Attachment 02.04.03-08Q TVA letter dated February 2, 2010 RAI Response

ASSOCIATED ATTACHMENTS/ENCLOSURES:

.
مەنبىي بىل

 $\mathcal{P} \cong \mathcal{S}$ a Per

Attachment 02.04.03-8Q: Dam Rating Curves, Nottely

 $\frac{1}{2}$

(106 Pages including Cover Sheet)

NPG CALCULATION COVERSHEET/CCRIS UPDATE

Page 1 EDMS ACCESSION NO. (N/A for REV. 0)

Page 1 of 2

158 081211 001

TVAN CALCULATION COVERSHEET/CCRIS UPDATE

Page 1a

T.VA 40532 [07-2005]

 $\ddot{}$

NEDP-2-1 [07-08-2005]

TVAN CALCULATION COVERSHEET/CCRIS UPDATE

NEDP-2-1 [07-08-2005]

NPG CALCULATION COVERSHEET/CCRIS UPDATE

 $\frac{1}{2}$

CATEGORIES NA

KEY NOUNS (A-add, D-delete)

CROSS-REFERENCES (A-add, C-change, D-delete)

TVA 40532 [10-2008]

Page $\overline{2}$

IVA 40710 [1 0-20081 Page 1 of 1 NEDP-2-3 [10-20-20081 TVA **407101(10-20081** Page **1** of **1 NEDP-2-3 [10-20-20081**

TVA 40533 [10-2008] Page **1 of 1** NEDP-2-4 [10-20-2008]

1. Purpose

Headwater rating curves for twenty dams geographically located on the Tennessee River and its tributaries above the existing Bellefonte Nuclear facility are required as inputs to TVA's SOCH and TRBROUTE models, which perform flood-routing calculations. The headwater rating curves for each dam provide total dam discharge as a function of headwater elevation. This calculation presents the headwater rating curve for Nottely Dam.

TVA developed methods of analysis, procedures, and computer programs for determining design basis flood levels for nuclear plant sites in the 1970's. Determination of maximum flood levels included consideration of the most severe flood conditions that may be reasonably predicted to occur at a site as a result of both severe hydrometerological conditions and seismic activity. This process was followed to meet Nuclear Regulatory Guide 1.59. At that time, there were no computer programs available that would handle unsteady flow and dam failure analysis. As a result of this early work and method development TVA developed a runoff and stream course modeling process for the TVA reservoir system. This process provided a basis for currently licensed plants (Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, and Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant). The Bellefonte Nuclear Plant (BLN) Units 1 & 2 Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) was also based on this process.

BLN Unit 3 & 4 Combined Operating License Application (COLA) was submitted using data and analysis that was determined for the original BLN FSAR (Unit 1 and Unit 2) and was documented in a 1998 reassessment. In 1998, the analysis process and documentation was brought under the nuclear quality assurance process for the first time. A quality assurance audit conducted by NRC staff in early 2007 raised several questions related to the documentation of past work regarding design basis flood level determinations. This calculation supports a portion of the effort to improve the design basis documentation.

Preparation of all calculations supporting nuclear development and licensing are subject to TVA Standard Department Procedure NEDP-2. This standard dictates the process in which calculations are prepared, checked, verified, stored, and cross referenced in a goal to provide the highest quality nuclear design input and output possible.

Figure 1 is a plan and elevation view of Nottely dam (Reference 2.1.1). For headwaters in the normal operating range, discharge is passed through the Unit 1 turbine or over the spillway. The spillway consists of fifty (50) vertical lift spillway gates, each with a rectangular gate to control discharge. During a PMF event, headwater rises above the normal operating range and discharge passes over the spillway crest assuming all fifty gates are in the up and stored configuration. As the headwater level increases, flow is un-restricted until the free flowing nappe first contacts the bottoms of the raised gates. The discharge under the gates is predicted by orifice flow equations. As the headwater elevation continues to rise, it will eventually flow over the raised gates. At this point discharge is occurring both aboveand below the raised gates. The dam embankment elevation was raised in 1988 to accommodate the PMF to ensure no overflow of the dam.

This headwater rating curve is based on the configuration of the Nottely Dam as defined on the current design drawings. The purpose of this calculation does not evaluate the design loading conditions for the dam.

Headwater rating curves are computed for three separate scenarios as follows:

Case 1 – Headwater Rating Curve with Turbine Flow

Case 1a - Headwater Rating Curve without Turbine Flow

Case 2 - Headwater Rating Curve with Gate Failure and without Turbine Flow

Previous revisions included curves with and without turbine flow in which the gates remained in the stored position. In Revision 2, a third scenario is added in which the gates fail in the open stored position, without turbine flow, due to a PMF event.

TVA

2. References

- 2.1. TVA Drawings
	- 2.1.1. 10W200, **R18** (Attachments 8 and 17)
	- 2.1.2. 54W320, R3 (Attachments 9 and 18)
	- 2.1.3. 21E205-1, R4 (Attachments 10 and 19)
	- 2.1.4. 54N310, R1 (Attachments 11 and 20)
	- 2.1.5. 58N202, RI (Attachments 12 and 21)
	- 2.1.6. 41W600, R7 (Attachments 13 and 22)
- 2.2. "Nottely Dam Spillway Discharge Tables", River Operations, Tennessee Valley Authority, 2004 (Attachments 3 and 15)
- 2.3. "Hydraulic Design Criteria", USACE (U.S. Army Corp of Engineers), U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Eighteenth Issue, Vicksburg, MS, 1998.
- 2.4. Tennessee Valley Authority. "Spillway Discharge Studies: Nottely Project Rating Curve." Engineering Lab Project Files. Box 53760 (K04K070). ASF 590. (Attachment 2)
- 2.5. Hydraulic Design Chart 711 (HDC 711) from Reference 2.3 (Attachment 5).
- 2.6. U.S. Department of the Interior. "Design of Small Dams." U.S. Government Printing Office. 1977.
- 2.7. TVA Files, Binder "River Scheduling: Tailwater Rating Curves by Project." (Attachment 1)
- 2.8. TVA Water Control Project Blue Book. Nottely Dam. July 2001. Page 41. (Attachments 6, 7 and 16)
- 2.9. "Basis for Dam Spillway Gate/Outlet Open Configuration for Flood Analyses," Tennessee Valley Authority, May 29, 2009 (EDMS No. L58 090529 800).

3. Assumptions & Methodology

The headwater rating curves developed in these calculations will be used in simulations of probable maximum flood events. Consequently, the rating curves have been calculated well above the normal operating range.

3.1. Assumptions

TV*i* A

3.1.1. Assumption: The Unit 1 turbine will be operating during the PMF event for tailwater elevations of less than 1643 feet.

Technical Justification: The unit 1 turbine will be in operation until there is a technical reason to shut off the turbine. The elevation of the powerhouse and switchyard (Reference 2.1.1 and Reference 2.1.6) is lower than the anticipated tailwater levels shown in Attachment 1 (Reference 2.7). Therefore, the switchyard and powerhouse will be submerged whenever the tailwater levels exceed approximately 1643 feet. If the tailwater elevation is less than 1643 feet, the turbine will be assumed to be operating at a maximum sustainable discharge of 1800 cfs as indicated in Attachment 7.

- 3.1.2 Assumption: Tailwater does not affect spill discharge at Nottely. Technical Justification: See Attachment 1 for tailwater curve plot of discharge versus elevation which indicates that the maximum tailwater elevation would be much less than the spillways crest elevation of 1775.0 thereby not affecting the discharge.
- 3.1.3 Assumption: The tailwater rating curve provided as Attachment 1 is used in the evaluation of headwater rating curve calculations.

Technical Justification: This curve was produced by TVA's River Operations Flood Risk Group. The maximum estimated overflow presented in this calculation is 166,000 cfs which places the tailwater elevation at approximately 1666 feet. Since the crest elevation is located at approximately 1775 feet, there is a possibility for over 100 feet of error in the tailwater rating curve before it affects the overflow of the dam. Since a flood of this magnitude would be highly unlikely as well as incredibly destructive, it is assumed that the tailwater will have no effect on the overflow of the dam. Reference 2.1.1 also shows that the dam was designed for a maximum tailwater elevation of 1638.7 at a flow of 57,000 cfs, a minimum tailwater elevation of 1605.6 at no flow and a normal tailwater elevation of 1613.5 at a flow of 1730 cfs. These values correlate well with the curve and show that the model used to predict the tailwater curve is accurate enough to make this assumption.

3.1.4 Assumption: The embankments will not be overtopped during a PMF event.

Technical Justification: The dam safety modifications completed in the late 1980s were designed to ensure that the embankments will not be overtopped during a PMF event (Reference 2.8, relevant pages included in Attachment 6).

- 3.1.5 Assumption: All spillway gates will remain operable and will be set to the maximum openings specified in the spillway discharge tables. Technical Justification: For technical justification, see Reference 2.9, "Basis for Dam Spillway Gate/Outlet Open Configuration for Flood Analyses."
- 3.1.6 Assumption: The position of the Nottely spillway gates will not be significantly changed at headwater levels up to 1789.8 feet (transition point from free flow to orifice flow). The spillway gates will remain in place when the headwater level is at or below 1789.8 feet. The spillway gates' stability is indeterminate for water levels above elevation 1789.8 feet and the gates will be considered to fail (total washout).

Technical Justification: There are no structural evaluations that confirm the structural integrity of the spillway gates in their stored position. Headwater levels above this value results in water forces directly impacting the lower portion of the raised gate. In the fully raised stored position, only the lower rollers are in contact with the gate guides. At headwater levels at or above 1789.8 feet, the gate is in the flow path. The gate has been judged to be wedged at the lower roller within the guide, and any structural failure of the gate was judged to be bending; not a total washout of the gate. However, even if a total washout of the gate occurred, the remaining orifices that would allow flow through would represent only a minor increase in flow capacity from the calculated values, and would have discernable impact on downstream PMF levels. Once the water reaches the midpoint of the gate, the

TVA

gate stresses increase significantly and it is uncertain the gates will remain in place. For conservatism, the gates will be considered to fail (total washout) when water elevations rise above 1789.08 feet on the gate (midpoint of fully raised stored gate), which corresponds to a headwater elevation of 1789.8 feet.

3.2 Unverified Assumptions (UVA)

None.

3.3 Methodology -- Discharge Equations

3.3.1 Case 1 – Free Flow through Spillways ($1775'$ \leq H_W \leq H_T)

As water level rises and gates are opened, water will crest the spillway and flow as a weir flow as shown in Figure 2 above $H_w=1775'$. This type of flow will continue until the water level reaches H_T . H_T is the height at which the nappe touches the bottoms of the raised gates and will be discussed further in Section 3.3.2.

Standard flow computations are not utilized for this scenario as a rating curve giving Q_f vs. Headwater Elevation is available from the TVA Spillway Discharge Study dated November 4, 1942 for the Nottely Project (Reference 2.4, Attachment 2). This free discharge curve can be modeled using the following polynomial:

$$
Q_f = 0.4163H_c^4 - 16.551H_c^3 + 413.75H_c^2 + 602.98H_c
$$

Where H_c is the head over crest (ft) (1)

Figure 3 shows the scaled points and the fit derived from the data. Also note that the rating curve in Attachment 2 is still in use in the most updated spillway discharge tables by TVA (Reference 2.2, Attachment 3) and correlates very well with the current data.

Note that this curve was derived from model data. The preliminary measured flows were less than 2000 cfs (see note on attachment) and the rest of the curve was fit by scale model simulations.

Submergence factors and related calculations are unnecessary as there are no tailwater effects (Assumption 3.1.2).

3.3.2 Case 2 - Transition Region (H_{bottom}<H_W<H_T)

The flow does not transform into orifice flow as soon as the water height reaches the elevation of the bottoms of the gates (See Figure 4). There is a transition zone in which unknown behavior of the flow is anticipated. Attachment 11 (Dwg. 54N3 10, View-Typical Section Thru Centerline of Gate) shows a water elevation of 1788.5 ($H_C=13.5'$) and a height of nappe at the crest equal to 1785.4' ($H_n=10.4$). The ratio of these values is taken to develop a relationship between the water elevation and nappe height for a given crest geometry.

$$
\frac{H_c}{H_n} = \frac{13.5'}{10.4'} = 1.30\tag{2}
$$

Where H_n is the height of the nappe directly beneath the spillway gates.

This ratio can be assumed as constant for the same crest. Therefore, $H_T = 1.3(d) = 1.3*11.4' = 14.8'$ over the crest or a headwater elevation of 1789.8'. Note that d=11.4' comes from Attachment 9, Elevation A-A/B-B.

The headwater elevation will remain relatively constant as the nappe gradually rises to equal the previously determined H_T value. At this point, the flow is no longer in the transition region and the headwater will continue to rise (see Figure 5).

3.3.3 Case $3 -$ **Orifice flow through gates (** $H_T < H_W < H_{MAX}$ **)**

As headwater rises, it eventually reaches a level beyond the transition zone (See Figure 6). For headwaters above that level, discharge is predicted using an orifice type equation. Model data for the gated flow at Nottely are not available, but Reference 2.6 provides a relationship between **Co** (the orifice discharge coefficient) and **d/H** that may be used as an approximation in the following equation for orifice discharge, Q_0 :

$$
Q_{o} = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2g} C_{o} L \Big[H_{c}^{1.5} - (H_{c} - d)^{1.5} \Big]
$$
\n(3)

with C_O taken from Fig 257 (Attachment 4) out of Reference 2.6, L= Overflow Length (ft), d = height of orifice, and g=the acceleration due to gravity. See Figure 4 for graphical representation of equation terms. All other terms are defined in Figure 5.

Interpolation of C_o values from the chart in Attachment 4, yields values shown in Table 1. A linear regression fit shown in Figure 7 indicates a satisfactory estimate of C_0 can be yielded for a range of H_c values from 16.29' to 32.57' for Cases 1 and 1a (in the actual figure, H_1 is equivalent to H_c in this calculation), and 15.4' to 34.29' for Case 2. The equation developed from the linear regression is shown in Equation 4 and will be used to estimate the values of C_0 for a range of 16.29'<H_c<32.57' for Cases 1 and la, and a range of 15.4'<Hc<34.29' for Case 2.

TVA

Table 1: Interpolation of C_o from Figure 257 of Reference 2.6

Note that the maximum d/H_c on Attachment 4 is 0.70 which translates into a minimum H_c of 16.29' (i.e. d=11.4', therefore at $d/He=0.7$, $He=11.4'/0.7=16.29'$ for Cases 1 and 1a. However, a value of 0.78 was needed for Case 2, giving a minimum Hc of 15.4'. Therefore, the value was extrapolated. The minimum d/H_c of 0.35 was all that was necessary to provide the data for the range of headwater elevations required by this calculation.

I Figure 7 - Linear Regression fit for Data in Table 1

$$
C_O = -.105 \frac{d}{H_C} + .7194
$$

3.3.4 Case 4 – Combined Orifice Flow through Gates and Weir Flow Over Gates ($H_w>H_{Top}$)

As the headwater continues to rise, it will eventually overtop the raised gates at elevation 1791.4. This flow can be computed as a weir flow over the top of the gates. The C_W coefficient can be computed using USACE Hydraulic Design Criteria, specifically Hydraulic Design Chart 711 (Attachment 5, Reference 2.5). The governing weir equation is a slightly modified form of the basic weir equation and is taken as (Reference 2.5):

$$
Q_w = C_w L_w (H_w - 1791.4)^{1.5}
$$
 (5)

where L_w is the length of the weir, H_w is the elevation of the headwater, and C_w is the discharge coefficient of the weir.

The upper plot of HDC 711 (Attachment 5, Reference 2.5) shows that C_W is about 2.65 for very broad crests $(H_1/B < 0.4$ where $H_1 = H_2$ and $B =$ streamwise length of the crest) and gradually increases to 3.3, the maximum value for a "sharp crested" weir. The flood gates are approximately 4.25"** wide (Attachment 11, Reference 2.1.4). The water level can range from 0-16.1' over the top of these gates given the analysis elevations of this calculation. This yields an H_1/B ranging from 0 to 45.5, indicating that the weir will likely behave as a sharp crested weir. Since the estimation of discharge over the top of various sections of the dam is an approximation, small variations of C_w with H_c are not modeled. Consequently, for all overflows C_w will be assigned a single value taken as the maximum of 3.3 since this is the value indicated for a sharp crested weir. Neglecting minor variations in C_w values has negligible impact on the dam rating curve.

**Gate is made of a 4" wide C-Channel and covered with a $\frac{1}{4}$ " skin plate for a total width of approximately 4.25".

In Case 2, the gates fail as water reaches the midpoint of the gate at 1789.08 feet, when the headwater is at an elevation of 1789.8 feet. When the gates fail, the water overtops the gate machinery at elevation 1790.4 feet. This flow can be computed as a weir flow. The C_w coefficient can be computed using USACE Hydraulic Design Chart 711. The governing weir equation is a slightly modified form of Equation 5:

$$
Q_W = C_W L_W (H_W - 1790.4)^{1.5}
$$
 (6)

where L_w is the length of the weir, H_w is the elevation of the headwater, and C_w is the discharge coefficient of the weir.

The gate machinery is approximately 11" wide (Attachment 9, Reference 2.1.2). The weir will likely behave as a sharp crested weir. Consequently, for all overflows C_w will be assigned a single value taken as the maximum of 3.3. Neglecting minor variations in C_w values has negligible impact on the dam rating curve.

TVA

4. Design Input

4.8 Tailwater rating curve

The tailwater rating curve used in this calculation is shown in Attachment 1-1. Attachment 1-2 lists points scaled from this plot and shows a polynomial fit to the result. The polynomial indicated in Attachment 1-2 and repeated below is used for the dam rating curve calculations.

 $TW = 1611.1148 + 0.8083Q - 6.807x10^{-3}Q^{2} + 3.305x10^{-5}Q^{3} - 5.759x10^{-8}$ Q^4 (7) in which $Q =$ total discharge past the dam in cfs divided by 1000 ("1000 cfs").

5. Special Requirements/Limiting Conditions

N/A

TIVAT A

6. Calculations

The calculations consist of computing spillway and overflow discharges (from Equations **1** through 4) for a list of headwater elevations ranging from the minimum for which discharge exceeds zero up to **1807.5.** The headwater rating curve is a plot of, headwater elevation versus total dam discharge.

Table 2 shows the spreadsheet calculations for the headwater rating curve (spreadsheet included as Attachment 14). The final result, the rating curve, is defined **by** the first two columns, HW vs. Total Discharge and is shown in Figure **7.**

The calculations presented in Table 2 are a reflection of the methodologies outlined in Section **3.** The Free Flow column is computed using the spillway discharge curve shown in Figure **3** and represented **by** Equation **1. Cf** is obtained **by** utilizing Equation 2 and the flow is calculated using Equation **1.**

There are no particular calculations shown for the transition region. The geometry of this dam's crest and height of the spillway gates gives a transition area of less than **6".** Therefore, it was judged that calculations would not be required in this region.

The orifice flow columns calculate the flow once the water level exceeds H_T and the flow transforms into orifice flow versus a free discharge as before. **Co** is calculated utilizing Equation 4 and the flow is calculated **by** Equation **3.**

The Overtopping Flow in Cases 1 and 1a is the flow over the tops of the raised gates. It is combined with the orifice flow in the final discharge rating curve as both flows will be occurring simultaneously. Flow is calculated using Equation **5.** Cw for this case was selected as a constant value of **3.3** and is justified in Section 3.3.4.

The Overtopping Flow in Case 2 is the flow over the top of the gate machinery at a headwater elevation of 1790.4 feet when the gates fail. It is combined with the orifice flow in the final discharge rating curve as both flows will be occurring simultaneously. Flow is calculated using Equation **6.** Cw for this case was selected as a constant value of **3.3** and is justified in Section 3.3.4.

The turbine flow is calculated as outlined in Assumption **3. 1.1** and section 4.7

The Total Discharge column provides the final discharge curve values in **1000** cfs and is simply a summation of flows in the appropriate flow regimes as outlined above.

Table **3** shows the calculations for case I a which are performed identical to case **I** with the omission of the turbine flow.

Table 4 shows the calculations for Case 2 which are performed similar to Case **I** a but with gate failure.

Nottely Dam Headwater Rating Curve **-** With Turbine Flow

Spill Way Parameters

L= **300** feet **Z,= 1775** feet d= 11.4 feet **Lw= 325** feet

Table 2 - Case 1 Calculation

Nottely Dam Headwater Rating Curve - No Turbine Flow

Table 3 - Case 1a Calculation

Nottely Dam Headwater Rating Curve - Gate Failure Without Turbine Flow

Spill Way Parameters

L= **300** feet Z_c = 1775 feet

d= 11.4 feet feet (bottom of walkway at 1781.0') after gates fail at HW = 1789.8' Lw= **325** feet

Table 4 - Case 2 Calculation

7. Results/Conclusions

For convenience, the headwater rating results, separate from the calculation details provided above, are tabulated as total discharge in cfs vs. headwater elevation in feet in Table 5. The headwater rating curve is plotted in Figure 8.

Note the discontinuity that appears in Figure 8 at a headwater elevation of just under 1790.4'. This is the result of the flow transitioning from free flow over the dam crest to orifice flow through the flood gates. The discontinuity was anticipated and is typical for this type of flow transition.

The headwater rating curves developed in this calculation provide Nottely total dam discharge vs. headwater elevation for use in TVA's SOCH and TRBROUTE models for simulation conditions satisfying the assumptions in [3.1]. In particular, the spillway gates must all be fully raised.

 \overline{a}

 $\ddot{}$

Table 5 - Headwater Rating Results

Figure 8 - Headwater Rating Curves

Page 23 of 37 **Calculation CDQ000020080016**

This page revised in R1

Discharge (cfs)

Attachment 1-2

Source: Reference 2.7

Page 24 of 37 **Calculation CDQ000020080016**

Prepared: ATT

1672.735

Attachment 2

Page 25 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Source: Reference 2.4

NOTTELY DAM

LOCATION OF SPILLWAY **GATES**

Attachment 3-2

Page 27 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Source: Reference 2.2

NOTTELY DAM

SPILLWAY **GATE ARRANGEMENTS**

GATE OPENINGS

Figures in columns under each gate number refer to gate opening indicator reading dash (-) indicates closed gate "R" indicates gate raised above water surface and dogged "R" indicates first use of each gate

Page 28 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Source: Reference 2.6

Figure 257. Coefficient of discharge for flow under gates. 288-D-2417.

is the inflow per foot of length of weir crest. The momenta³ at the two sections therefore will be:

$$
Upstream, M_u = \frac{Qv}{g} \tag{8}
$$

Downstream,
$$
M_d = \frac{[Q + q(\Delta x)]}{g}[v + \Delta v]
$$
 (9)

Subtracting equation (8) from equation (9):

$$
\Delta M = \frac{Q(\Delta v)}{g} + \frac{q(\Delta x)}{g} [v + \Delta v] \tag{10}
$$

Dividing by Δx :

$$
\frac{\Delta M}{\Delta x} = \frac{Q(\Delta v)}{g(\Delta x)} + \frac{q}{g}[v + \Delta v] \tag{11}
$$

The rate of change of momentum with respect to time being v times the rate of change with respect to x , and considering the average ve-

locity to be $\left\lceil v + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta v) \right\rceil$, equation (11) can be written:

$$
\frac{\Delta M}{\Delta t} = \frac{Q(\Delta v)}{g(\Delta x)} \left[v + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta v) \right] + \frac{q}{g} [v + \Delta v] \left[v + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta v) \right] \tag{12}
$$

As $\frac{\Delta M}{\Delta t}$ is the accelerating force, which is equal to the slope of the water surface $\frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x}$ times the average discharge, equation (12) becomes:

$$
\frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x} \left[Q + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta Q) \right] = \frac{Q(\Delta v)}{g(\Delta x)} \left[v + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta v) \right] + \frac{q}{g} \left[v + \Delta v \right] \left[v + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta v) \right] \tag{13}
$$

³ The weight of 1 cubic foot of water is taken as a unit force to eliminate the necessity of multiplying all forces and momenta by 62.5 to convert them into pounds.

Attachment 5

Source: Reference 2.5

A

Attachment 6 **Page 30 of 37 Calculation CDQ000020080016**

Source: Reference 2.8

RESERVOIR RELEASES IMPROVEMENTS

The aeration and minimum flow equipment at Nottely Dam is part of the implementation of TVA's Lake Improvement Plan (LIP) approved by the Board of Directors in 1991. One of the goals of the Lake Improvement Plan is to improve the dissolved oxygen (DO) levels and minimum flows of the releases of 16 dams. Minimum flow releases of 55 cfs at Nottely were obtained by the installation of a small hydroturbine unit which is operated whenever the main unit is off. At Nottely testing showed the target minimum DO content of the release (4 mg/L) to be best achieved by the installation of air injection equipment. Blower and compressor systems inject air at the large and small hydroturbines respectively. The blower system consists of two blowers (250 hp each), controls, piping, and valves designed to inject air into the water flow through the large unit. The air compressor system consists of two air compressors, controls, piping, and valves designed to inject air into the flow through the small unit. The air compressors are rated at 25 hp each.

SAFETY MODIFICATIONS FOR PROBABLE MAXIMUM FLOOD

Chronology

Safety analysis studies for Chatuge Dam for the probable maximum flood
(PMF) were started on July 29, 1976, and completed in May 1984. Final (PMF) were started on July 29, 1976, and completed in May 1984. design was completed in January 1988. Onsite construction began in July 1986, and was completed on June 20, 1988.

Cost of Modifications

Design costs for the capital safety modifications to Chatuge Dam were \$1,520,000. Construction costs were \$13,680,000. The total project cost was \$15,200,000. This total does not include costs for dam safety evaluation studies which resulted in the modifications.

Controlling Features

The embankments at Nottely were modified in order to safety pass the probable maximum flood. The embankments were raised to elevation 1807 by the addition of rockfill. A new bridge was built with a 30 ft. width of asphalt roadway. These PMF modifications will prevent overtopping and erosion of the embankments and thus prevent breach and failure of the dam.
JV Source: Reference 2.8

Page 31 of 37 **Calculation CDQ000020080016**

This page added in R1³⁰

RESERVOIR AND POWER DATA

Nottely

NOTE: Energy in storage data not included

Page 32 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Source: Reference 2.1.2

Page 33 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Page 35 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

Page 36 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$

Attachment 13 Source: Reference 2.1.6

Page 37 of 37

Calculation CDQ000020080016

This page added in R1

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY RIVER SYSTEM OPERATIONS & ENVIRONMENT RIVER OPERATIONS

NOTTELY DAM

SPILLWAY **DISCHARGE TABLES**

APRIL 2004

CONTENTS

Headwater Range

INSTRUCTIONS FOR **USE** OF **TABLES**

1. Tables Update

These tables supersede the tables issued in January **1961.** The revised discharges, which are only slightly different from those in the **1961** tables, were generated using the computer code **SPILLQ. SPILLQ** is a computer code used in TVA software for monitoring spill discharges and determining gate arrangements.

2. Purpose of Tables

These tables provide a means for setting required spillway discharges and for determining the discharge when a specific arrangement of gates is in use. The tabulated discharges are based on test results from a 1:45 scale model of Nottely spillway supplemented **by** prototype measurements, which were used to establish the lower end of the rating.

The specific gate arrangements in the tables were determined from model tests in which consideration was given to obtaining satisfactory flow conditions throughout the length of the spillway chute. Any deviation from the specified arrangements may cause overtopping of the chute walls.

3. Range of Tables

The tables cover a discharge range from **0** to 60,040 cubic feet per second. Headwater elevations range from **1775** feet to **1789** feet. The tailwater does not affect the discharges from this spillway.

4. Arrangement of Tables

The tables show spillway discharges in cubic feet per second. Headwater elevations in **0. 1** -foot increments are shown at the top of each column. The headwater range is shown at the bottom of each page.

The discharge is tabulated under the headwater elevations for specific arrangements of gate openings, which are indicated **by** number in the left and right columns of each page. The numbered arrangements are defined in the table of Spillway Gate Arrangements on page **5.** Reference to this table and to the drawing showing the location of the gates on page 4 will detennine the gates to be raised for any particular discharge given in the tables.

5. Discharge Intervals

The tables have been prepared so that the incremental discharge between the tabulated values for consecutive gate arrangements is adequate for all situations. Therefore it will not be necessary to interpolate between values given in these tables.

When the exact headwater elevation does not appear in the tables, the discharge for the headwater elevation closest to it is used. For example, the column headed **1776.2** is used for actual headwater elevations between **1776.15** feet and **1776.24** feet inclusive. When the actual headwater elevation is exactly halfway between tabular values, the larger value is used.

6. Spillway Gate Operation

The spillway gates are used to control discharges up to headwater elevation **1780** feet, which is the top elevation of the closed gates. To prevent gate overflow, all spillway gates should be raised before the headwater elevation exceeds **1780** feet. However, to provide for accidental operation in which some gates have not been raised, the tabulated discharges include the total discharge, under the raised

gates and over the closed gates, for headwater elevations from **1780** feet to **1783** feet.

Either one or two cranes may be used to open and close the spillway gates. It has been estimated that all gates can be raised in approximately 3 hours using one crane and in $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours using two cranes.

7. Use of Tables

The tables can be used in two ways: **(1)** to determine the arrangement of gates needed to pass a required discharge at a given headwater elevation, and (2) to determine the discharge for a given arrangement of gates and headwater elevation.

Example **I --** What gate arrangement is necessary to pass a discharge of **1,000** cubic feet per second with the headwater at elevation **1777.84** feet?

The first step is to find the table in which the headwater elevation appears.' Referring to the contents page, we find that headwater elevations between **1777** feet and **1779** feet are found on page **7.** The headwater elevation closest to **1777.84** feet is **1777.8** feet. In the column headed **1777.8** the discharge nearest to the required **1,000** cubic feet per second is **920** cubic feet per second. **By** tracing the horizontal line in which **920** cubic feet per second appears, to either side of the page, we find that gate arrangement **5** is the one for producing the discharge closest to **1,000** cubic feet per second at headwater elevation 1777.8 feet. Referring to page 5 it is found that for gate arrangement **5,** gates **1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17,** and **19** are raised.

After the gates are raised, suppose it is necessary to increase the discharge from **1,000** cubic feet per second to 2,000 cubic feet per second. Assume the headwater elevation remains at **1777.8** feet. In the column headed **1777.8** feet on page **7,** the discharge closest to the required 2,000 cubic feet per second is **2,030** cubic feet per second

for gate arrangement **11.** To change from gate arrangement **5** to gate arrangement **11,** gates 21, **23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32,** 34, **36, 38,** 40, and 42 are raised in addition to those gates already opened.

Example 2 -- Suppose the operating records show that the headwater is at elevation **1779.5** feet, and gate arrangement 21 is in use. The headwater is found on page **8** which is marked "Headwater **1779** to **1781."** In the column headed **1779.5** opposite gate arrangement 21, the discharge is found to **be** 8,240 cubic feet per second. **.**

NOTTELY DAM

LOCATION OF SPILLWAY **GATES**

4

NOTTELY DAM

SPILLWAY **GATE ARRANGEMENTS**

 \mathbb{Z}

GATE OPENINGS

Figures in columns under each gate number refer to gate opening indicator reading dash **(-)** indicates closed gate "R" indicates gate raised above water surface and dogged "R" indicates first use of each gate

5

 $\sim 10^{11}$

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$.

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\sim 10^7$

 \sim \sim

 ~ 100

 ~ 100

 $\sim 10^{11}$ km s $^{-1}$

 $7 - 7$

 \mathbb{R}^2

9

HEADWATER **1783** to **1789** APRIL 2004

 \sim λ

 \sim

NO *TTEL* **Y** *DAM*

July 2001 Nottely i

RESERVOIR OPERATION OVERVIEW

Nottely is a multipurpose tributary project located on the Nottely
River, a tributary to the Hiwassee River. The project was River, a tributary to the Hiwassee River. originally constructed without any hydropower facility, primarily to be used for storage augmentation for TVA's downstream Hiwassee and Apalachia projects on the Hiwassee River, as well as for TVA mainstream dams on the Tennessee River. The project was built during World War II, with dam closure in 1942. The single unit powerhouse was completed in 1956. Nottely is operated for many purposes, including flood control, augmentation of flows for navigation, hydropower production, water quality, recreation, and aquatic ecology. Nottely Reservoir has an annual pool variation of about 35 feet during normal years, but could be several feet more during drought or flood periods.

 $\ddot{}$

Table of Contents

J.

 \mathcal{L}^{max}

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

Table of Contents (Continued)

FIGURE 1 - Construction of Dam, 1942

FIGURE 2 - Single Unit Powerhouse, 1956

FIGURE 3

s est

FIGURE 4

SECTION **Al-Al**

SECTION Bl-Bl

SECTION **Cl-Cl**

July 2001

 \mathcal{L}_{∞}

SECTION D1-D1

 \bar{z}

NVTd

 $\overline{1}$

EIGNEE 8

 \sim \sim

TOOZ ATAP

NOTTELY **PROJECT**

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL **FEATURES**

NOTE:

Elevations are based on the **U.S.C. & G.S. 1936** supplementary Adjustment.

LOCATION

On Nottely River at river mile 21.0; in Union County, Georgia; **11** air miles southwest of Murphy, North Carolina; **2.3** river miles upstream from Georgia-North Carolina State line.

CHRONOLOGY

PROJECT COST

l,

STREAMFLOW

RESERVOIR

 $\Delta \phi$

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(\log n))$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{2}d\mu_{\rm{max}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right).$

July 2001 Nottely 17

RESERVOIR (continued)

Reservation for flood control on:

TAILWATER

HEAD (Gross)

RESERVOIR ADJUSTMENTS

 $\bar{\Lambda}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

DAMS

MAIN DAM

SADDLE DAM

OUTLET FACILITIES

SPILLWAY (See Figures **11** and 12)

July 2001 Nottely 19

OUTLET FACILITIES

SPILLWAY (See Figures 11 and 12)

Discharge capacity: HW el. 1787.4 **...........................** 49,500 cfs HW el. 1780.0 **...........................** 11,500 cfs HW el. 1779.0 **............................** 8 ,100 cfs Highway 20 ft wide, on bridge upstream from wei: Foundation Earth, except chute outlet on rock

FIGURE **11** - Upper end of concrete spillway chute, October 1999

Figure 12 - Lower end of concrete spillway chute, October 1999

 \mathcal{P}^{max} and

POWER FACILITIES

INTAKE (See Figure 13)

Type Circular reinforced concrete dry tower Size: Inside diameter ... 25 ft Height ... 206 ft Trashrack 32 sections, 8 ft 0-1/4 in. wide by **10** ft 6 in. high Gross area at racks 2,700 sq. ft Gates Two 5-ft-8-in.-wide by 10-ft high hydraulically operated slide gates $\sim 10^7$ Service crane 15-ton overhead crane

CONDUIT

(Intake to Powerhouse)

FIGURE 13 - Intake tower and footbridge, October 1999

POWER FACILITIES (CONT.)

POWERHOUSE (See Figure 14)

Generating capacity, 1 unit 15,000 kW Type of construction Semioutdoor; reinforced concrete Principal outside dimensions 96.5 ft long by 41 ft wide by 70 ft high Draft tube: Type .. Elbow, 2 openings Horizontal length (centerline of turbine to downstream face) 40 ft Vertical distance from distributor centerline to draft tube floor 26 ft Net area at outlet opening 304 sq. ft Derrick Stiff leg derrick, installed on powerhouse structure; hook load 70 tons at 25-1/2-ft radius

 \mathcal{L}

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

POWER FACILITIES (CONT.)

EXCAVATED TAILRACE CHANNEL

HYDRAULIC TURBINE

GENERATOR

 $\sim 10^{10}$ m $^{-1}$

POWER FACILITIES (CONT.)

GENERATOR (CONT.)

GENERATOR AND TURBINE MODERNIZATION

This project for Nottely was completed on June 21, 1997. The unit was disassembled. The principal components replaced were the wicket gate seals, the stainless steel wear rings, the runner, and wicket gate bushings (greaseless). Also, the turbine shaft was modified for a new water-lubricated guide bearing. The unit was then reassembled. Unit efficiency and capacity have been improved; refer to the latest "Operating Characteristics Curves" for details.

ELECTRIC CONTROLS

From Hiwassee hydro plant, by frequency-shift powerline carrier. Local controls for initial operation and maintenance.

TRANSMISSION PLANT

(See Figure 15 for single line diagram of main connections and Figure 16 for view of switchyard)

Step-up and intersystem transformer:

1 3-phase, 3-winding transformer, bank 1; rated 12.47 13.2-69 kV, 14,500 kVA self-cooled, 19,333 kVA forced-air-cooled on 13.2- and 69-kV windings; 5000 kVA self-cooled, 6667 kVA forced-air-cooled on 12.47-kV windings; Moloney

69-kV circuit breakers:

1 600-A, i,000,000-kVA, 8/20-Hz, Westinghouse

1 600-A, 685,000-kVA, 8/20-Hz, Westinghouse Structures:

2 69-kV switchyard bay, 26 ft wide

FIGURE 15 - Single line diagram of main connections

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{0}^{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1$

POWER FACILITIES (CONT.)

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$

EXCAVATED TAILRACE CHANNEL

HYDRAULIC TURBINE

GENERATOR

POWER FACILITIES (CONT.)

GENERATOR (CONT.)

GENERATOR AND TURBINE MODERNIZATION

This project for Nottely was completed on June 21, 1997. The unit was disassembled. The principal components replaced were the wicket gate seals, the stainless steel wear rings, the runner, and wicket gate bushings (greaseless). Also, the turbine shaft was modified for a new water-lubricated guide bearing. The unit was then reassembled. Unit efficiency and capacity have been improved; refer to the latest "Operating Characteristics Curves" for details.

ELECTRIC CONTROLS

From Hiwassee hydro plant, by frequency-shift powerline carrier. Local controls for initial operation and maintenance.

TRANSMISSION PLANT

(See Figure 13 for single line diagram of main connections and Figure 14 for view of switchyard)

Step-up and intersystem transformer:

1 3-phase, 3-winding transformer, bank **1;** rated 12.47 13.2-69 kV, 14,500 kVA self-cooled, 19,333 kVA forced-air-cooled on 13.2- and 69-kV windings; 5000 kVA self-cooled, 6667 kVA forced-air-cooled on 12.47-kV windings; Moloney

69-kV circuit breakers:

1 600-A, 1,000,000-kVA, 8/20-Hz, Westinghouse

1 600-A, 685,000-kVA, 8/20-Hz, Westinghouse Structures:

2 69-kV switchyard bay, 26 ft wide

FIGURE 16 - Switchyard, October 1999

TRANSMISSION PLANT DATA

Note: H=High voltage winding Y=Tertiary winding X=Low voltage winding $\sim 10^7$

 $\sim 10^7$

RESERVOIR **AND** POWER **DATA**

 $\sim 10^7$

NOTE: Energy in storage data not included

 ~ 10

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

RESERVOIR **AND** POWER **DATA**

 \sim

Nottely

NOTE: Energy in storage data not included

July 2001

Nottely 32

 \sim

 \sim $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\,d\mu\,d\mu\,.$

 \sim

Nottely 34 Tennessee Valley Authority River System Operations

 $\bar{\epsilon}$

Nottely Spill Compilation

Nottely **³⁵** Tennessee Valley Authority River System Operations

 $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$

 \mathbf{r}

TVA OPERATED RESERVOIR SYSTEM **ANNUAL** MAXIMUM **AND** MINIMUM ELEVATIONS, IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE FROM **DATE** OF RESERVOIR **CLOSURE** THROUGH 2000

NOTTELY

 χ^2 .

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

TVA OPERATED RESERVOIR SYSTEM **ANNUAL** MAXIMUM **AND** MINIMUM ELEVATIONS, IN ORDER OF **MAGNITUDE** FROM **DATE** OF RESERVOIR **CLOSURE** THROUGH 2000

NOTTELY

 \mathcal{L}

 $\bar{\lambda}$

 $\overline{}$

AVERAGE WEEKLY CFS

MAXIMUM, MINIMIUM, MEDIAN, AND MEAN Adjusted Flow by Weeks Nottely $Years = 1903 - 2000$

AVERAGE WEEKLY CFS

ANNUAL OPERATING CYCLE

RESERVOIR RELEASES IMPROVEMENTS

The aeration and minimum flow equipment at Nottely Dam is part of the implementation of TVA's Lake Improvement Plan (LIP) approved by the Board of Directors in 1991. One of the goals of the Lake Improvement Plan is to improve the dissolved oxygen (DO) levels and minimum flows of the releases of 16 dams. Minimum flow releases of 55 cfs at Nottely were obtained by the installation of a small hydroturbine unit which is operated whenever the main unit is off. At Nottely testing showed the target minimum DO content of the release (4 mg/L) to be best achieved by the installation of air injection equipment. Blower and compressor systems inject air at the large and small hydroturbines respectively. The blower system consists of two blowers (250 hp each), controls, piping, and valves designed to inject air into the water flow through the large unit. The air compressor system consists of two air compressors, controls, piping, and valves designed to inject air into the flow through the small unit. The air compressors are rated at 25 hp each.

SAFETY MODIFICATIONS FOR PROBABLE MAXIMUM FLOOD

Chronology

Safety analysis studies for Chatuge Dam for the probable maximum flood (PMF) were started on July 29, 1976, and completed in May 1984. Final design was completed in January 1988. Onsite construction began in July 1986, and was completed on June 20, 1988.

Cost of Modifications

Design costs for the capital safety modifications to Chatuge Dam were \$1,520,000. Construction costs were \$13,680,000. The total project cost was \$15,200,000. This total does not include costs for dam safety evaluation studies which resulted in the modifications.

Controlling Features

The embankments at Nottely were modified in order to safety pass the probable maximum flood. The embankments were raised to elevation 1807 by the addition of rockfill. A new bridge was built with a 30 ft. width of asphalt roadway. These PMF modifications will prevent overtopping and erosion of the embankments and thus prevent breach and failure of the dam.

CONSTRUCTION DATA

PERSONNEL

HOUSING FACILITIES (Initial Project)

Public buildings constructed included a cafeteria and hospital.

QUANTITIES

 $\hat{\theta}_0$

CONSTRUCTION PLANT LAYOUT

July 2001

 \mathbb{R}^2

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F})$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$, where

 $\Delta \sim 20$

Carlo Carlo

 $\sim 1000~M_{\odot}$ $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})$ $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, where $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ $\sqrt{1+\epsilon}$, $\sqrt{2}$, $\Delta_{\rm{max}}$ and $\Delta_{\rm{max}}$ $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})))$ $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}})))$ the control of the control of

ال المناسب المتعلقة التعا الأنفس فسترين والأقداريس المعربين والسموع وسوسهم وسواري \mathbb{R}^{n+1} $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}$ ~ 12.2 ~ 1.3 Service S 医细胞 计图 on sales

