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## INTRODUCTION

Tiber Dam, that forms Lake Elwell, is located in north central Montana on the Marias River in Liberty County about 13 miles west of the town of Chester (figure 1). Lake Elwell is also known as Tiber Reservoir and is referenced as both within this report. These features are part of the Lower Marias Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program that was designed to provide municipal and industrial water, flood control, and irrigation water to 127,000 acres of land. The original designed irrigation features were not constructed because the irrigation district did not negotiate a repayment contract with the United States.


Figure 1 - Tiber Dam Location Map.
Settlement of the spillway crest of Tiber Dam began following initial filling of the reservoir in 1956. Reservoir operating level restrictions were imposed to safeguard the structure until repaired. The rate of settlement became more alarming following a 1964 flood. Measures to protect the structure were approved by Congress and initial construction began in 1967 with completion in 1970. The work consisted of modifying the canal outlet works for use as an auxiliary outlet works and closing the entrance channel of the spillway by a temporary earthfill cofferdam. For additional protection, the reservoir operating criteria was further revised and the active capacity was eliminated. Additional work was completed, 1976-81, that included replacing the upstream section of the spillway and raising the dam 5 feet (figures 2 and 3). Beginning in 1982, and continuing through 1983, Tiber Reservoir was filled to its original design capacity of elevation 2,993.0 feet and normal reservoir operations were restored.
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Tiber Reservoir is formed by Tiber Dam along with a dike that closes a saddle on the south rim of the reservoir near the dam. The earthfill dike is 16,650 feet long and has a maximum height of 65 feet. The dam is a zoned earthfill structure whose dimensions are:

| Hydraulic height ${ }^{1}$ | 189 | feet | Structural height | 206 feet |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Top width | 45 | feet | Crest length | 4,300 feet |
| Crest elevation | 3,026 | feet $^{2}$ |  |  |

The spillway, crest elevation 2,975 , is located on the right abutment. The flows are controlled by three 22 - by 38 -foot radial gates with top of gate elevation $3,012.5$. The spillway capacity is 68,470 cubic feet per second (cfs) at reservoir elevation 3,020.2.

The River Outlet Works (ROW) through the right abutment contains two discharge pipes, 22and 72 -inch diameters that are controlled by a 24 -inch gate value and a 5.0 -foot square highpressure gate respectfully. The discharge capacity is 65 cfs for the 22 -inch pipe and $1,540 \mathrm{cfs}$ for the 72 -inch pipe at reservoir elevation 3,020.2.

The 22 -inch diameter outlet pipe with 24 -inch gate valve and 18 -inch butterfly valve (BFV) has not been operational since completion of the dam. The existing hydraulic operating system is inadequate to operate the upstream gate valve due to excessive friction losses in the piping system. The Montana Area Office is planning to convert the 22 -inch outlet pipe into a ventilation system in 2006.

In 2003-2004, the ROW underwent extensive modification to incorporate the addition of a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) 7.5 MW powerplant, privately owned by Tiber Montana, LLC. A bifurcation pipe was installed in the ROW tunnel at the downstream end to divert flow from the existing 72 -inch outlet pipe through a bifurcation and 96 -inch BFV to the powerplant. Releases from the regulating gate and powerplant enter directly into the ROW stilling basin.

Under normal operation, river releases up to about 700 cfs will be primarily through the 7.5 MW FERC powerplant. River flows greater than 700 cfs will normally be released through the auxiliary outlet works. However, if the auxiliary outlet works is not available for use, flows in excess of the powerplant capacity are released through a combination of the ROW regulating gate and powerplant.

An auxiliary outlet works, constructed as part of the safety of dams modification, is located through the left abutment of the dam. The auxiliary outlet is controlled by a 7.25 - by 9.25 -foot outlet gate with a capacity of $4,240 \mathrm{cfs}$ at reservoir elevation $3,020.2$.

[^0]The drainage area above Tiber Dam is approximately 4,375 square miles and all is considered sediment contributing. The reservoir, at elevation 2,990.0, is about 44 miles in length with an average width of 1.6 miles. The total length includes 35 miles of the Marias River arm and 9 miles of the Willow Creek arm.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This Reclamation report presents the 2002 results of the survey of Tiber Reservoir. The primary objective of the survey was to gather data to:

- develop reservoir topography
- compute area-capacity relationships
- estimate storage depletion since dam closure

Prior to the underwater collection, the hydrographic survey crew conducted a RTK GPS survey utilizing horizontal and vertical control established by the National Geodetic Survey (NGS) for datum point "Tibl." This point is located near the dam and is not a high-order vertical datum. Other NGS datums in the surrounding area found elevations in NAVD88 to be around three feet higher than elevations in NGVD29. The 2002 hydrographic survey found the vertical project datum established by Reclamation during construction to be 2.9 feet lower than NAVD88 assigned to "Tibl". All elevations are in feet and referenced to Reclamation's project vertical datum.

The underwater survey, June and July of 2002, was conducted between reservoir elevation $2,991.9$ and 2,995.4. The bathymetric survey used sonic depth recording equipment interfaced with a RTK GPS capable of determining sounding locations within the reservoir. The system continuously recorded depth and horizontal coordinates of the survey boat as it navigated along grid lines covering Tiber Reservoir. The positioning system provided information to allow the boat operator to maintain a course along these grid lines. The reservoir's water surface elevations, recorded by the Reclamation reservoir gauge during the time of collection, were used to convert the sonic depth measurements to reservoir bottom elevations. These gauge elevations are tied to the Reclamation project datum.

The above-water area of Tiber Reservoir was developed by digitizing the developed contour lines from the USGS quad maps and the reservoir water surface from rectified aerial photographs flown July 4, 2003 at reservoir elevation 2,991.6. The 2003 aerial survey covered the entire reservoir and provided valuable information about the extensive shoreline erosion that has occurred on Tiber Reservoir.

The final 2002 Tiber Reservoir topography is a combination of the 2003 aerial water surface contour, the USGS quad contours, and the 2002 underwater collected data. A computer graphics program generated the 2002 reservoir surface areas at predetermined contour intervals from these combined data sets. The 2002 area and capacity tables were generated by a computer program that used the measured contour surface areas and a curve-fitting technique to compute area and capacity at prescribed elevation increments (Bureau of Reclamation, 1985).

Tables 1 and 2 contain summaries of the Tiber Reservoir and watershed characteristics for the 2002 survey. The 2002 survey determined that the reservoir has a total storage capacity of 925,649 acre-feet and a surface area of 18,275 acres at joint use reservoir water surface elevation 2,993.0. Since closure in October of 1957, the reservoir has an estimated volume change of 42,179 acre-feet below reservoir clevation $2,993.0$. This volume represents a 4.4 percent change in total capacity at this elevation.

## RESERVOIR OPERATIONS

Tiber Dam operates to provide regulated flows downstream on the Marias River. The July 2002 capacity table shows $1,515,522$ acre-fect of total storage below the maximum water surface elevation $3,020.3$. The 2002 survey measured a minimum lake bottom of around elevation 2,839 . The following values are from the July 2002 capacity table:

- 186,799 acre-feet of surcharge between elevation 3,012.5 and 3,020.2
- 403,074 acre-feet of flood control between elevation 2,993.0 and 3,012.5.
- 258,436 acre-feet of joint use between elevation 2,976.0 and 2,993.0.
- 112,883 acre-foot of conservation storage between elevation 2,966.4 and 2,976.0.
- 534,709 acre-foot of inactive storage between elevation 2,870.0 and 2,966.4.
- 19,621 acre-foot of dead storage below 2,870.0.

Tiber Reservoir computed annual inflow and reservoir stage records are listed by water year on table 1 for the operation period 1956 through 2002. The inflow values were computed by the regional office and show annual fluctuations with a computed average inflow of 618,300 acrefeet per year. The maximum reservoir elevation was $3,005.6$ in 1965 with a minimum elevation of $2,953.8$ in 1968.

## HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY EQUIPMENT AND METHOD

The hydrographic survey equipment was mounted in the cabin of a 24 -foot trihull aluminum vessel equipped with twin in-board motors (figure 4). The hydrographic system included a GPS receiver with a built-in radio, a depth sounder, a helmsman display for navigation, a computer, and hydrographic system software for collecting the underwater data. An on-board generator supplied power to all the equipment. The shore equipment included a second GPS receiver with an external radio. The GPS receiver and antenna were mounted on a survey tripod over a known datum point and a 12 -volt battery provided the power for the shore unit.

The Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group uses RTK GPS with the major benefit being precise heights measured in real time to monitor water surface elevation changes. The basic output is from a RTK receiver are precise 3D coordinates in latitude, longitude, and height with accuracies on the order of 2 centimeters horizontally and 3 centimeters vertically. The output is on the GPS datum of WGS-84 that the hydrographic collection software converted into Montana's state plane coordinates in NAD83. The RTK GPS system employs two receivers that track the same satellites simultaneously just like with differential GPS.


Figure 4 - Survey vessel with mounted hydrographic equipment on Jackson Lake in Wyoming
In 2001, the Sedimentation and River Hydraulics Group began utilizing an integrated multibeam hydrographic survey system. The system consists of a single transducer mounted on the center bow or forward portion of the boat. From the single transducer a fan array of narrow beams generate a detailed cross section of bottom geometry as the survey vessel passes over the areas to be mapped. The system transmits 80 separate $1-1 / 2$ degree slant beams resulting in a 120 -degree swath from the transducer. The 200 kHz high-resolution multibeam echosounder system measured the relative water depth across the wide swath perpendicular to the vessel's track. Figure 5 illuminates the swath of the sea floor that is about 3.5 times as wide as the water depth below the transducer.


Figure 5 - Multibeam collection system

The multibeam system is composed of several instruments that are all in constant communication with a central on-board notebook computer. The components include the RTK GPS for
positioning; a motion reference unit to measure the heave, pitch, and roll of the survey vessel; a gyro to measure the yaw or vessel attitude; and a velocity meter to measure the speed of sound of the reservoir water column. With the proper calibration, the data processing software utilizes all the incoming information to provide an accurate detailed $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ data set of the lake bottom.

The Tiber Reservoir bathymetric survey collection was conducted in June and July of 2002 between water surface elevation 2,991.9 and 2,995.4 (Reclamation project datum). The survey was run using the multibeam instrumentation described above where the survey system software continuously recorded reservoir depths and horizontal coordinates as the survey vessel moved across closely spaced grid lines covering the reservoir area. Most of the transects (grid lines) were run along the original river alignment to the reservoir where the multibeam swaths overlapped each other. The multibeam system could have provided full bottom coverage, but time, budget, and access did not allow this to occur in all the shallow portions of the reservoir. The loss of these additional data points did not have a significant impact on the area computations since an extensive above water collection was not conducted for this study.

Additional data in the upper shallow water reaches of the two inlets was also collected using a single beam depth sounder. The depth sounder was calibrated by lowering a weighted cable below the boat with beads marking known depths. The depth sounder was calibrated by adjusting the speed of sound, which can vary with density, salinity, temperature, turbidity, and other conditions. The collected data were digitally transmitted to the computer collection system via a RS-232 port. The depth sounder also produces an analog hard-copy chart of the measured depths. These graphed analog charts were printed for all survey lines as the data were collected and recorded by the computer. The charts were analyzed during post-processing, and when the analog charted depths indicated a difference from the recorded computer bottom depths, the computer data files were modified. The water surface elevations at the dam, recorded by a Reclamation gauge, were used to convert the sonic depth measurements to true lake-bottom elevations.

## Shoreline Erosion

The 2002 underwater survey revealed extensive shoreline erosion throughout the reservoir area. During collection, the GPS boat positions were found to be at times outside the digitized USGS quad contour locations indicating the boat was on solid ground. These USGS quad contours were developed from aerial photography flown in the 1960's and at times, the position of the boat was tens of feet outside their boundary. In addition, during the 2002 survey a major windstorm occurred and the crew witnessed vertical sections of the shoreline collapsing into the reservoir for days after. Even with the extensive shore erosion that has occurred since dam closure, the survey vessel was able to hug the vertical banks in deep water conditions where previous shore material had collapsed into the reservoir. It appears that over time the collapsed material is washed further into the reservoir by the wave action, similar to ocean waves smoothing the beaches. This is possible because the material dissipates in the water and consists of little to no rock or large cobble. Following are views showing the shoreline erosion and its affect on the reservoir, figure 6 through 9, from photographs taken by Sharon Nuanes in 2002.


Figure 6 - Eroded Material Forming a Shelf.


Figure 7 - Large Areas of Erosion Occurring Above the Reservoir Maximum Water Surface.


Figure 8 - Recent Eroded Material That Has Not Moved Further Into Reservoir.


Figure 9 - Eroded Bank Where the Eroded Material Has Deposited Below the Water Line.

The above photographs show several different stages of the shoreline erosion along the Tiber Reservoir banks. If the erosion occurred only below the reservoir high water mark, the total volume of the reservoir would not be greatly affected. In this case, however, the gain in surface area and resulting volume in the upper reservoir elevation zone is offset by the loss of surface area and volume in the lower elevations of the reservoir. The eroded upper elevation shoreline deposits in the lower elevations of the reservoir. The photographs show the large amount of shore erosion above the maximum reservoir elevation, meaning that a portion of the loss of the original total reservoir volume is due to the above reservoir shoreline erosion along with the incoming river sediments. The only means to accurately measure the extent of the shoreline erosion would be by an above water aerial survey.

For a vegetation study, an aerial survey was conducted on July 4 of 2003 at reservoir water surface elevation 2,991.6. The collected digital aerial photos were rectified, but no above water contours were developed. As part of this analysis, the 2003 reservoir water surface image was digitized to compute the surface area at elevation 2,991.6. The 2003 digitized surface area at reservoir elevation $2,991.6$ was 17,935 acres compared to the original computed surface area of 17,472 acres at the same elevation. The 2003 surface area was nearly 500 acres greater, illustrating the extent of the shoreline erosion that has occurred throughout the reservoir.

## Tiber Dam Datum

Prior to the underwater collection, the hydrographic survey crew conducted a RTK GPS survey utilizing horizontal and vertical control at NGS datum point "Tibl." Tibl is located near the dam and is not a highly rated vertical control point. Other NGS vertical datums in the surrounding area show the elevations in NAVD88 to be around three feet higher than the elevations in NGVD29. The 2002 hydrographic survey found the vertical project datum established by Reclamation during construction to be 2.9 feet lower than NAVD88 elevation at Tib1. This was an average measured shift from multiple water surface shots compared to the Reclamation gauge readings. All elevations in this report are in feet and referenced to the Reclamation project vertical datum or gauge readings at the time of this survey. Following are the NGS coordinates for "Tibl" used for this survey. The Montana's state plane coordinates are in NAD83 and elevation in NAVD88.

| North | $1,486855.785$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| West | $1,578,509.929$ |
| Elevation | $3,025.51$ |

## Multibeam Analysis

The analysis started with processing all the collected raw multibeam bottom profile files. This included applying all necessary correction information that was collected, such as the roll, pitch, and yaw effects on the survey vessel. Other corrections included applying the field measured sound velocity of the reservoir water column. All this information was used when converting all the corrected depth data to elevations. All elevations in the final analysis were tied to the Reclamation measured water surface elevation at the time of collection. Due to the massive
amount of data, the data set was filtered utilizing procedures within the collection and analysis software that logically removed data points without adversely affecting the results. Quality control and assurance of the data sets were accomplished by conducting field calibration as required by the multibeam system and collecting velocity profile data for the areas being surveyed.

## RESERVOIR AREA AND CAPACITY

## Topography Development

The topography of Tiber Reservoir was developed from the 2002 collected underwater data, the digitized contours from the USGS quad maps, and the digitized 2003 aerial water surface contour. The digitized USGS contour lines were used to supplement areas of the reservoir not covered by the survey vessel due to shallow water conditions. The USGS quad maps were developed from aerial photography dated in the 1960's because it was the only available data for certain portions of the reservoir. ARC/INFO geographic information system software was used to digitize the USGS quad contours. The digitized contours were transformed to Montana's NAD 1983 state plane coordinates using the ARC/INFO PROJECT command. This same method was used to digitize the reservoir water surface from the 2003 rectified digital aerial photographs that were flown on July 4, 2003 at reservoir water surface elevation 2,991.6. These rectified photographs were part of a vegetation study and no contours were developed. The aerial water surface image did allow a complete contour to be digitized for the reservoir's water surface elevation $2,991.6$. The 2003 digitized surface area at elevation $2,991.6$ was 17,935 acres compared to the original computed surface area of 17,472 acres. The 2003 surface area was nearly 500 acres greater due to the extensive shoreline erosion that has occurred throughout the reservoir.

The digitized 2003 reservoir water surface, elevation 2,991.6, was used to perform a clip of Tiber Reservoir triangular irregular network (TIN) such that interpolation was not allowed to occur outside the enclosed polygon. This contour was selected since it was the closest data available to represent the reservoir water surface at the time the 2002 underwater survey was conducted (between reservoir elevation 2,992 and 2,995). The clip was assigned an elevation of 2,991.6.

Contours for the reservoir below elevation 2,991.6 were computed from the 2002 underwater data set using the triangular irregular network (TIN) surface-modeling package within ARC/INFO. A TIN is a set of adjacent non-overlapping triangles computed from irregularly spaced points with $x, y$ coordinates and $z$ values. TIN was designed to deal with continuous data such as elevations. The TIN software uses a method known as Delaunay's criteria for triangulation where triangles are formed among all data points within the polygon clip. The method requires that a circle drawn through the three nodes of a triangle will contain no other point, meaning that sample points are connected to their nearest neighbors to form triangles using all collected data. This method preserves all collected survey points. Elevation contours are then interpolated along the triangle elements. The TIN method is discussed in detail in the ARC/INFO Users Documentation, (ESRI, 1992).

The linear interpolation option of the ARC/INFO TINCONTOUR command was used to interpolate contours from the Tiber Reservoir TIN. In addition, the contours were generalized by filtering out vertices along the contours. This generalization process improved the presentability of the resulting contours by removing very small variations in the contour lines. This generalization had no bearing on the computation of surface areas and volumes for Tiber Reservoir since the areas were calculated from the developed TIN. The areas of the enclosed contour polygons at one-foot increments were developed from the survey data for elevation 2991.0 and below. The contour topography at 10 -foot intervals is presented on figures 10 through 18.

## Development of 2002 Contour Areas and Reservoir Volume

The 2002 contour surface areas for Tiber Reservoir were computed at 1 -foot increments from elevation 2,839.0 to 2991.0. These calculations were performed using the ARC/INFO VOLUME command. This command computes areas at user-specified elevations directly from the TIN and takes into consideration all regions of equal elevation. For the purpose of this study, the measured 2002 survey areas at 2 -foot increments from elevation 2,839.0 through 2,985.0 were used to compute the new area and capacity tables. Due to the limited amount of 2002 shallow water data, the digitized surface area at elevation 2,991.6 was used to complete the area and volume computations between elevation 2,985.0 and 2,991.6. Due to the absence of above water data, this study assumed no change in original area from elevation 3,005.0 and above. The area and capacity program computes the areas between the elevations by assuming a straight-line interpolation between the input data set. For the 2002 study, this was the only means to compute the areas between elevation 2,991.6 and 3,005.0.

The storage-elevation relationships based on the measured surface areas were developed using the area-capacity computer program ACAP85 (Bureau of Reclamation, 1985). The surface area data as described above were used as the control parameters for computing the 2002 Tiber Reservoir capacity. Since this study did not collect above water data, the measured 2003 aerial water surface contour area and the original surface areas from elevation 3,005.0 and above were used to complete the area and capacity tables.

The ACAP85 program can compute an area and capacity at elevation increments 0.01 - to 1.0 foot by linear interpolation between the given contour surface areas. The program begins by testing the initial capacity equation over successive intervals to ensure that the equation fits within an allowable error limit. The error limit was set at 0.000001 for Tiber Reservoir. The capacity equation is then used over the full range of intervals fitting within this allowable error limit. For the first interval at which the initial allowable error limit is exceeded, a new capacity equation (integrated from a basic area curve over that interval) is utilized until it exceeds the error limit. Thus, the capacity curve is defined by a series of curves, each fitting a certain region of data. Differentiating the capacity equations, which are of second order polynomial form, the final area equations are derived:

$$
y=a_{1}+a_{2} x+a_{3} x^{2}
$$

where: $\quad y=$ capacity

$$
x=\text { elevation above a reference base }
$$

$a_{1}=$ intercept
$\mathrm{a}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{a}_{3}=$ coefficients
Results of the Tiber Reservoir area and capacity computations are listed in table 1 and columns 4 and 5 of table 2. On table 2, columns 2 and 3 list the original surface areas and recomputed original capacities. A separate set of 2002 area and capacity tables has been published for the $0.01,0.1$ and 1 -foot elevation increments (Bureau of Reclamation 2002). A description of the computations and coefficients output from the ACAP85 program is included with these tables. Both the original and 2002 area-capacity curves are plotted on figure 19. As of July 2002, at maximum reservoir elevation $3,020.2$, the surface area was 25,407 acres with a total capacity of 1,515,522 acre-feet.

## 2002 RESERVOIR ANALYSES

Results of the Tiber Reservoir area and capacity computations are listed in table 1 and columns 4 and 5 of table 2 . Columns 2 and 3 of table 2 list the original area and recomputed capacity values. Column 6 lists the capacity differences between the original and 2002 computations. Figure 19 is a plot of the Tiber Reservoir surface area and capacity values and illustrates the differences between the two surveys. Since Tiber Dam closure in 1957, the measured total volume change at reservoir elevation $2,993.0$ is 42,179 acre-feet. The estimated average annual rate of capacity lost for this period ( 44.8 years) was 941.5 acre-feet per year. The storage loss in terms of percent of original storage capacity was 4.4 percent at elevation 2,993.0. The 2002 area and capacity tables were generated assuming no change in area and capacity, since the original survey, from elevation $3,005.0$ and above. This is in all probability not the case, but the lack of above water data only allows this assumption. As indicated before, there have been large areas of shoreline erosion that has occurred above elevation 2,993 and in some areas it appears to have occurred above maximum reservoir elevation 3,005 . The only means to measure this would be by an aerial topographic survey.

The 2002 survey noted the large areas of shoreline erosion by comparing with the original contours. The 2003 aerial water surface contour was able to measure the erosion at elevation $2,991.6$ that this study found to be around 500 acres. The shoreline erosion has enlarged the surface area and volume of the upper elevations while decreasing the surface area and volume of the lower reservoir elevations where the eroded material has deposited. If the shoreline material only occurred within the reservoir boundary, the overall volume of the reservoir would not significantly change due to the shoreline erosion. The volume would have redistributed within the reservoir affecting the reservoir operation levels, but not the total volume. The 2002 survey visually noted significant erosion above the normal maximum reservoir elevation. This material has settled within the reservoir along with the inflowing sediments to reduce the original capacity.

During the original planning of Tiber Reservoir, the estimated loss of total capacity of the reservoir over the first 100 years of operation was 47,000 acre-feet. There is no information on how this sediment inflow value was determined and what factors were used to compute this value. The 2002 survey found a current volume loss of 42,179 acre-feet in the first 44.8 years of reservoir operation below elevation 2,993.0. That is near the total 100 -year estimate in less than half the time, 44.8 years. As stated before, a large part of this volume is due to shoreline-eroded material that this study is not able to distinguish from inflowing sediment. The 2002 survey results did measure where the volume loss has occurred as illustrated on item 43 of table 1. The study found that of the total volume of 42,179 acre-feet, 4.9 percent occurred below dead storage elevation $2,870,50.2$ percent below inactive reservoir elevation 2,966.4, 22.1 percent below conservation elevation 2,976.0 and 22.8 percent below joint use elevation 2,993.0 There is no information above elevation $2,991.6$ feet to allow computing changes above this elevation.

A resurvey of Tiber Reservoir should be considered in the future if major sediment inflow events are observed or if the average annual rate of sediment accumulation requires further clarification. Due to the extensive shoreline erosion, any new survey should include detailed above water collection. Comparing the aerial data with the original values would make it possible to measure the extent of the reservoir shoreline erosion.
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DATA SHEET NO.



Tabie 1. - Reservoir sediment data summary (page 1 of 3).

| YEAR | MnX. ElEV. | MTN. ETEV. | INFLOW, AE |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { MIN. ELEV. }}{2959.2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2956 | 297: |  | 654 |  | 2957 | $\frac{\text { NAX. ELEV }}{2982.5}$ |  |  |
| 1958 | 3944 | 2972.8 | 568 |  | 1959 | 2985.5 | 2972. 3 | 938,097 |
| 1960 | 2963 | 2954.7 | ¢14 | 5 | 1962 | 2984.2 | 2972.8 | 432.929 |
| 1952 | 2982.t | 2971.0 | 482 |  | 1963 | 2980.0 | 2971.2 | 392, 538 |
| 1964 | 300.8 | 2973.5 | 572 |  | 1965 | 3005.6 | 2975.2 | 955,346 |
| 2966 | 3967. | 2969.8 | 632 |  | 1967 | 2984.8 | 2955.2 | 931,543 |
| 2968 | 2970. 3 | 2953.6 | 5i2 |  | 1559 | 2975.2 | 2956.3 | 670.260 |
| 1970 | 2904. 2 | 2952.3 | 592 |  | 1972 | 2975.4 | 2957.4 | 778.927 |
| 1972 | 2975.i | 2950. 5 | 525 |  | 1973 | 2970.2 | 2950.5 | 345,915 |
| 1974 | 2595 | 2351.8 | 604 |  | 1975 | 2993.9 | 2960.0 | 157,605 |
| 1975 | 2910. | 2955.1 | 784 |  | 2977 | 2969.4 | 2960.2 | 293,573 |
| 1978 | 2970. | 2962.9 | 788 |  | 3979 | 2980.2 | 2961.2 | 7-5, 744 |
| 1980 | 2976.3 | 2960.9 | 578 |  | 1981 | 2972.5 | 2959.4 | 602,630 |
| 1982 | 2978.0 | 2959.7 | 535 |  | 1983 | 2983.7 | 2975.2 | 300,728 |
| 1984 | 2983.8 | 2976.7 | 254 |  | 1985 | 2989.3 | 2975.2 | 397,556 |
| 1986 | 2993.6 | 2977. | 720 |  | 1987 | 2988.5 | 2975.4 | 508,388 |
| 1988 | 2984.9 | 2975.0 | 273 |  | 1989 | 2989.4 | 2973.3 | 641,313 |
| 1990 | 2992.5 | 2980.E | 740 |  | 1991 | 2995.5 | 2974.9 | 927,078 |
| 1992 | 2983.3 | 2974.8 | 294 |  | 1993 | 2991.2 | 2976.6 | 513.396 |
| 1994 | 2991.8 | 2979.7 | 540 |  | 1995 | 2995.3 | 2979.0 | 754,503 |
| 1996 | 2993.9 | 2983.6 | 977 |  | 1997 | 2996.5 | 2978.5 | 843.373 |
| 1998 | 2992.7 | 2981.2 | 428. |  | $=999$ | 2990.3 | 2975.8 | 434,990 |
| 2000 | 2938.0 | 2981.8 | 336 |  | 2001 | 2983.4 | 2976.5 | 203,948 |
| 2002 | 2903.9 | 2974.1 | 766. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46. ELEVATION - AREA - CAPACITY DATA FOR 2002 CAPACITY ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELEVATION | AREA | CAPACITY | ELIEVATION | AREA | CAPACITY | ELEVATION |  | CAPACITY |
| 2,839 | 0 | 0 | 2,840 | 0 | 0 | 2,841 | 0 | 0 |
| 2,842 | 4 | 3 | 2,843 | 8 | 9 | 2,844 | 30 | 28 |
| 2,845 | 51 | 68 | 2,846 | 92 | 140 | 2,847 | 134 | 253 |
| 2,848 | 186 | 413 | 2,849 | 238 | 625 | 2, 850 | 290 | 869 |
| 2,85 | 341 | $\pm .204$ | 2,852 |  | 1,577 | 2,853 | 468 | 2,014 |
| 2,854 | 549 | 2.523 | 2,855 | 629 | 3,112 | 2,856 | 691 | 3,772 |
| 2,857 | 753 | 4.494 | 2,858 | $8 \pm 2$ | 5,277 | 2,859 | 871 | 6,118 |
| 2,860 | 928 | 7.017 | 2,861 | 986 | 7,974 | 2,862 | 1,046 | 8,990 |
| 2,863 | 1,106 | 20,066 | 2,854 | 2.183 | 11,211 | 2,865 | 1,260 | 12,432 |
| 2,866 | 1,338 | 13.731 | 2.867 | 1,416 | 15.108 | 2,868 | 1,477 | 16,555 |
| 2,869 | 1,536 | 18,061 | 2.870 | 1.582 | 19,621 | 2,871 | 1,628 | 21,226 |
| 2,872 | $\pm .677$ | 22,879 | 2,873 | 1.725 | 24,580 | 2,874 | 1,773 | 26,329 |
| 2,875 | 2.825 | 28, 126 | 2,876 | 1,889 | 29,981 | 2,877 | 1.956 | 31,903 |
| 2,878 | 2,023 | 33,893 | 2,879 | 2,090 | 35,950 | 2,880 | 2,164 | 38.077 |
| 2,881 | 2,238 | 40,278 | 2,882 | $2,327$ | 42.560 | 2,883 | 2,417 | 44,933 |
| 2,884 | 2,517 | 47,400 | 2,885 | $2,618$ | 49,967 | 2,886 | 2,701 | 52,627 |
| 2,887 | 2.785 | 55,369 | 2,888 | 2,852 | 58,188 | 2,889 | 2,919 | 61,073 |
| 2.890 | 2.992 | 64,029 | 2,891 | 3,064 | 67,056 | 2,892 | 3,134 | 70,156 |
| 2,893 | 3.205 | 73,325 | 2,894 | 3,271 | 76,563 | 2,895 | 3,335 | 79,866 |
| 2,896 | 3.405 | 83,237 | 2,897 | 3,473 | 86,676 | 2,898 | 3,549 | 90.187 |
| 2,899 | 3.624 | 93,773 | 2,900 | 3.708 | 97,439 | 2,901 | 3,792 | 101,189 |
| 2,902 | 3.867 | 105,019 | 2.903 | 3,942 | 108,923 | 2,904 | 4,020 | 112,904 |
| 2,905 | 4,098 | 116,963 | 2,906 | 4,178 | 121,101 | 2,907 | 4.258 | 125,319 |
| 2,908 | 4.327 | 129,6:2 | 2,909 | 4.397 | 133,974 | 2,310 | 4,473 | 138,409 |
| 2,911 | 4.550 | 242,921 | 2,912 | 4,527 | 147,509 | 2,913 | 4.703 | 152.174 |
| 2,914 | 4,785 | 156,918 | $2,915$ | $4,857$ | 151,745 | 2,916 | 4.965 | 166.651 |
| 2,917 | 5,064 | 171,675 | $2,918$ | $5,160$ | 176,792 | 2.919 | 5.272 | 182,013 |
| 2,920 | 5,377 | 187,337 | 2,921 | 5,482 | 192,768 | 2,922 | 5.580 | 198,299 |
| 2,923 | 5,677 | 203,928 | 2,924 | 5,777 | 209,655 | 2,925 | 5,877 | 215,482 |
| 2.926 | 5.962 | 221,402 | 2.927 | 6.048 | 227,407 | 2.928 | 5,147 | 233,504 |
| 2.929 | 6.245 | 239.701 | 2.930 | 6.350 | 245.999 | 2,931 | 6,454 | 252,400 |
| 2.932 | 6,567 | 258,931 | 2,933 | 6.680 | 255.535 | 2.934 | 5,792 | 272,271 |
| 2,935 | 6,904 | 279,119 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7,009 \\ & 7,334 \\ & 7,657 \end{aligned}$ | 286,075 | 2,937 | 7,114 | 293.136 |
| 2,938 | 7,224 | 300.305 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,936 \\ & 2,939 \end{aligned}$ |  | 307,584 | 2,940 | 7.444 | 314,972 |
| 2,941 | 7,553 | 322.471 | 2.942 |  | 330.075 | 2.943 | 7,760 | 327,784 |

Table 1. - Reservoir sedimert data summary (page 2 of 3 ).


Table i. - Reservoir sediment data summary (page 3 of 3).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevations | Originas | Original | 2002 | 2002 | 2002 | Percent of |
|  | Survey | Capacity | Survey | Survey | Volume | Reservoir |
| (teet) | Lacres) | (acre-feet) | (acres) | (acre-feet) | Change | Depta |
| 3020.2 | 25407 | 15554.29 | 25407 | 1515522 | 39,907 | 100.0 |
| 3020 | 25357 | 2550353 | 25357 | 1510446 | 39.907 | 99.9 |
| 3019 | 25052 | 1525148. | 25052 | 1485241 | 39,907 | 99.4 |
| 3018 | 24747 | 1500248 | 24747 | 1460341 | 39.907 | 98.9 |
| 3017 | 24443 | 1475653 | 24443 | 1435746 | 39,907 | 98.4 |
| 3016 | 24138 | 1451363 | 24138 | 1411456 | 39,907 | 97.8 |
| 3015 | 23833 | 1427278 | 23833. | 1387471 | 39.807 | 97.3 |
| 3014 | 23866. | 1.403678 | 23566 | 1363771 | 39.907 | 96.8 |
| 3013 | 23299 | 1380246 | 23299 | 1340339 | 39.907 | 96.3 |
| -_3012.5 | 23165 | 1368630 | 23165 | 1328723 | 39,907 | 96.1 |
| 3012 | 23031 | 1357081 | 23031 | 1317174 | 39,907 | 95.8 |
| 3011 | 22764 | 1334183 | 22764 | 1294276 | 39.907 | 95.3 |
| 3010 | 22497 | 1311553 | 22497 | 1271646 | 39.907 | 94.8 |
| 3009 | 22235 | 1289186 | 22235 | 2249279 | 39,907 | 94.3 |
| 3008 | 21974 | 1267082 | 21974 | 2227175 | 39,907 | 93.8 |
| 3007 | 21712 | 1245239 | 21712 | 1205332 | 39,907 | 93.2 |
| 3006 | 21451 | 1223657 | 21451 | 1183750 | 39,907 | 92.7 |
| 3005 | 21189 | 1202338 | 21189 | 1162431 | 39.907 | 92.2 |
| 3004 | 20909 | 1181288 | 20946 | 1141363 | 39,925 | 91.7 |
| 3003 | 20629 | 1160519 | 20703 | 1120538 | 39,981 | 91.2 |
| 3002 | 20350 | 1140030 | 20460 | 1099956 | 40,074 | 90.7 |
| 3001 | 20070 | 1119820 | 20218 | 1079617 | 40,203 | 90.2 |
| 3000 | 19790 | 1099890 | 19975 | 1059521 | 40,369 | 89.7 |
| 2999 | 19529 | 1080231 | 19732 | 1039668 | 40,563 | 89.1 |
| 2998 | 19267 | 1060833 | 19489 | 1020058 | 40.775 | 88.6 |
| 2997 | 19006 | 1041696 | 19246 | 1000690 | 41,006 | 88.1 |
| 2996 | 18744 | 1022821 | 19003 | 981566 | 41,255 | 87.6 |
| 2995 | 18483 | 1004208 | 18760 | 962684 | 41,524 | 87.1 |
| 2994 | 18190 | 985871 | 18517 | 944045 | 41,826 | 86.6 |
| 2993 | 17896 | 967828 | 18275 | 925649 | 42,179 | 86.1 |
| 2992 | 17603 | 950079 | 28032 | 907496 | 42,583 | 85.6 |
| 2991 | 17309 | 932623 | 17662 | 889624 | 42,999 | 85.0 |
| 2990 | 17016 | 915460 | 17209 | 872188 | 43,272 | 84.5 |
| 2989 | 16794 | 898555 | 16755 | 855206 | 43,349 | 84.0 |
| .... 2988 | 16571 | 881873 | 16302 | 838678 | 43,295 | 83.5 |
| 2987 | 16349 | 865413 | 15848 | 822603 | 42,810 | 83.0 |
| 2986 | 16126 | 849175 | 15395 | 806981 | 42.194 | 82.5 |
| 2985 | 15904 | 833160 | 14941 | 791813 | 41,347 | 82.0 |
| 2984 | 15660 | 817378 | 14729 | 776978 | 40.400 | 81.5 |
| 2983 | 15416 | 801840 | 14516 | 762356 | 39,484 | 80.9 |
| 2982 | 15171 | 786547 | 14288 | 747953 | 38,594 | 80.4 |
| 2981 | 14927 | 771498 | 14061 | 733779 | 37,719 | 79.9 |

# Tiber Reservoir <br> 2002 Survey Summary 

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevations | Original | Original | 2002 | 2002 | 2002 | Percent of |
|  | Survey | Capacity | Survey | Survey | Volume | Reservoir |
| (feet) | cacresl | (acre-feet) | (acres) | (acre-feet) | Change | Depth |
| 2980 | 24683 | 756693 | 13727 | 719886 | 36,807 | 79.4 |
| 2979 | 24459 | 742122 | 23393 | 706326 | 35,796. | 78.9 |
| 2978 | 14235 | 727775 | 23252 | 693054 | 34, 721 | 78.4 |
| 2977 | 14010 | 713652 | 22910 | 680023 | 33,629 | 77.9 |
| 2976 | 23785 | 699754 | 12710 | 667213 | 32,541 | 77.4 |
| 2975 | 13562 | 686080 | $125: 0$ | 654602 | 32,478 | 76.8 |
| 2974 | 13321 | 672638 | 12321 | 642186 | 30,452 | 76.3 |
| 2973 | 13081. | 659437 | 12132 | 629960 | 29,477 | 75.8 |
| 2972. | 12840 | 646477 | 11947 | 617920 | 28.557 | 75.3 |
| 2971 | 12600 | 633757 | 11761 | 606066 | 27,691 | 74.8 |
| 2970 | 12359 | 621278 | 11515 | 594428 | 26,850 | 74.3 |
| 2969 | $\pm 2182$ | 609007 | 11268 | 583037 | 25,970 | 73.8 |
| 2968 | 12005 | 596913 | 11093 | 571857 | 25,056 | 73.3 |
| 2967 | 11829 | 584996 | 10918 | 560851 | 24, 145 | 72.7 |
| 2966.4 | 11723 | 577931 | 10819 | 554330 | 23,601 | 72.4 |
| 2966 | 11652 | 573256 | 10753 | 550016 | 23,240 | 72.2 |
| 2965 | 11475 | 561693 | 10589 | 539344 | 22,349 | 71.7 |
| 2964. | 11306 | 550302 | 10451. | 528824 | 21,478 | 71.2 |
| 2963 | 11137 | 539081 | 10313 | 518443 | 20,638 | 70.7 |
| 2962. | 10968 | 528028 | 10183 | 508195 | 19,833 | 70.2 |
| 2961 | 10799 | 517144 | 10054 | 498076 | 19.068 | 69.7 |
| 2960 | 10630 | 506430 | 9925 | 488087 | 18,343 | 69.2 |
| 2959 | 20455 | 495887 | 9795 | 478226 | 17,661 | 68.6 |
| 2958 | 10281 | 485519 | 9659 | 468499 | 17.020 | 68.1 |
| 2957 | 10106 | 475326 | 9523 | 458908 | 16,418 | 67.6 |
| 2956 | 9932 | 465307 | 9403. | 449446 | 15,861 | 67.1 |
| 2955 | 9757 | 455462 | 9283. | 440103 | 25,359 | 66.6 |
| 2954 | 9600 | 445784 | 9170 | 430877. | 14,907 | 66.1 |
| 2953 | 9443 | 436262 | 9056 | 421764 | 14.498 | 65.6 |
| 2952 | 9286 | 426898 | 8929 | 412772 | 14,226 | 65.1 |
| .--- 2951 | 9129 | 417690 | 8802 | 403906 | 13,784 | 64.5 |
| 2950 | 8972 | 408640 | 8669 | 395171 | 13,469 | 64.0 |
| 2949 | 8834 | 399737 | 8536 | 386569 | 13,168 | 63.5 |
| 2948 | 8695 | 390973 | 8400 | 378101 | 12,872 | 63.0 |
| 2947 | 8557 | 382347 | 8264 | 369769 | 12,578 | 62.5 |
| 2946 | 8418 | 373859 | 8122 | 361576 | 12,283 | 62.0 |
| 2945 | 8280 | 365510 | 7981 | 353524 | 11,986 | 61.5 |
| 2944 | 8164 | 357288 | 7870 | 345599 | 11.689 | 61.0 |
| 2943 | 8048 | 349182 | 7760 | 337784 | 11,398 | 60.5 |
| 2942 | 7931 | 341193 | 7657 | 330076 | 21,117 | 59.9 |
| 2941 | $78 \pm 5$ | 333320 | 7553 | 322471 | 10,849 | 59.4 |
| 2940 | 7699 | 325563 | 7444 | 314972 | 10,591 | 58.9 |
| 2939 | 7585 | 317920 | 7334 | 307584 | 10,336 | 58.4 |

Tiber Reservoir 2002 Survey Summary

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elevations | Original | Original | $2002$ | $2002$ | 2002 | Percent of |
|  | Survey | Capacity | Survey | Survey | Volume | Reservoiz |
| (feet) | (acres) | (acrefeet) | (acres) | (acre-feet) | Change | Depth |
| 2938 | 7471 | 310392. | 7224 | 300305 | 20,087 | 57.5 |
| 2937 | 7358 | 302978 | 7154 | 293136 | 9,842 | 57.4 |
| 2936 | 7244 | 295677 | 7009 | 286075 | 9.602 | 56.9 |
| 2935 | 7230 | 288490 | 6904 | 279119 | 9,371 | 56.4 |
| 2934 | 7024 | 281413 | 6792 | 272271 | 9.142 | 55.8 |
| - 2933 | 6918 | 274442 | 6680 | 265535 | 8.907 | 55.3 |
| 2932 | 6813 | 267576 | 6557 | 258911 | 8,665 | 54.8 |
| 2931 | 6707 | 260816 | 6454 | 252400 | 8,416 | 54.3 |
| .-. 2930 | 6601. | 254163 | 6350 | 245999 | 8,164 | 53.8 |
| 2929 | 6503 | 247610 | 6246 | 239701 | 7,909 | 53.3 |
| 2928 | 6406 | 241156 | 6147 | 233504 | 7,652 | 52.8 |
| 2927 | 6308 | 234799 | 6048 | 227407 | 7.392 | 52.3 |
| 2926 | 6211 | 228539 | 5962 | 221402 | 7.137 | 51.7 |
| ..- 2925 | 6113 | 222378 | 5877 . | 215482 | 6,896 | 51.2 |
| 2924 | 5992 | 216325 | 5777 | 209655 | 6,670 | 50.7 |
| . 2923 | 5871 | 210394 | 5677 | 203928 | 5,466 | 50.2 |
| 2922 | 5750 | 204583 | 5580 | 198299 | 6,284 | 49.7 |
| 2921 | 5629 | 198894 | 5483 | 192768 | 6,126 | 49.2 |
| 2920 | 5508 | 193325 | 5377 | 187337 | 5,988 | 48.7 |
| 2919 | 5420 | 187861 | 5272 | 182013 | 5,848 | 48.2 |
| 2918 | 5331 | 182486 | 5168 | 176792 | 5,694 | 47.6 |
| 2917 | 5243 | 177199. | 5064 | 171676 | 5,523 | 47.1 |
| 2916 | 5154 | 172000 | 4966 | 166661 | 5,339 | 46.6 |
| 2915 | 5066 | 166890 | 4867 | 161745 | 5,245 | 46.1 |
| 2914 | 4974 | 161870 | 4785 | 156918 | 4,952 | 45.6 |
| --.-- 2913 | 4882. | 156942 | 4703 | 152174 | 4,768 | 45.1 |
| ... 2912 | 4789 | 152107 | 4627 | 147509 | 4,598 | 44.6 |
| - 2911 | 4697 | 147364 | 4550 | 142921 | 4,443 | 44.1 |
| -. --.....-2910 | 4605 | 142713 | 4473 | 138409 | 4.304 | 43.5 |
| 2909 | 4507 | 138156 | 4397 | 133974 | 4,182 | 43.0 |
| 2908 | 4409 | 133698 | 4327 | 129612 | 4,086 | 42.5 |
| -....- 2907 | 4312 | 129338 | 4258 | 125319 | 4,019 | 42.0 |
| 2906 | 4214 | 125075 | 4178 | 121101 | 3.974 | 42.5 |
| 2905 | 4116 | 120910 | 4098 | 116963 | 3.947 | 41.0 |
| 2904 | 4038 | 116833 | 4020 | 112904 | 3,929 | 40.5 |
| 2903 | 3960 | 112834 | 3942 | 108923 | 3,911 | 40.0 |
| 2902 | 3882 | 108913 | 3867 | 105019 | 3,894 | 39.4 |
| 2901 | 3804 | 105070 | 3792 | 102189 | 3,881 | 38.9 |
| 2900 | 3726 | 102305 | 3708 | 97439 | 3,866 | 38.4 |
| 2899 | 3664 | 97610 | 3624 | 93773 | 3,837 | 37.9 |
| 2898 | 3601 | 93978 | 3549 | 90187 | 3,791 | 37.4 |
| 2897 | 3539 | 90408 | 3473 | 86676 | 3,732 | 36.9 |
| 2896 | 3476 | 86900 | 3405 | 83237 | 3,663 | 36.4 |
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Figure 10. - Tiber Reservoir topographic map, No 1.









## Area-Capacity Curves for Tiber Reservoir



Figure 19. - 2002 area and capacity curves.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The definition of such terms as "hydraulic height," "structural height," etc. may be found in manuals such as Reclamation's Design of Small Dams and Guide for Preparation of Standing Operating Procedures for Dams and Reservoirs, or ASCE's Nomenclature for Hydraulics.
    ${ }^{2}$ Elevations in feet. All elevations based on the original project datum established by U.S. Bureau of Reclamation that was determined to be 2.9 feet lower than the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88).

