WATERSHED STRUCTURE INSPECTION REPORT

| Watershed: | | _ Site #: _ | | Hazard Class (H/S/L): County: |
|--|--------|-------------|--------|---|
| Date of Inspection: Inspection | Team M | embers: | | |
| 1 | | | | |
| Sponsor: | | | L | egal Description: Sec T R |
| | | | | |
| ITEM | | | | REMARKS |
| IILM | | | | "YES"/"POOR" responses need remarks. (ie: What? Where? Extent?) |
| Inlet Structure | | | | |
| 1 11 11 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | YES | | NO | |
| Has inlet been modified to alter water surface? | | | | |
| 2. Is the trash rack or tower obstructed, plugged, or non-functional? | YES | | NO | |
| | YES | NOT | NO | |
| 3. Was drain gate determined not operational? | TES | NOT | 110 | |
| | YES | TESTED | NO | Components missing, broken, or deteriorated: |
| 4. Are components missing, broken, or deteroriated? | TES | | NO | Drain Gate Item Handwheel Manhole Cover Trash Rack Vent Pipe |
| 5. Tower structural condition: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | |
| (Poor - Rebar exposed, leakage, deep corrosion, leaning, or damaged; Fair - Slight spalling, cracking, surface rust; Good - No deterioration) | | | | |
| Embankment | | | | |
| 6. Condition of front slope wave erosion: | 7+ ft | 2-7 ft | < 2 ft | |
| (Poor - 7+ ft vertical wave erosion; Fair- 2-7 ft vertical wave erosion; Good - < 2 ft vertical wave erosion) | | | | |
| 7. Is the top of dam vulnerable to overtopping failure due to lowered | YES | | NO | |
| elevation and/or an easily erodible condition? (Examples: Trails/Ruts, Settlement, Earthwork, Erosion, Trees, Holes) | | | | |
| 8. Condition of embankment grass cover: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | |
| (Poor - Bare or inconsistent; Fair - Short or heavily grazed; Good - Healthy and consistent) | | | | |
| 9. Trees or brush presence: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | Location(s): Upslope Top of dam Downslope Abutment |
| (Poor - Dense trees or brush; Fair - Trees or brush < 3 years old; Good - No trees or brush) | | | | |
| 10. Condition of erosion (ex. vehicle/cattle trails): | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | |
| (Poor - Repair requires heavy equipment; Fair - Erosion present but insignificant; Good - No erosion present) | | | | |
| | YES | | NO | Location(s): Waterline Upstream slope Downstream Toe Other |
| 11. Animal burrows or holes? (Please note animal type in remarks section) | | | | |
| | YES | | NO | |
| 12. Visible and significant slope movement or sloughing? | | | | |
| 13. Cracks in embankment and/or abutments: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | Location(s): Embankment Abutment |
| (Poor - Cracks > 1 ft in depth or > 15 ft in length; | | | | |
| Fair - Cracks < 1 ft in depth and < 15 ft in length; Good - No cracks) | YES | | NO | |
| 14. Is there poor physical or visual access to the downstream groin and toe for inspection? | | | | |
| 15. Condition of seepage: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | |
| (Poor - Seepage has concentrated points (boil) or is carrying fines; | | | | |
| Fair - General wet areas with flow < 1 gpm; Good - No seepage) 16. Condition of foundation drains: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | Could not find |
| (Poor - Cloudy flow, damaged, could not find, or none present; | | | | Could not find |
| Fair - Present but no evidence of flow; Good - Present and flowing) Conduit | | | | |
| 17. Overall conduit condition: | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | Does the conduit condition merit an in-depth video inspection? |
| (Poor - Damaged condition that could impact the dam's function; | | | | |
| Fair - Some deterioration that won't impact function; Good-No deterioration) | YES | COULD | NO | Suspected Source(s): Tower Gate valve Conduit Unknown |
| 18. Is there leakage into the principal spillway? | | | | Somes(s). Tower Gate valve General Guikhown |
| | YES | NOT TELL | NO | |
| 19. Is conduit outlet support failing? | 11.5 | MINOR | 110 | |
| | 1 | UNDERMINING | | |

| Principal Spillway Outlet Basin and Channel | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|--|--------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| 20. Is the outlet basin degrading? (Poor - Degradation could impact the dam's function; Fair - Minor degradation that will not impact function; Good-No degradation) | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | | | | | | |
| 21. Is outlet channel obstructed? (Poor - Water submerges the conduit outlet or backs water on the dam; Fair - Obstruction will not impact the dam's function; Good-No obstruction) | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | Obstruction: | Beaver | Debris R | oad Sedimen | at/Vegetation | Other |
| 22. Is there outlet channel erosion that could compromise principal spillway function or the dam? | YES | | NO | | | | | | |
| Auxiliary Spillway | | | | | | | | | |
| 23. Auxiliary spillway grass cover: (Poor - Bare or inconsistent cover; Fair - Short or heavily grazed cover; Good - Healthy and consistent cover) | POOR | FAIR | GOOD | | | | | | |
| 24. Is flow area obstructed with debris, trees, or objects? | YES | | NO | Obstruction: | Brush/T | rees Building | Debris Piles | Fencing | Other |
| 25. Are vehicle ruts, cattle trails, animal burrows, or other compromising conditions present in the spillway? | YES | | NO | Location(s): | Forebay | Control section | n 🗌 Exit slop | e | |
| 26. Is control section damaged or disturbed? | YES | | NO | | | | | | |
| 27. Are there overfalls or erosion in exit channel before reaching creek? | YES | | NO | | | | | | |
| General Site Conditions | | | | | | | | | |
| 28. Current water level: | Abo | ve PS Crest | At P | S Crest E | Below PS Cre | st Dry or Ga | te Open Si | lted to PS Cre | est |
| 29. Unauthorized modifications to the dam or its appurtenances? | YES | | NO | | | | | | |
| 30. Is there unauthorized structure(s), development, or major earthwork within the easement? | YES | | NO | | | | | | |
| 31. Are there sinkholes or depressions on the dam, in the auxiliary spillway, or within 100 feet of dam? | YES | | NO | Location(s): | Embankr | nent | Spillway 🔲 V | Within 100 ft | |
| 32. Does fencing allow for overgrazing or unwanted entry? | NO FENCING | YES | NO | | | | | | |
| 33. Are there any other major safety concerns not noted elsewhere on this inspection? | VES | | NO | | | | | | |
| ACTIONS TAKEN: (Identify all work performed in the pr | eceding 12 | 2 months | by spons | ors, contrac | tors, and/ | or NRCS.) | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| ACTIONS NEEDED: (Identify maintenance items needed | by priority | y; low - no | ext 12 mo | nths, high - | as soon a | s possible). | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Sponsor Representative (type) | | | | | NR | CS Representati | ve (type) | | |
| Parismalandamana II Company Division 1 CO | Ni | | | NIDGG | | - 4:4 4: 1 NOT | | | |
| Reviewed and approved by Conservation District Board of Directors? \[\sum \text{Yes} \text{No} \] | | | NRCS representative did or did NOT participate in field review? did participate did NOT participate | | | | | | |