass



Vegetation growing on upstream embankment and near waterline

Instrumentation and Monitoring:

All instruments were clean and well maintained. They were all locked and secured with updates coming to the monitoring software soon.



Monitoring station, clean and secured

Summary of Recommendations:

Please manage the vegetation on the dam that has begun to grow near the waterline and on the upstream embankment. Vegetation should be maintained to a low ground cover.

Please note that if any work is to be completed on the dam or surrounding areas which either directly or indirectly impacts the reservoir, downstream waterway quality, or fish passage, other state and federal agencies may have permit requirements or regulations for this work.

This dam is well maintained and operated and is in Fair condition. Please continue the good operation and maintenance of this dam. Also note that the condition rating does not reflect the seismic stability of this dam as an analysis has not been completed. As a result, an analysis will be needed in the near future.

We use a standard inspection form, and a copy of the field inspection sheet for this dam is attached. Thanks again for meeting with Arden and Greg. Please let me know if you have any questions about this inspection. We look forward to future inspections of this dam.

Sincerely,

Tony Janicek Ph.D., P.E.

Dam Safety Program Coordinator

(971)718-7921

C: Keith Mills, P.E., State Engineer

Greg Wacker, Watermaster District 16

Dam Safety File S -66



Oregon Dam Safety Inspection Form

Name of Dam: SILVE	ER CREEK File #: S-66						
Height: 65 ft. Storage: 1,300 ac. ft.		c. ft.	ft. Permit:		NID #: OR00622		
High Hazard Dam		Condition Assess	sment: Fair	Fair District: 16			
Date: August 26, 2021	weather: Dry Rain Snow Now Prior Inspection: September Recently		17, 2020				
Inspector(s): Tony Jan	icek	*	Others on Sit	te: Greg Wacker, Jensen,	rob,		
Issues from Prior Insp	ectior	1:					
Rating Criteria: 5: Ex 2: Maintenance Actio	_			intenance; 3: Maintenar	ice Act	ion Needed;	
General							Rating
Vehicle Access	V	All Weather Road	☐ Dirt Road ☐	None			4
Access Control	\square	Gate ☐ Locked an	d Secured 🔽 I	Fencing ☑ Signage □ N	one 🗆	Other	4
Detail:	Acc	ess agreement made	e, check condition	on of private road 2022			
Reservoir	Poo	l Level: <u>423.8</u> ft.		ited ☑ Measured □ Ot Gage □ Other	her		Rating
Minimum Freeboard	Vertical distance from debris line to lowest place on crest: 10 ft.				4		
Condition	✓ No Issue ☐ Floating Debris/Trash ☐ Log Boom ☐ Unusual Condition ☐ Other				4		
Detail:							
Carillaran							Rating
Spillway		Louds II Consumb	o [] Culuant [I Dook T Twickle tube T] Othor		Rating
Structure				Rock Trickle tube	Other		
Structure Approach Channel	V	Clear Trees/bi	rush 🗆 Debris	☐ Erosion ☐ Other			4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section	V	Clear Trees/bi	rush □ Debris	☐ Erosion ☐ Other			
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions	✓ Wid	Clear ✓ Trees/bi Concrete □ Rock th: ft. Depth: ft.	rush □ Debris □ Soil □ Culv □ Survey Atta	☐ Erosion ☐ Other ert ☐ Other ☐ Unstable ched			4 4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section	Wid	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta	☐ Erosion ☐ Other ert ☐ Other ☐ Unstable ched onal ☐ Deteriorated			4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions	Wid	Clear	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation	☐ Erosion ☐ Other ert ☐ Other ☐ Unstable ched onal ☐ Deteriorated	,		4 4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate	Wid U Y	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Leadcutting feet fr Lone Functiona	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage om spillway cor	☐ Erosion ☐ Other ert ☐ Other ☐ Unstable ched onal ☐ Deteriorated	□ Non	e	4 4 N/A
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel	Wid UY UNITED HISSU	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Leadcutting feet fr Lone Functiona	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage rom spillway con al Minor Eros	☐ Erosion ☐ Other ert ☐ Other ☐ Unstable ched onal ☐ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion ☐ Severe Erosion ☐	□ Non	e	4 4 N/A 4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel Stilling basin	Wid Wid I Y I Ssu	Clear Trees/br Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Clear Trees/br Leadcutting feet fr Tone Functiona e Tes No (use "D	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage rom spillway cor al Minor Eros retail" box below areas of patches	□ Erosion □ Other ert □ Other □ Unstable ched onal □ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion □ Severe Erosion □ v) s. No changes since last ye	□ Non	e reutting No	4 4 N/A 4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel Stilling basin Aux. Spillway	Wid Wid I Y I Ssu	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Ieadcutting feet fr Ione Functiona e Tes No (use "D crete looks good in	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage rom spillway cor al Minor Eros retail" box below areas of patches	□ Erosion □ Other ert □ Other □ Unstable ched onal □ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion □ Severe Erosion □ v) s. No changes since last ye	□ Non	e reutting No	4 4 N/A 4
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel Stilling basin Aux. Spillway Detail:	Widd Y H N Issu Con with	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Iteadcutting feet fr Itended Functiona e Tes No (use "D crete looks good in a next spillway flow	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage om spillway con al Minor Eros petail" box below areas of patches y. Monitor in cas	□ Erosion □ Other ert □ Other □ Unstable ched onal □ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion □ Severe Erosion □ v) s. No changes since last ye	□ Non] Under	e rcutting No s in spillway should was	4 4 A N/A 4 4 Sh out
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel Stilling basin Aux. Spillway Detail: Seepage/Leakage	Widd Y H Issu Con with	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Iteadcutting feet fr Itended Functiona e Tes No (use "D crete looks good in a next spillway flow	rush Debris Soil Culv Survey Atta lace Operation ush Leakage rom spillway cor al Minor Eros retail" box below areas of patches y. Monitor in cas	□ Erosion □ Other ert □ Other □ Unstable ched onal □ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion □ Severe Erosion □ v) s. No changes since last ye se of blockage ge □ Piping □ Discolore	□ Non] Under	e rcutting No s in spillway should was	4 4 N/A 4 4 Rating
Structure Approach Channel Control Section Spillway dimensions Flashboards/Gate Discharge Channel Stilling basin Aux. Spillway Detail: Seepage/Leakage Serious Conditions	Widd Y H Issu Con with	Clear Trees/bi Concrete Rock th: ft. Depth: ft. Tes No In p Clear Trees/br Leadcutting feet fr Tone Functiona e Tes No (use "D crete looks good in next spillway flow None Rew Seep Center Left R	rush □ Debris □ Soil □ Culv □ Survey Atta lace □ Operation ush □ Leakage rom spillway corn al □ Minor Eros retail" box below areas of patches y. Monitor in cas reage □ Leakage light □ Around	□ Erosion □ Other ert □ Other □ Unstable ched onal □ Deteriorated atrol section, depth: feet.) sion □ Severe Erosion □ v) s. No changes since last ye se of blockage ge □ Piping □ Discolore	□ Non □ Under ar. Tree	e rcutting No s in spillway should was	4 4 N/A 4 4 Rating

Flow (gpm)/Detail:	gpm					
Conduit			Rating			
Control	✓ Manual ✓ Power Hydraulic □ None					
Inlet	✓ Submerged □ Debris on trash rack □ Deterioration					
Control/Stem	☐ Missing ✓ Operable ☐ Damaged ☐ Inoperable ☐ Unknown					
Valve(s) Cycling	☐ Frozen ☐ Unknown ☐ Past Year ☑ Frequent ☐ During Inspection					
Principal Conduit	Diameter/Size: 18&42in. Material: Steel Condition: Fair		4			
Primary Outlet	☐ Overgrown ☐ Clean ☐ Buried/Obstructed ☐ Pressuriz	zed 🗆 Leaking: gpm	4			
Other Outlet(s)	☐ Yes ☑ No		N/A			
Detail:	18 and 42 inch conduits	8				
Structure of Dam	☑ Earth ☐ Rock ☐ Concrete ☐ Other	2	Rating			
Detail:						
Deformation	✓ None □ Cracks □ Landslide(s) □ Sinkhole(s) □ I	Movement	4			
Crest	✓ No Issues ☐ Settlement/Low Spots ☐ Narrow ☐ Way	ve Erosion	4			
Erosion	✓ None □ Trampling □ Surface Erosion		4			
Aux. Dam (s)	☐ Yes ☑ No Number:		N/A			
Detail:	и					
Animals		A:	Rating			
Evidence	✓ No Evidence □ Trails □ Burrows □ Deep Burrows	Max Depth:_ft.	4			
Locations		Extensive: Yes No				
Detail:						
Vegetation	ž.	Di .	Rating			
Cover	☐ None ☑ Low Grass ☑ High Grass ☐ Brush ☐ Sma	The state of the s				
Locations	C	Impairs Inspection ☐ Yes ✓ No	4			
Detail:						
Monitoring			Rating			
Instrumentation	□ None ✓ Weir □ Piezometer □ Camera ✓ Reservoir level ✓ Other					
Monitoring	□ None ✓ Continuous □ Frequent □ Past year □ Unknown					
Expedited Re-inspection Needed: No Next Inspection Date: 2022 Emergency Action Plan: Exists: Yes Onsite: Yes Current: Yes Maintenance action - First Notice Maintenance action - Subsequent Inspection with Deficiency Corrective action - Unsafe Condition						