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PHASE I REPORT

NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

Name of Dam: Williams Dam
State Located: Missouri
County Located: Jefferson County
Stream: Unnamed tributary to Joachim Creek
Date of Inspection: 10 November 1978 and 23, 24 and 25 October 1978

The Williams dam was inspected by an interdisciplinary team of engineers from Reitz & Jens, Inc. under contract with the St. Louis District Corps of Engineers. The purpose of the inspection was to make an assessment of the general condition of the dam with respect to safety, based upon available data and visual inspection, in order to determine if the dam poses hazards to human life or property.

The guidelines used in the assessment were furnished by the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers and developed with the help of several Federal and State agencies, professional engineering organizations and private engineers. Based on these guidelines, this dam is classified as a small size dam with a high downstream hazard potential. The estimated damage zone from failure of the dam extends two miles downstream from the dam.

Failure would threaten the life and property of five families and cause appreciable damage to one railroad bridge and one highway crossing.

Our inspection and evaluation indicates that the dam is deficient in that the spillways do not meet the criteria set forth in the guidelines for a dam having the above size and hazard potential. Considering the small volume of water impounded, the large floodplain downstream and the five buildings downstream, one-half Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) is the appropriate spillway design flood. The probable maximum flood is defined as the flood discharge that may be expected from the most severe combination of critical meteorological and hydrologic conditions that are reasonably possible in the region. The dam will begin to be overtopped by a flood having a discharge (peak and volume) equal to 15% of the PMF. The spillways will pass a 1% chance flood (100-year flood) without overtopping, which is a flood that has a 1% chance of being exceeded in any given year.

Seepage and stability analyses comparable to the requirements of the "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams" were not available which is considered a deficiency.

The dam is also deficient in that there is a growth of trees and heavy underbrush on the downstream slope.

We recommend the owner take prompt action to correct or control the deficiencies described.

HENRY M. REITZ, President
Reitz & Jens, Inc.

JOHN J. BAXLEY, JR., Vice President
Chief Engineer
Reitz & Jens, Inc.
SECTION 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 GENERAL

a. Authority The National Dam Inspection Act, Public Law 92-367, authorized the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, to initiate a program of safety inspection of dams throughout the United States. Pursuant to the above, the St. Louis District, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer contracted with Reitz & Jens, Inc. (Contract DACW43-78-C-0162) for a safety inspection of the Williams Dam, MO ID No. 30384.

b. Purpose of Inspection The purpose of the inspection was to make an assessment of the general condition of the dam with respect to safety, based upon available data and visual inspection, in order to determine if the dam poses hazards to human life or property.

c. Evaluation Criteria Criteria used to evaluate the dam were furnished by the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, in "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams". These guidelines were developed with the help of several Federal agencies and many State agencies, professional engineering organizations and private engineers.

1.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

a. Description of Dam and Appurtenances

(1) The dam is an earth structure built across an unnamed tributary of Joachim Creek in the hills immediately to the north side of the Joachim Creek floodplain. The soil in the drainage area is about 30% steep rocky slopes and about 70% soils in the Union Silt Loam group. There is sparse tree growth on the rocky slopes. Union group soils occur on both flat slopes on the ridges and the sides of the hills. These areas have been cleared and are in pasture. The dam is on a curved alignment concave toward the lake. The east spillway is a long flat channel on the hillside below the dam. The west spillway is a notch where the crest of the dam meets the hillside.

Topography in the vicinity of the dam is shown on Plate 3. Pertinent physical data are given in paragraph 1.3 below.

b. Location The dam is located in the east south-central portion of Jefferson County about one mile northeast of Hematite as shown on Plate 2. The dam and lake are located in the NW¼ of the NE¼ of Section 9, T40N, R5E, and are shown on the Missouri Festus Quadrangle Sheet, 1964 Edition, covering a portion of Jefferson County.

c. Size Classification Criteria for determining the size classification of dams and impoundments are presented in the guidelines referenced in paragraph 1.1.c above. Based on these criteria, this dam and impoundment are in the small size category.

d. Hazard Classification Guidelines for determining hazard classification are presented in the same guidelines as referenced in paragraph c above. Based on referenced guidelines, this dam is in the High Hazard Classification.
e. **Ownership** The dam is owned by Mrs. Jean Jeans, 8730 Cherokee Ct., Leawood, Kansas, 66206

f. **Purpose of Dam** The dam forms a 4.9-acre recreational lake

g. **Design and Construction History** The inspection team was unable to find any design data on this dam. It was reported that water impoundment commenced in 1965

h. **Normal Operating Procedure** Water surface fluctuates to 15 feet below spillway elevation due to leakage from the reservoir area. The maximum water depth experienced at the spillway is unknown.

### 1.3 PERTINENT DATA

a. **Drainage Area** - 143 acres

b. **Discharge at Damsite** -
   
   (1) All discharge at the damsite is through uncontrolled spillways.
   
   (2) Estimated experienced maximum flood at damsite - unknown
   
   (3) Estimated ungated spillway capacity at maximum pool elevation -
      
      (a) East spillway - 83 cfs
      
      (b) West spillway - 0 cfs
      
      (c) Total - 83 cfs

c. **Elevation (Feet Above M.S.L.)**
   
   (1) Top of dam - 463.3 to 464.7 feet M.S.L. (See Plate 3.)
   
   (2) Spillway crest (1) 460.6, east spillway
      (2) 463.4, west spillway
   
   (3) Streambed at centerline of dam - 436.4 (est.)
   
   (4) Maximum tailwater - unknown.

d. **Reservoir Length of maximum pool** - 1000 feet ±

e. **Storage (Acre-Feet)** -
   
   (1) top of dam - 127 acre feet.
   
   (2) spillway crest - 93 acre feet.

f. **Reservoir Surface (Acres)**
   
   (1) top of dam - 11.2 acres (est.)
   
   (2) Spillway crest - 9.2 acres (measured on aerial photo)
g. **Dam**

1. **Type** - earth embankment
2. **Length** - 500 feet
3. **Height** - 26.5 feet maximum (from survey).
4. **Top width** - 12 feet
5. **Side Slopes** -
   
   a. **Downstream** - 1V on 2H (determined from section at Station 4+00)
   
   b. **Upstream** - 1V on 3H (determined from section at Station 4+00)
6. **Zoning** - unknown
7. **Impervious core** - unknown
8. **Cutoff** - unknown
9. **Grout curtain** - unknown

h. **Diversion and Regulating Tunnel** - None

i. **Spillways**

1. **East spillway**: 480-foot long channel on side hill alignment. Channel depth is about 3½ feet and the top width varies from 22 to 40 feet. Flowline grade is about 0.2%.

2. **West spillway**: This is a 20-foot wide depression at the west end of the dam. The flowline is about the same elevation as the low part of the dam crest. A channel about 1½ feet deep and 10 feet wide would carry flow from this spillway about 75 feet south of the centerline of the dam where it would turn and flow down the valley slope.

j. **Regulating Outlets** - None
SECTION 2 - ENGINEERING DATA

2.1 DESIGN

No design data were found to be readily available.

2.2 CONSTRUCTION

No data on construction were available. See paragraph 1.2.g.

2.3 OPERATION

The maximum loading on the dam is unknown. The lake level seems to vary appreciably below spillway crest elevation.

It appears from the condition of the east spillway that, at some time since completion, appreciable discharge from the reservoir has flowed in it.

2.4 EVALUATION

a. Availability No engineering data were available.

b. Adequacy No engineering data were available to make a detailed assessment of design, construction and operation. The owner should have an engineer, experienced in the design of dams, perform detailed seepage and stability analyses.

However, for the size of dam, materials used and measurements taken, a satisfactory hydrologic/hydraulic evaluation resulted.

c. Validity This report is primarily for safety through maintenance and operation and the conclusions and evaluation for this Phase I Inspection are considered adequate for the definitive statement in this report.
SECTION 3 - VISUAL INSPECTION

3.1 FINDINGS

a. General A visual inspection of the Williams dam was made on 10 November 1978. This followed three days of field measurements by a survey party on 23, 24 and 25 October 1978. The training and experience of personnel in these inspections included hydraulic/hydrologic engineering, soils and materials engineering, surveying and structural engineering. Specific observations are discussed below.

b. Dam The grade of the top of the dam varies approximately 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) feet which makes it relatively uniform. When visited, the downstream slope of the dam had trees growing on it and relatively heavy underbrush (D-2, D-3, D-4 D-5). The upstream slope of the dam which shortly before the visit appears to have had the same type cover, was strewn with the cut trees that had been felled toward the reservoir (D-7, D-8). There is a larger capacity emergency spillway at the east end (S-2, S-4, S-7) and the appearance of a small emergency spillway at the west end (S-1, S-3, S-8). However, the grade difference between the bottom of the west emergency spillway and the center elevation of the dam was small to the point that water would overflow the center portion of the dam as soon as it would start flowing in the west emergency spillway.

The outlet channel for the east spillway was on a nearly flat grade and had a length approaching 400 feet. It was entirely in virgin soil. Rock is exposed at various points in the bottom of the channel (S-5, S-6, S-7) and has been washed clean at the lower end (S-4). The hydraulic capacity of this spillway and outlet channel could be substantially improved by re-routing the spillway into the downstream valley in one of two small natural sub-valleys between the present outlet and existing dam.

Downstream from the dam, on high ground (V-3, V-4, V-6), is a cemetery which location in no way is impacted by the dam and reservoir. At the time of the surveys, the lake level was approximately 10 feet below the control elevation of the lower (east) emergency spillway due to loss by seepage beneath. No hydrophilic growth was at or above the downstream toe of the dam nor was there any indication of through-seepage in the dam section or along the contact between the base of dam and natural ground.

c. Appurtenant Structures No low level outlets, regulating works or other appurtenant structures were visible
d. Reservoir Area Since the level of the lake was at least 10 feet below the control elevation, a barren slope (P-1, P-2, P-3) was visible both on the lake side of the dam and along the natural banks. This prevented and indication of surface erosion which could be considered potentially hazardous to the development. The present conditions do not necessarily indicate absence of potential under or through seepage problems for the dam.

e. Downstream Channel The downstream channel leads through a pasture with some farm buildings which were not habitated (V-1, V-3, V-5). Several residences are below the elevation of the top of the dam down valley from the
dam. However, the surface grade at each is at least 10 feet above the corresponding grade of the lowest point of the valley. Also the cemetery (V-4) mentioned above, is on sufficiently high ground (V-6) that it would not be endangered by rupture of the dam. Approximately 800 feet downvalley from the dam dam is Missouri Highway 21A (V-5) and another 1,500 feet is a Missouri Pacific track and another 1,000 feet, the runoff from this watershed enters Joachim Creek.

3.1 EVALUATION

The tree growth on the dam is a deficiency which, if uncorrected or uncontrolled, could result in eventual serious safety deficiencies.

Trees provide shelter and habitat for rodents whose burrowing activity might cause detrimental seepage. Furthermore, as the trees mature and die, sloughing of the embankment may occur as the roots decay. The tree growth on the downstream slope of the dam should be removed then turf established. Continued annual attention to cutting growth on the slopes of the dam is suggested.

None of the conditions observed is significant enough to indicate a need for immediate remedial action or a serious potential failure.
SECTION 4 - OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

4.1 PROCEDURES

There are no controlled outlet works for this dam; therefore, no regulating procedures exist. The pool is controlled by rainfall, runoff, evaporation and capacity of the uncontrolled spillway.

4.2 MAINTENANCE OF DAM

Based on the amount of brush and size of trees on the downstream slope and the felled trees on the upstream slope, attention to control of growth of vegetation has been inadequate.

4.3 MAINTENANCE OF OPERATING FACILITIES

No operating facilities exist at this dam.

4.4 DESCRIPTION OF ANY WARNING SYSTEM IN EFFECT

The inspection team is not aware of any existing warning system for this dam.

4.5 EVALUATION

If the uncontrolled vegetation on the downstream slope is allowed to continue, a serious potential of failure may develop.
SECTION 5 - HYDRAULIC/HYDROLOGIC

5.1 EVALUATION OF FEATURES

a. Design Data  No design data are available.

b. Experience Data  The drainage area is 143 acres developed from USGS Festus Missouri Quadrangle. Also available are 1"=2000' aerial stereo pairs taken 8 April 1977, by Surdex Corporation. Lake area is measured on a 1"=200' enlargement of a portion of one of these photographs and shown on Plate 1. The spillway and dam layout are from surveys made during the inspection. For grades to USGS-msl, see Plate 3.

c. Visual Observations

(1) The spillways and exit channels are located at the east and west ends of the dam.

(2) The east spillway channel is in good condition. However, the berm along the west side of the exit channel is low. Maximum spillway discharges will overflow and erode this berm at its upper end near the dam and may endanger the dam embankment.

(3) The west spillway crest is at too high an elevation to be effective in discharging water before the dam is overtopped.

(4) No drawdown facilities are available to evacuate the pool.

d. Overtopping Potential  Although the lake seems to remain well below spillway elevation, prudent engineering analysis requires that spillway capacities be evaluated on the basis of a reservoir full to the spillway crest. On this basis the spillways are too small to pass the minimum required flood of one-half the probable maximum without overtopping. The probable maximum flood is defined as the flood discharge expected from the most severe combination of critical meteorologic and hydrologic conditions reasonably possible in the region. The dam will start to be overtopped by a flood equal to 15% of the PMF. The one-half PMF will overtop the dam to a maximum depth of about 1.5 feet. The depth will vary to zero across the dam because of the sloping crest. A width of 360 feet of dam crest will be subject to some overtopping flow. Maximum rate of flow over the dam crest will be about 942 cubic feet per second. Overtopping flow will have a duration of 6 hours. The existing lake and spillway will contain a 100-year frequency flood below the crest of the dam. For numerical data see Plates A-1 and A-2.

According to the recommended guidelines from the Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers, the 100-year frequency flood is only adequate for a low hazard dam of small size.

The effect from rupture of the dam could extend approximately two miles downstream of the dam. There are five inhabited homes downstream of the dam which could be severely damaged with loss of life if the dam fails.
SECTION 6 - STRUCTURAL STABILITY

6.1 EVALUATION OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY

a. Visual Observations Visual observations which adversely affect the structural stability of this dam are discussed in Section 3, paragraph 3.1.6.

b. Design and Construction Data No design or construction data relating to the structural stability of the dam were found.

c. Operating Records No appurtenant structures requiring operation exist at this dam.

d. Post Construction Changes No post construction changes, other than those referenced in paragraph a above, exist which will affect the structural stability of the dam.

e. Seismic Stability Considering the seismic zone (2) in which this dam is located, an earthquake of this magnitude is not expected to cause a structural failure of this dam.
SECTION 7 - ASSESSMENT/REMEDIAL MEASURES

7.1 DAM ASSESSMENT

a. Safety The spillway is inadequate to pass the required one-half Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Considering the small volume of water impounded, the large floodplain downstream and the five buildings downstream, one-half PMF is the appropriate spillway design flood. The reservoir and principal spillway are adequate to contain a flood which has a 1% chance of being exceeded (100-year flood) in any given year.

The heavy growth of trees on the upstream and downstream slopes of the dam is a safety deficiency.

Seepage and stability analyses comparable to the requirements of the "Recommended Guidelines for Safety Inspection of Dams" were not available which is considered a deficiency.

b. Adequacy of Information Due to lack of engineering design and construction data, the conclusions in this report were based on performance history and external visual conditions. The inspection team considers these data sufficient to support the conclusions herein.

c. Urgency The remedial measures recommended in paragraph 7.2 should be accomplished in the near future. If the safety deficiencies listed in paragraph a are not corrected in the near future, they will continue to deteriorate and lead to a serious potential of failure.

d. Necessity for Phase II Based on the results of the Phase I inspection, no Phase II inspection is recommended.

e. Seismic Stability This dam is located in Seismic Zone 2. An earthquake of this magnitude is not expected to be hazardous to this dam.

7.2 REMEDIAL MEASURES

a. Alternatives Spillway size and/or height of dam should be increased to prevent overtopping by the probable maximum flood. The owner should obtain the services of an experienced engineer to design and observe construction of remedial measures.

b. Stability and Seepage Analyses The owner should have an engineer experienced in design and construction of dams prepare seepage and stability analyses.

c. O&M Maintenance and Procedures The following O & M maintenance and procedures are recommended:

(1) Remove uncontrolled vegetation growth on the downstream slope of the dam and establish grass on any resulting bare areas.
(2) After removal of existing tree growth, vegetation on the dam should be periodically cut.

(3) After completion of remedial measures, detailed inspections of the dam should be made periodically by an engineer experienced in the design and construction of dams. Records should be kept of these inspections and major maintenance.
APPENDIX A

HYDROLOGIC CALCULATIONS
HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

1. The hydrologic analysis used in development of the overtopping potential is based on applying a hypothetical storm to a unit hydrograph to obtain the inflow hydrograph for a reservoir routing. The Probable Maximum Precipitation for those dams in the high hazard potential category is derived and determined from regional charts prepared by the National Weather Service in "Hydrometeorological Report No. 33". Reduction factors have not been applied. A 24-hour storm duration is assumed with the 24-hour rainfall depths distributed over 6-hour periods in accordance with procedures outlined in EM 1110-2-1411 (SPF Determination). The maximum 6-hour rainfall period is then distributed to hourly increments by the same criteria. Within-the-hour distribution is based upon NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS HYDRO-35. The non-peak 6-hour rainfall periods are distributed uniformly. All distributed values are arranged in a critical sequence by the SPF criteria. The final inflow hydrograph is produced by deduction of infiltration losses appropriate to the soil, land use and antecedent moisture conditions.

2. The reservoir routing is accomplished by using Modified Puls routing techniques wherein the flood hydrograph is routed through lake storage. Hydraulic capacities of the spillways and crest of dam are used as outlet controls in the routing. Storage in the pool area is defined by an elevation-area curve. The hydraulic capacity of the spillways and the sloping top of dam is defined by a composite elevation discharge curve.

3. Dam overtopping analysis has been conducted by hydrologic methods for this dam and lake. This computation determines the percentage of the PMF hydrograph that the reservoir can contain without the dam being overtopped. An output summary in the hydrologic appendix displays this information as well as other characteristics of the simulated dam overtopping.

4. The above methodology has been accomplished for this report using the systemized computer program HEC-1 (Dam Safety Version), July 1978, prepared by the Hydrologic Engineering Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, California. The numeric parameters estimated for this site are listed on Plate 1A. Definitions of these variables are contained in the "User's Manual" for the computer program.

5. The capacity of the east spillway was calculated using computer program HEC-2 from the cited source in paragraph 4 above. This program calculated critical velocity at the lower end of the 380-foot long spillway channel and then computed a drawdown curve up the channel to the reservoir water level taking account of velocity head changes, losses and friction. The west spillway was included as part of the dam crest because of its relatively high flowline elevation with respect to the lowest elevation of the dam crest.

6. Discharge over the irregular top of dam (the crest is not level) including the west spillway was calculated using a coefficient of 3.0 in the broad-crested weir equation for the sections of dam crest at different elevations. All spillway and overtopping discharges were included in a composite rating curve. Dummy values of 0.1 for dam length, coefficient of discharge and exponent were entered on the $D$ card to suppress diagnostic statements in the output. The amount of this dummy flow is never greater than 0.02 cfs.
### Flood Hydrograph Package

**ID**: 30394

**DAM**: WILLIAMS DAM

**ADD 35G FOR USGS ELEV.**

**DAM SAFETY PROGRAM - U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

**REITZ & JENKINS, INC. - AUGUST 1978**

#### Inflow Hydrograph - SCS Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.15</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>0.25</th>
<th>0.30</th>
<th>0.35</th>
<th>0.40</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reservoir Routing - Rating Curve Supplied - Sloping Dam

| Y1 | 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     | -109.9 | -1 |
| Y4 | 109.9 | 111.0 | 111.5 | 112.0 | 112.5 | 113.0 | 113.5 | 113.9 | 114.5 |
| Y4 | 114.9 | 115.1 | 115.5 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Y5 | 0.0  | 3.0  | 8.0  | 21.0 | 39.0 | 65.0 | 83.0 | 108.0 | 236.0 | 738.0 |
| Y51327.0 | 1693.0 | 2617.0 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| A  | 0.0  | 4.94 | 9.2  | 18.4 |      |      |      |      |      |
| E  | 95   | 100  | 110  | 130  |      |      |      |      |      |
| $A$ | 109.9 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| $D$ | 113.3 | 0.1  | 0.1  | 0.1  |      |      |      |      |      |
| K  | 99   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
### Flood Hydrograph Package (NEC-1)

**DAM SAFETY VERSION**  
**JULY 1978**  
**LAST MODIFICATION 3 AFG 79**

**RUN DATE:** 7/18/79  
**TIME: 14:10:36**

---

**IO # 30384 WILLIAMS DAM ADD 35% FOR USGS ELEV.**

**DAM SAFETY PROGRAM - U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

**REITZ & JCHS, INC. - AUGUST 1979**

---

**JOB SPECIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NWH</th>
<th>NMIN</th>
<th>IDAY</th>
<th>INR</th>
<th>ITHR</th>
<th>METR</th>
<th>IPMT</th>
<th>IPRT</th>
<th>NRTAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MULTI-PLAN ANALYSIS TO BE PERFORMED**

- PLAN = 1  
- NATION = 9  
- LATIN = 1

**RTOL = 0.10  0.15  0.20  0.25  0.30  0.35  0.40  0.50  1.00**

---

**AREA RUNOFF COMPUTATION**

---

**INFLOW HYDROGRAPH - SCS METHOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITHD</th>
<th>ICHD</th>
<th>ICHAP</th>
<th>IFCON</th>
<th>ITEP</th>
<th>IPMT</th>
<th>INAME</th>
<th>ISAG</th>
<th>IAUTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HYDROGRAPH DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHEAD</th>
<th>HHEAD</th>
<th>TAREA</th>
<th>SNAPP</th>
<th>TRSND</th>
<th>TRSRE</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>ISNOW</th>
<th>ISAME</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRECIP DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPFF</th>
<th>PMS</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R12</th>
<th>R24</th>
<th>PDR</th>
<th>P72</th>
<th>P96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>75.70</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOSS DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LHOPT</th>
<th>STKRA</th>
<th>DLTKR</th>
<th>RTIO</th>
<th>FRAIN</th>
<th>STRKS</th>
<th>RTIO</th>
<th>STROL</th>
<th>CNSTR</th>
<th>ALSMX</th>
<th>RTIMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-45.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURVE NO = -05.00  WETNESS = -1.00  EFFECT CN = 85.00**

**UNIT HYDROGRAPH DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>LAG</th>
<th>CCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECESSION DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRTO</th>
<th>ORC</th>
<th>SRTN</th>
<th>STMTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNIT HYDROGRAPH | 12 | END OF PERIOD ORBITN, TCE = -0.00 HOURS, LAG = -17 VOL = 1.00**

4, 40, 44, 30, 15, 43, 27, 12

**END-OF-PERIOD FLOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>RAIN</th>
<th>EXCS</th>
<th>LOSS</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>RAIN</th>
<th>EXCS</th>
<th>LOSS</th>
<th>COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PLAN A-2**

Sheet 2 of 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio P/M</th>
<th>Maximum Reservoir W.S.E.L.F</th>
<th>Maximum Depth Over Dam ft</th>
<th>Maximum Storage AC-FT</th>
<th>Maximum Outflow CF</th>
<th>Duration Over Top</th>
<th>Time of Max Outflow</th>
<th>Time of Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>110.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>113.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>114.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>114.36</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>114.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>114.79</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF DAM SAFETY ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak 24-Hour Total Volume</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>CMS</th>
<th>Inches</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>AC-Ft</th>
<th>Thousand Cu M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>425.70</td>
<td>924.74</td>
<td>388.8</td>
<td>478.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Spillway CFS: 26.79
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PLATE A-1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
<th>Column 7</th>
<th>Column 8</th>
<th>Column 9</th>
<th>Column 10</th>
<th>Column 11</th>
<th>Column 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td>Value 6</td>
<td>Value 7</td>
<td>Value 8</td>
<td>Value 9</td>
<td>Value 10</td>
<td>Value 11</td>
<td>Value 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 13</td>
<td>Value 14</td>
<td>Value 15</td>
<td>Value 16</td>
<td>Value 17</td>
<td>Value 18</td>
<td>Value 19</td>
<td>Value 20</td>
<td>Value 21</td>
<td>Value 22</td>
<td>Value 23</td>
<td>Value 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 25</td>
<td>Value 26</td>
<td>Value 27</td>
<td>Value 28</td>
<td>Value 29</td>
<td>Value 30</td>
<td>Value 31</td>
<td>Value 32</td>
<td>Value 33</td>
<td>Value 34</td>
<td>Value 35</td>
<td>Value 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 37</td>
<td>Value 38</td>
<td>Value 39</td>
<td>Value 40</td>
<td>Value 41</td>
<td>Value 42</td>
<td>Value 43</td>
<td>Value 44</td>
<td>Value 45</td>
<td>Value 46</td>
<td>Value 47</td>
<td>Value 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 49</td>
<td>Value 50</td>
<td>Value 51</td>
<td>Value 52</td>
<td>Value 53</td>
<td>Value 54</td>
<td>Value 55</td>
<td>Value 56</td>
<td>Value 57</td>
<td>Value 58</td>
<td>Value 59</td>
<td>Value 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLATE A-2
Sheet 1 of 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KCNO</th>
<th>VCH</th>
<th>TYP</th>
<th>FILT</th>
<th>FLLE</th>
<th>FI.MIN</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>CMWF</th>
<th>CRWS</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>10K+S</th>
<th>VCH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ARIK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>110.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.64</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>111.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.98</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>111.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.23</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>111.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.69</td>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>111.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.25</td>
<td>56.64</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>112.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.05</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>113.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.28</td>
<td>62.58</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>116.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>116.76</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>116.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>116.91</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>117.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117.38</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>111.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.84</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>112.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>113.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.93</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34000</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.10</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>113.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.87</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>95.64</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>111.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.28</td>
<td>121.40</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>111.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.47</td>
<td>121.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>111.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.97</td>
<td>50.61</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>112.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.51</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>113.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.82</td>
<td>35.47</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>113.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.75</td>
<td>39.91</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.70</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>114.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>114.19</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF ERRORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KCNO</th>
<th>VCH</th>
<th>TYP</th>
<th>FILT</th>
<th>FLLE</th>
<th>FI.MIN</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>CMWF</th>
<th>CRWS</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>10K+S</th>
<th>VCH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ARIK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PHOTO INDEX 4
FOR
VALLEY BELOW DAM

WILLIAMS DAM
JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO.
NOVEMBER 1978

PREPARED BY
REITZ & JENS, INC
SECTION OF DAM
AT STA. 4+00

PROFILE OF
EAST SPILLWAY

Scales
1''=10' VERT.
1'=100' HORIZ.

WATER LEVEL
23 OCT 1978

E OF DAM
AT STA 0+86

0+00 1+00 2+00 3+00 4+00
WATERSHED AND OUTFLOW CHANNEL

PROFILE OF TOP OF DAM

SCALES
1" = 5' VERT.
1" = 100' HORIZ.

WILLIAMS DAM

ADD 350' TO ELEVATIONS TO OBTAIN APPROX. USG

PHASE I - INSPECT
COUNTY I.D. NO. 090
JEFFERSON COUNTY, MO

INVENTORY NO. I.D.
FOR ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, CORPS OF
ENGINEERS

REITZ & JENS, INC. ST. L.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
WILLIAMS DAM

ADD 350' TO ELEVATIONS SHOWN TO OBTAIN APPROX. USGS DATUM

PHASE I - INSPECTION
COUNTY I.D. NO. 099
JEFFERSON COUNTY, MISSOURI
INVENTORY NO. I. D. 30384
FOR ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
REITZ & JENKS, INC. ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
CONSULTING ENGINEERS DECEMBER 1979