

Dam Evaluation Summary Detail Sheet

1. NID ID: N/A	2. Dam Name: Waitsfield Town Pond Dam	3. Dam Location: Irasville
4. Inspection Date: April 16, 2008	5. Last Insp. Date: N/A	6. Next Inspection: 2013
7. Inspector: Shawn Patenaude, PE	8. Consultant: Weston & Sampson	
9. Hazard Code: N/A	10. Insp. Frequency: 5-years	11. Insp. Condition: Poor
E1. Design Methodology:	1	E7. Low-Level Discharge Capacity: 1
E2. Level of Maintenance:	2	E8. Low-Level Outlet Physical Condition: 1
E3. Emergency Action Plan:	2	E9. Spillway Design Flood Capacity: 4
E4. Embankment Seepage:	1	E10. Overall Physical Condition of the Dam: 2
E5. Embankment Condition:	2	E11. Estimated Repair Cost (in thousand \$): \$30 -\$50
E6. Concrete Condition:	N/A	

Evaluation Description

E1: DESIGN METHODOLOGY

1. Unknown Design – no design records available
3. Some standard design features
5. State of the art design – design records available

E2: LEVEL OF MAINTENANCE

1. No evidence of maintenance, no O&M manual
2. Very little maintenance, no O&M manual
3. Some level of maintenance and standard procedures
4. Adequate level of maintenance and standard procedures
5. 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

E4: EMBANKMENT SEEPAGE

1. Severe piping and/or seepage with no monitoring
2. Evidence of monitored piping and seepage
3. No piping but uncontrolled seepage
4. Controlled seepage
5. No seepage or piping

E5: EMBANKMENT CONDITION

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

1. Major cracks, misalignment, discontinuities causing leaks, seepage or stability concerns
2. Cracks with misalignment inclusive of transverse cracks with no misalignment
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
2. Outlet with insufficient drawdown capacity
3. Inoperable gate with potentially sufficient drawdown capacity
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
3. 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 - 20% of the SDF
2. 21- 40% of the SDF
3. 41- 60% of the SDF
4. 61- 80% of the SDF
5. 81- 100% of the SDF

E10: OVERALL PHYSICAL CONDITION OF THE 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 critical parameters
4. **SATISFACTORY** - Minor operational and maintenance deficiencies. Infrequent hydrologic events would probably result in deficiencies.
5. **GOOD** - No existing or potential deficiencies recognized. Safe performance is expected under all loading including SDF

E11: ESTIMATED REPAIR COST

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