Evaluation of a Site-Specific PMP/PMF to Potentially Preclude the Need for Overtopping Protection

Presented by Jerry A. Gomez, P.E.

Gomez and Sullivan Engineers, P.C.

National Dam Safety Program Technical Seminar No. 20
"Overtopping of Dams" – February 20 – 21, 2013

FEMA

Moore Dam

GOMEZ AND SULLIVAN
Engineers, P.C.

CASE STUDY: Moore Dam

- 3,243 ft. long
- 178 ft. High Earthen Embankment with Concrete Gravity Spillway, abutments, and Intake
- 2,380 ft. long Embankments to North and South of Concrete Gravity Sections (Crest El. 820)
- Spillway: Taintor Gate and Stanchion Bays with Concrete with Concrete Walkways (El. 817)
- Concrete Intake (Crest El. 817)
- Concrete Abutments (Crest El. 817.25, 819.25 & 820.75)

CASE STUDY: Moore Dam

1983 PMF Study (HMR# 33)

- Peak Inflow = 237,000 cfs
- Peak Outflow = 230,000 cfs
- Peak Reservoir El = 820.9 ft (Overtops Earthen Embankments)
- Dambreak Studies Indicate IDF = PMF

CASE STUDY: Moore Dam

- Based on 1983 PMF, Would Need to Raise Earthen Embankments ~5.5 ft. (Including provision for wave run-up)
- Would Need to Tie Into Impermeable Core
- Would Also Need to Raise Training Walls, Walkways etc.
- Expected Cost of Modifications Probably >$10 Million

CASE STUDY: Moore Dam

Results of Site-Specific PMP/PMF Study

All Season PMF

- Peak Outflow = 123,135 cfs
- Peak Res. El. = 809.9 ft.

Rain on Snow PMF (Governs)

- Peak Inflow = 144,730 cfs
- Peak Outflow = 143,200 cfs
- Peak Res. El. = 811.5 ft.
- Min. Freeboard = 6.25 ft (w/o wave-run-up)

Sample Basin Comparison of Site-Specific PMP vs HMR 51						
Site-Specific PMP		Duration				
	Area (mi^2)	6 hour	12 hour	24 hour	48 hour	72 hour
	10	8.1	10.5	13.4	16.2	16.3
	200	6.8	9.2	12.2	15.0	15.1
	1000	5.5	7.9	10.8	13.4	13.5
	5000	3.9	6.4	8.8	11.1	11.6
	10000	3.2	5.8	7.6	10.0	10.5
	20000	2.4	5.0	6.4	8.7	9.2
HMR 51		Duration				
	Area (mi^2)	6 hour	12 hour	24 hour	48 hour	72 hour
	10	20.3	23.3	25.5	29.0	29.5
	200	13.5	16.4	18.7	21.2	22.5
	1000	9.6	12.4	14.9	17.6	18.0
	5000	6.1	8.7	10.9	13.3	14.4
	10000	4.6	7.4	9.5	11.5	12.6
	20000	3.5	5.9	7.9	10.3	11.3
Percent Reduction		Duration				
	Area (mi^2)	6 hour	12 hour	24 hour	48 hour	72 hour
	10	60%	55%	47%	44%	45%
	200	50%	44%	35%	29%	33%
	1000	43%	36%	28%	24%	25%
	5000	36%	26%	19%	17%	19%
	10000	30%	22%	20%	13%	17%
	20000	31%	15%	19%	16%	19%

When to Consider a Site-Specific PMP Study

- You want to better assess the risk of your project.
- The current PMP does not have the required back-up
- The project discharge capacity is insufficient to pass the current PMF and expected remediation is costly.
- The project lies within the HMR 51 “stippled area”
- There is a significant topographic barrier between the drainage basin and the expected moisture sources.

HMR No. 51 Values

- HMR No. 51 was published in 1978 and includes storm evaluations that are several decades old. Hurricane Agnes (June 1972) was the latest significant storm to be worked up for the northeast.
- Modern computer modeling methods are being used to develop more accurate PMP estimates
  - Geographic Information System (GIS) software
  - Improved understanding of the meteorological processes
- Estimates of PMP values within the stippled regions of HMR No. 51 "might be deficient because detailed terrain effects have not been evaluated."

Areas of Uncertainty in HMR 51 Generalized Estimates of PMP



GOMEZ AND SULLIVAN
Engineers, P.C.

Site-Specific PMP vs. HMR No. 51 Values

- Both use the same basic rainfall adjustment procedures.
- The July 17-18, 1942 Smethport, PA storm was included in HMR 51 and likely influenced values across NY and New England. MCCs were excluded from eastern NY and New England site-specific PMPs, as not considered transpositionable to this region.
- HMR 51 did not address topographic effects.

Site-Specific PMP vs. HMR No. 51 Values

- Site-Specific Studies Included:
  - Barrier Moisture Depletion
  - Storm Elevation Adjustments
  - In Basin Orographic Adjustments
  - Analysis of New Storms
  - Re-analysis of Moisture Source/Storm Maximization for Select Storms
  - NEXRAD Radar Used to Assist in Rainfall Evaluation

Site-Specific PMP Studies



GOMEZ AND SULLIVAN
Engineers, P.C.

Sample Basin Comparison of Site-Specific PMP vs HMR 51 For Basins from 356 - 3375 sq. mi.			
Percent Reduction		Duration	
	Area (mi^2)	6 hour	72 hour
	10	50-65%	44-50%
	200	35-54%	32-40%
	1000	30-47%	25-34%
	5000	14-38%	15-29%
	10000	9-32%	11-34%
	20000	21-31%	11-42%

Site-Specific PMP Estimation

- Identify historic extreme storms that could occur within basin of interest
- Identify topographic features which can dilute or enhance the moisture content of the storm
- Evaluate meteorological conditions for transposition and maximization of storm
- Envelope transposed and maximized storms

Storm Adjustments for PMP Estimation

- In-Place Maximization
- Transposition
- Elevation Adjustment
- Barrier Adjustment
- In-Basin Orographic Adjustment

Applying Site-Specific PMP for PMF Estimation

- Warm-Season Procedure
  - Prepare/Calibrate hydrologic model
    - Compile rain and flow gage records
    - Evaluate existing project discharge curves
    - Initial estimates of unit hydrograph and baseflow parameters
    - Calibrate model for unit hydrograph parameters and loss rates
  - Model PMF
    - Estimate antecedent moisture, baseflow and reservoir stage

Applying Site-Specific PMP for PMF Estimation

- Cold-Season Procedure
  - Screening level analysis
    - Estimate 100-year snowpack
  - Full rain on snow analysis
    - Re-calibrate hydrologic model – additional data needed
      - Temperature, dewpoint, snow water content, wind, solar radiation, albedo
    - Maximum wind and temperature series
    - Seasonally adjusted PMP

Potential Challenges

- Data deficiencies
  - Out of date data storage methods – lack of equipment to read stream flow records
  - Infrequent rainfall data – daily recordings only
  - Lack of snow water equivalence data – lack of monitoring sites and low frequency of measurements
  - Temperature measurements only taken once daily at most NOAA stations
  - Dewpoint and windspeed only measured at first order NOAA stations – typically only at airports – data often recorded only during daylight hours

New Data Sources

- National Center for Environmental Prediction – North American Regional Reanalysis (NCEP NARR)
  - Estimates of environmental variables based on analysis/forecast model
  - 4 hour frequency, 0.3 degree spatial grid (approximately 20 mi.)
    - Temperature, wind, dewpoint, rainfall, snowpack, radiation, evaporation, pressure, etc.
  - Most data available from 1979 to present

New Data Sources

- MesoWest – University of Utah
  - Similar to NOAA Cooperative Network stations
  - Typically collect rainfall, temperature and dewpoint, may have wind pressure and solar radiation measurements
  - Only recent data – since early 2000's at most stations in the northeast
  - Add additional stations to traditional NOAA stations

Additional Considerations

- Incremental Dambreak/IDF Study
- Review/Update of Project Discharge Capacity Curves
- Calibrate Hydrologic Model to Significant Historic Storms
- Review of Operational Procedures/Constraints

Follow-up Questions?

Contact:

Jerry Gomez, P.E.

Gomez and Sullivan Engineers, P.C.

288 Genesee Street

Utica, NY 13502

jgomez@gomezandsullivan.com

315-724-4860

GOMEZ AND SULLIVAN
Engineers, P.C.