FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY RIVERINE STRUCTURES FORM

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 7 hours per response. The burden estimate includes the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the needed data, and completing, reviewing, and submitting the form. You are not required to respond to this collection of information unless a valid OMB control number appears in the upper right corner of this form. Send comments regarding the accuracy of the burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing this burden to: Information Collections Management, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington DC 20472, Paperwork Reduction Project (3067-0148). Submission of the form is required to obtain or retain benefits under the National Flood Insurance Program. **Please do not send your completed survey to the above address.**

Flooding Source: Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied A. GENERAL Complete the appropriate section(s) for each Structure listed below: Channelization complete Section B Bridge/Culvert complete Section C Dam..... complete Section D Levee/Floodwall complete Section E Sediment Transport...... complete Section F (if required) **Description Of Structure** 1. Name of Structure: Dam Type (check one): Channelization Bridge/Culvert Levee/Floodwall Location of Structure: Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Upstream Limit/Cross Section: 2. Name of Structure: Channelization Bridge/Culvert Levee/Floodwall Dam Type (check one): Location of Structure: Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Upstream Limit/Cross Section: 3. Name of Structure: Bridge/Culvert Levee/Floodwall 🗌 Dam Type (check one) Channelization Location of Structure: Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Upstream Limit/Cross Section: NOTE: For more structures, attach additional pages as needed.

	B. CHANNELIZATION
Floc	ding Source:
Nan	ne of Structure:
1.	Accessory Structures
	The channelization includes (check one):
	 Levees [Attach Section E (Levee/Floodwall)] Superelevated sections Debris basin/detention basin Other (Describe):
2.	Drawing Checklist
	Attach the plans of the channelization certified by a registered professional engineer, as described in the instructions.
3.	Hydraulic Considerations
	The channel was designed to carry (cfs) and/or the -year flood.
	The design elevation in the channel is based on (check one):
	□ Subcritical flow □ Critical flow □ Supercritical flow □ Energy grade line
	If there is the potential for a hydraulic jump at the following locations, check all that apply and attach an explanation of how the hydraulic jump is controlled without affecting the stability of the channel.
	 Inlet to channel Outlet of channel At Drop Structures At Transitions Other locations (specify):
4.	Sediment Transport Considerations
	Was sediment transport considered?
	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT
Floc	ding Source:
Nan	ne of Structure:
1.	This revision reflects (check one):
	 New bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS New analysis of bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS
2.	Hydraulic model used to analyze the structure (e.g., HEC-2 with special bridge routine, WSPRO, HY8): If different than hydraulic analysis for the flooding source, justify why the hydraulic analysis used for the flooding source could not analyze the structures. Attach justification.
3.	Attach plans of the structures certified by a registered professional engineer. The plan detail and information should include the following (check the information that has been provided):
	 Dimensions (height, width, span, radius, length) Shape (culverts only) Material Beveling or Rounding Wing Wall Angle Skew Angle Distances Between Cross Sections

4. Sediment Transport Considerations

Was sediment transport considered?	Yes	🗌 No	If yes, then fill out Section F	(Sediment Transport).
If No, then attach your explanation for v	vhy sedim	ent transp	port was not considered.	

Floo	oding Source:
	ne of Structure:
1.	This request is for (check one):
2.	The dam was designed by (check one): 🔲 Federal agency 🗌 State agency 🔲 Local government agency
	Private organization Name of the agency or organization:
3.	Does the project involve revised hydrology? Yes No
	If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2).
4.	Does the submittal include debris/sediment yield analysis? 🗌 Yes 📄 No
	If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport). If No, then attach your explanation for why debris/sediment analysis was not considered.
5.	Does the Base Flood Elevation behind the dam or downstream of the dam change?
	☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2) and complete the table below.
	Stillwater Elevation Behind the Dam
	FREQUENCY (% annual chance) FIS REVISED
	10-year (10%) 50-year (2%) 100-year (1%) 500-year (0.2%) Normal Pool Elevation
6.	Please attach a copy of the formal Operation and Maintenance Plan

1.	<u>Sy</u> s	stem Elements				
	a.	This Levee/Floodwall analysis is based on (check one):				
		 upgrading of an existing levee/floodwall system a newly constructed levee/floodwall system reanalysis of an existing levee/floodwall system 				
	b.	Levee elements and locations are (check one):				
		 earthen embankment, dike, berm, etc. structural floodwall Other (describe): 	Station Station Station	to to to		
	C.	Structural Type (check one):				
		 monolithic cast-in place reinforced concrete reinforced concrete masonry block sheet piling Other (describe): 				
	d.	Has this levee/floodwall system been certified by a Federal agend	cy to provide protection	on from the base flood?	,	
		Yes No				
		If Yes, by which agency?				
	e.	Attach certified drawings containing the following information (indic	cate drawing sheet n	umbers):		
		1. Plan of the levee embankment and floodwall structures.	Sheet Numbers	3:		
		 A profile of the levee/floodwall system showing the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), levee and/or wall crest and foundation, and closure locations for the total levee system. 	Sheet Numbers	5:		
		 A profile of the BFE, closure opening outlet and inlet invert elevations, type and size of opening, and kind of closure. 	Sheet Numbers	s:		
		4. A layout detail for the embankment protection measures.	Sheet Numbers	5:		
		 Location, layout, and size and shape of the levee embankment features, foundation treatment, floodwall structure, closure structures, and pump stations. 	Sheet Numbers	5:		
2.	Fr	eeboard				
	a.	The minimum freeboard provided above the BFE is:				
		Riverine				
		3.0 feet or more at the downstream end and throughout3.5 feet or more at the upstream end4.0 feet within 100 feet upstream of all structures and/or constriction	ions		☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □ No □ No
		Coastal				
		1.0 foot above the height of the one percent wave associated with stillwater surge elevation or maximum wave runup (whichever is g		nce	🗌 Yes	□ No
		2.0 feet above the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation			☐ Yes	

2.	P. Freeboard (continued)								
	Please note, occasionally exceptions are made to the minimum freeboard requirement. If an exception is requested, attach documentation addressing Paragraph 65.10(b)(1)(ii) of the NFIP Regulations.								
	If No is answered to any of the above, please attach an explanation.								
	b. Is there an indication	on from historical	records that id	ce-jamming can a	affect the BFE	?	Yes 🗌 No		
	If Yes, provide ice-	jam analysis profil	e and eviden	ce that the minim	num freeboard	l discussed ab	ove still exists	i.	
3.	<u>Closures</u>								
	a. Openings through t	the levee system ((check one):	□ e>	kists 🔲 do	es not exist			
	If opening exists, lis								
				0	T		Le altra fra	T	
Char	inel Station	Left or Righ	IT Bank	Opening	Туре		levation for ng Invert	Type of C	Closure Device
(Exte	nd table on an addeo	sheet as need	ed and refer	rence)					
Note	Geotechnical and g	eologic data							
	In addition to the re design analysis for Corps of Engineers	the following sys	stem feature	es should be su	ined during f Ibmitted in a	ield and labo tabulated su	ratory invest mmary form	igations and . (Reference	used in the U.S. Army
4.	Embankment Prote	ection							
	a. The maximum le	vee slope lands	ide is:						
	b. The maximum le	vee slope floods	side is:						
	c. The range of velo	ocities along the	levee durin	g the base floo	od is:		(min.) to		(max.)
	d. Embankment ma	iterial is protecte	ed by (descr	ibe what kind):					
	e. Riprap Design Pa	arameters (chec	k one).		Velocity		e stress		
	Attach references				volocity		0 01 000		
							Stone Ripra	20	
	Reach	Sideslope	Flow Depth	Velocity	Curve or Straight			ap Thickness	Depth of Toedown
Sta	to					- 100	- 50		
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
(Exte	nd table on an addeo	sheet as need	ed and refer	ence each ent	ry)				

4.	<u>Emba</u>	ankment Protection (cont	tinued)					
	f. Is	s a bedding/filter analysis	s and design attached?	🗌 Yes 🛛	No			
	g. D	Describe the analysis use	ed for other kinds of pro	tection used (ir	nclude copies of t	the desig	n analysis):	
	/	Attach engineering analy	sis to support construc	tion plans.				
5.	<u>Emba</u>	ankment And Foundation	<u>Stability</u>					
	a. I	Identify locations and de	scribe the basis for sele	ection of critical	l location for anal	ysis:		
		Overall height: Sta.	; heig	ht	ft.			
		Limiting foundation so	bil strength:					
		Sta.	, depth	to				
		strength ϕ =	degrees, c =		psf			
		slope: SS =	(h) to	(v)				
			on an added sheet for a		ons)			
	b. S	Specify the embankment				slidina b	ock. infinite slope	e. etc.):
					(- 5, ,	J	,F	, ,
	с. 5	Summary of stability ana	lvsis results:					
	C. 3	Summary of stability ana	ilysis results:					
Ca	c. S ase		Ilysis results: Conditions		Critical Safet	y Factor		Criteria (Min.)
			-		Critical Safet	y Factor		Criteria (Min.) 1.3
	ase	Loading	-		Critical Safet	y Factor		
	ase I	Loading C End of construction	-		Critical Safet	y Factor		1.3
	ase I	Loading C End of construction Sudden drawdown	Conditions		Critical Safet	y Factor		1.3 1.0
	ase I II	Loading C End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage	Conditions		Critical Safet	y Factor		1.3 1.0 1.4
	ase I II III IV VI	Loading C End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl	Conditions		Critical Safet	y Factor		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II III IV VI erence:	Loading 0 End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I)	Conditions	rformed?	Critical Safet	y Factor		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I III IV VI erence: d. W	Loading (End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19	Conditions	rformed?				1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II III V VI erence: d. W If	Loading C End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f	Conditions					1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II V VI erence: d. W If e. W	Loading C End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f Yes, describe methodol	Conditions	rmed?	Yes Yes			1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I III V VI erence: d. W If e. W f. W	Loading (End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f Yes, describe methodol Vas a seepage analysis f	Conditions	rmed? de toe checked	Yes Yes	□ No		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II VI erence: d. W If e. W f. W g. W	Loading O End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f Yes, describe methodol Vas a seepage analysis f	Conditions lood stage 013 Table 6-1) for the embankment pe logy used: for the foundation perfo he embankment landsid ents checked for piping	rmed? de toe checked potential?	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □ No □ No	hours.	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II IV VI erence: d. W If e. W f. W g. W h. T	Loading O End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f Yes, describe methodol Vas a seepage analysis f Vere uplift pressures at th Vere seepage exit gradie	Conditions Conditions lood stage 013 Table 6-1) for the embankment pe logy used: for the foundation perfo he embankment landsid ents checked for piping flood hydrograph again	rmed? le toe checked potential? st the embankr	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □ No □ No	hours.	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4
	ase I II IV VI erence: d. W If e. W f. W g. W h. T	Loading O End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at fl Earthquake (Case I) : USACE EM-1110-2-19 Vas a seepage analysis f Yes, describe methodol Vas a seepage analysis f Vere uplift pressures at th Vere seepage exit gradie The duration of the base f	Conditions Conditions lood stage 013 Table 6-1) for the embankment pe logy used: for the foundation perfo he embankment landsid ents checked for piping flood hydrograph again	rmed? le toe checked potential? st the embankr	☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	□ No □ No □ No	hours.	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

	lation Stability					
a. Describe analysi	s submittal based	I on Code (check	one):			
UBC (1988)	or 🗌	Other (specify):				
b. Foundation scou	r protection is pro	wided check box				
Overturning	Sliding	If not, explain:				
c. Loading included	in the analyses	were:				
Lateral earth	@ P _A =	psf; P _p =	= psf			
Surcharge-S	lope @	surface	psf			
\Box Wind @ P _w =		psf				
🗌 Seepage (Up	olift);	🗌 Earthq	uake @ P _{eq} =	%g		
🗌 1%-annual-c	hance significant	wave height:	ft.			
🗌 1%-annual-cł	nance significant	wave period:	sec.			
d. Summary of Sta	ability Analysis Re	sults: Factors of	Safety.			
Itemize for each	n range in site lay	out dimension and	l loading condition lin	nitation for each resp	ective reach.	
					1	
Loading Condition	Criteria		Sta	То	Sta	То
	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Oli ali a a
		-	0.000	5		Sliding
Dead & Wind	1.5	1.5				Sliding
Dead & Soil	1.5 1.5	1.5 1.5				Silding
	1.5	1.5				Silding
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, &	1.5 1.5	1.5 1.5				Silding
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3	1.5 1.5 1.5				Silding
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic (Ref: 1	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 1	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 986; USACE EM				Silding
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic (Ref: 1 (Note:	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 1	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 986; USACE EM an added sheet a	1110-2-2502)			
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic (Ref: 1 (Note: e. Foundation bea	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 1 Extend table on	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 986; USACE EM an added sheet a	1110-2-2502)	nce)	Short Term	
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic (Ref: 1 (Note: e. Foundation bea	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 1 Extend table on ring strength for e ng Pressure	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 986; USACE EM an added sheet a	1110-2-2502) s needed and referer	nce)		
Dead & Soil Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact Dead, Soil, & Seismic (Ref: 1 (Note: e. Foundation bea Bearin	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 FEMA 114 Sept 1 Extend table on ring strength for e ng Pressure	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.3 986; USACE EM an added sheet a	1110-2-2502) s needed and referer	nce)		

7.	<u>Set</u>	tlement
	a.	Has anticipated potential settlement been determined and incorporated into the specified construction elevations to maintain the established freeboard margin?
	b.	The computed range of settlement is ft. to ft.
	C.	Settlement of the levee crest is determined to be primarily from :
		 Foundation consolidation Embankment compression Other (Describe):
	d.	Differential settlement of floodwalls 🗌 has 🗌 has not been accommodated in the structural design and construction.
		Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.
8.	Inte	rior Drainage
	a.	Specify size of each interior watershed:
		Draining to pressure conduit: acres Draining to ponding area: acres
	b.	Relationships Established
		Ponding elevation vs. storage Yes No Ponding elevation vs. gravity flow Yes No Differential head vs. gravity flow Yes No
	C.	The river flow duration curve is enclosed:
	d.	Specify the discharge capacity of the head pressure conduit: cfs
	e.	Which flooding conditions were analyzed?
		 Gravity flow (Interior Watershed) Common storm (River Watershed) Historical ponding probability Coastal wave overtopping Yes No
		If No for any of the above, attach explanation.
	f.	Interior drainage has been analyzed based on joint probability of interior and exterior flooding and the capacities of pumping and outlet facilities to provide the established level of flood protection.
		If No, attach explanation.
	g.	The rate of seepage through the levee system for the base flood is cfs
	h.	The length of levee system used to drive this seepage rate in item g: ft.

F.	I FVFF/FI	(CONTINUED)	
_			

8.	Inter	rior Drainage (continued)				
	i.	Will pumping plants be used for interior	drainage?	🗌 Yes	🗌 No	
		If Yes, include the number of pumping p For each pumping plant, list:	plants:			
			Plant #1			Plant #2
The	num	ber of pumps				
-		ling storage capacity				
		imum pumping rate				
-		imum pumping head				
		ping starting elevation				
-		ping stopping elevation				
	-	charge facility protected?				
		a flood warning plan?				
-		ch time is available between warning				
	flood					
Will	the o	operation be automatic?			🗌 Yes	No
If the	e pun	nps are electric, are there backup power s	sources?		🗌 Yes	□ No
(Ref	erend	ce: USACE EM-1110-2-3101, 3102, 310	03, 3104, and 3105)			
Inclu inter	ide a ior w	copy of supporting documentation of data atersheds that result in flooding.	a and analysis. Provide a ma	p showing t	he floode	d area and maximum ponding elevations for all
9.	Oth	ner Design Criteria				
	a.	The following items have been addresse	ed as stated:			
		Liquefaction is is is not a problem Hydrocompaction is is is not a pro Heave differential movement due to soi	oblem] is not a p	oroblem	
	b.	For each of these problems, state the ba	asic facts and corrective actio	n taken:		
		Attach supporting documentation				
	C.		, will the structure adversely ir	npact flood l	levels and	d/or flow velocities floodside of the structure?
		Attach supporting documentation				
	d.	Sediment Transport Considerations:				
	u.	Was sediment transport considered?	□ Yes □ No If Yes. th	on fill out S	ection E (Sediment Transport)
		If No, then attach your explanation for v				Sediment Transport).

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINU

10.	<u>Op</u>	erational Plan And Criteria
	a.	Are the planned/installed works in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP Regulations?
	b.	Does the operation plan incorporate all the provisions for closure devices as required in Paragraph 65.10(c)(1) of the NFIP regulations?
	C.	Does the operation plan incorporate all the provisions for interior drainage as required in Paragraph 65.10(c)(2) of the NFIP regulations?
		If the answer is No to any of the above, please attach supporting documentation.
11.	Ma	intenance Plan
	a.	Are the planned/installed works in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP Regulations? Yes No If No, please attach supporting documentation.
12.	<u>Op</u>	erations and Maintenance Plan
		Please attach a copy of the formal Operations and Maintenance Plan for the levee/floodwall.

F. SEDIMENT TRANSPORT

Flooding Source:		
Name of Structure:		
If there is any indication from historical records that sediment transport (including scour and deposition) can affect the Base Flood Elevation (BFE); and/or based on the stream morphology, vegetative cover, development of the watershed and bank conditions, there is a potential for debris and sediment transport (including scour and deposition) to affect the BFEs, then provide the following information along with the supporting documentation:		
Sediment load associated with the base flood discharge:	Volume	acre-feet
Debris load associated with the base flood discharge:	Volume	acre-feet
Sediment transport rate	(percent concentration by volume)	
Method used to estimate sediment transport:		
Most sediment transport formulas are intended for a range of hydraulic conditions and sediment sizes; attach a detailed explanation for using the selected method.		
Method used to estimate scour and/or deposition:		
Method used to revise hydraulic or hydrologic analysis (model) to account for sediment transport: Please note that bulked flows are used to evaluate the performance of a structure during the base flood; however, FEMA does not map BFEs based on bulked flows.		
If a sediment analysis has not been performed, an explanation as to why sediment transport (including scour and deposition) will not affect the BFEs or structures must be provided.		