U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY - FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

RIVERINE STRUCTURES FORM

O.M.B No. 1660-0016 Expires: 12/31/2010

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, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington DC 20472, Paperwork Reduction Project (1660-0016). 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 Course:	
Flooding Source:	
Note: Fill out one form for each fleeding course studied	
Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied	

A GENERAL

			A. GENERAL				
Comp	Complete the appropriate section(s) for each Structure listed below:						
	Channelization						
Descr	Description Of Structure						
1.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one):	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam/Basin		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cross	s Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
2.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one):	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	☐ Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam/Basin		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cross	s Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
3.	Name of Structure:						
	Type (check one)	☐ Channelization	☐ Bridge/Culvert	Levee/Floodwall	☐ Dam/Basin		
	Location of Structure:						
	Downstream Limit/Cross	s Section:					
	Upstream Limit/Cross S	Section:					
NOT	E: For more structure	es, attach additional pages	as needed.				

B. CHANNELIZATION

Floo	oding Source:
Nan	ne of Structure:
1.	Accessory Structures
	The channelization includes (check one): Levees [Attach Section E (Levee/Floodwall)]
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
Floo	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT
	oding Source:
	oding Source: ne of Structure:
	oding Source: ne of Structure: 1. This revision reflects (check one): Bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS
	oding Source: ne of Structure: 1. This revision reflects (check one): Bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Revised 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
Nan	oding Source: ne of Structure: 1. This revision reflects (check one): Bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Revised 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. Attach plans of the structures certified by a registered professional engineer. The plan detail and information should include the following (check
Nan	bridge Source: 1. This revision reflects (check one): Bridge/culvert not modeled in the FIS Modified bridge/culvert previously modeled in the FIS Revised 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. 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 Cross-Section Locations

D. DAM/BASIN

Flo	oding Source:
Nar	me of Structure:
1.	This request is for (check one): Existing dam New dam Modification of existing dam
2.	The dam was designed by (check one): Federal agency State agency Local government agency Private organization
	Name of the agency or organization:
3.	The Dam was permitted as (check one):
	a.
	Provide the permit or identification number (ID) for the dam and the appropriate permitting agency or organization
	Permit or ID number Permitting Agency or Organization
	b.
	Provided related drawings, specification and supporting design information.
4.	Does the project involve revised hydrology? ☐ Yes ☐ No
	If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2).
	Was the dam/basin designed using critical duration storm?
	Yes, provide supporting documentation with your completed Form 2.
	No, provide a written explanation and justification for not using the critical duration storm.
5.	Does the submittal include debris/sediment yield analysis? ☐ Yes ☐ No
0.	If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport).
	If No, then attach your explanation for why debris/sediment analysis was not considered.
6.	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
7.	Please attach a copy of the formal Operation and Maintenance Plan

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL

1.	Sys	stem [<u>Elements</u>						
			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						
	h								
	b.		ee elements and locations are (check one):	0					
			earthen embankment, dike, berm, etc. structural floodwall Other (describe):	Station Station Station		to to to			
	c.	Stru	ctural Type (check one):						
		☐ r	monolithic cast-in place reinforced concrete reinforced concrete masonry block sheet piling Other (describe):						
	d.	Has	s this levee/floodwall system been certified by a Federal agence	cy to provide	e pi	rotection from the base floo	d?		
		□ Y	∕es □ No						
		If Ye	es, by which agency?						
	e.	Atta	ch certified drawings containing the following information (indi	cate drawinç	g s	heet numbers):			
		1. F	Plan of the levee embankment and floodwall structures.	Sheet	Νι	umbers:			
		В	A profile of the levee/floodwall system showing the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), levee and/or wall crest and boundation, and closure locations for the total levee system.	Sheet	Νι	umbers:			
		ir	a profile of the BFE, closure opening outlet and inlet overt elevations, type and size of opening, and ind of closure.	Sheet	Νι	umbers:			
		4. A	a layout detail for the embankment protection measures.	Sheet	Νι	umbers:			
		е	ocation, layout, and size and shape of the levee embankment features, foundation treatment, floodwall tructure, closure structures, and pump stations.	Sheet	Νι	umbers:			
2.	Fre	eeboa	<u>ard</u>						
	a.	The	minimum freeboard provided above the BFE is:						
		Rive	<u>erine</u>						
		3.5	feet or more at the downstream end and throughout feet or more at the upstream end feet within 100 feet upstream of all structures and/or constrict	ions			☐ Yes ☐ Yes ☐ Yes	3	☐ No ☐ No ☐ No
		Coa	<u>astal</u>						
			foot above the height of the one percent wave associated with		nu	al-chance			
		Still	water surge elevation or maximum wave runup (whichever is e	greater).			☐ Ye	s	□ No
		2.0	feet above the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation				☐ Ye	s	□ No

2.	r. 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 from historical records that ice-jamming can affect the BFE? ☐ Yes ☐ No								
	If Yes, provide ice-j	am analysis profil	e and eviden	ce that the minim	um freeboard	discussed abo	ove still exis	ts.	
3.	<u>Closures</u>								
	a. Openings through t	the levee system	(check one):	□ ex	ists 🗌 doe	es not exist			
	If opening exists, lis	st all closures:							
Cha	nnel Station	Left or Righ	ıt Bank	Opening	Туре		levation for g Invert	Type of 0	Closure Device
(Ext	end table on an added	d sheet as need	ed and refer	rence)					
Note	e: Geotechnical and g	eologic data							
	In addition to the red design analysis for Corps of Engineers	the following sys	stem feature	es should be su	ned during fi bmitted in a	ield and labor tabulated sur	ratory inves mmary forr	stigations and n. (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	d is:	(min.) to	(max.)		
	d. Embankment ma	terial is protecte	ed by (descr	ibe what kind):					
	e. Riprap Design Pa Attach references		ck one):		Velocity	Tractive	e stress		
			Flow		Curve or		Stone Rip	rap	Depth of
	Reach	Sideslope	Depth	Velocity	Straight	D ₁₀₀	D ₅₀	Thickness	Toedown
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
Sta	to								
(Ext	end table on an added	d sheet as need	ed and refer	ence each entr	ry)				

4.	<u>Eml</u>	pankment Protection (continued)				
	f.	Is a bedding/filter analysis and design attached?	☐ Yes ☐ No			
	g.	g. Describe the analysis used for other kinds of protection used (include copies of the design analysis):				
		Attach engineering analysis to support construc	tion plans.			
5.	<u>Eml</u>	pankment And Foundation Stability				
	a.	Identify locations and describe the basis for sele	ection of critical location for analysis:			
		Overall baiable Cts baiable				
		Overall height: Sta. ; height ft.				
		Limiting foundation soil strength:				
		Sta. , depth to				
		strength ϕ = degrees, c = psf				
		slope: $SS = (h)$ to (v)				
		(Repeat as needed on an added sheet for a	dditional locations)			
	b.	Specify the embankment stability analysis meth	odology used (e.g., circular arc, sliding block, infinite slope	e, etc.):		
	C.	Summary of stability analysis results:				
(Critical Safety Factor	Criteria (Min.)		
(c. Case	Summary of stability analysis results: Loading Conditions End of construction	Critical Safety Factor	Criteria (Min.)		
(Case	Loading Conditions	Critical Safety Factor			
(Case I	Loading Conditions End of construction	Critical Safety Factor	1.3		
(Case I II	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown	Critical Safety Factor	1.3 1.0		
(Case I II	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage	Critical Safety Factor	1.3 1.0 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage	Critical Safety Factor	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI Gerence	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I)		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI Gerence	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) e: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe		1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	IIIIIVVIVI	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) ee: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe If Yes, describe methodology used:	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	IIIIIVVIVI	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) ee: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe If Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performs	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II IV VI d. e. f.	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) e: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe If Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performs a seepage analysis for the embankment landsign.	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI d. e. f.	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe If Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance of the property of the embankment landside. Were uplift pressures at the embankment landside. Were seepage exit gradients checked for piping	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI Gerence d. e. f. g. h.	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment per lif Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance where uplift pressures at the embankment landsid were seepage exit gradients checked for piping. The duration of the base flood hydrograph again.	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI Gerence d. e. f. g. h.	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment pe If Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance of the property of the embankment landside. Were uplift pressures at the embankment landside. Were seepage exit gradients checked for piping	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		
	Case I II III IV VI Gerence d. e. f. g. h.	Loading Conditions End of construction Sudden drawdown Critical flood stage Steady seepage at flood stage Earthquake (Case I) E: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1) Was a seepage analysis for the embankment per lif Yes, describe methodology used: Was a seepage analysis for the foundation performance where uplift pressures at the embankment landsid were seepage exit gradients checked for piping. The duration of the base flood hydrograph again.	rformed?	1.3 1.0 1.4 1.4		

			E. LEV	EE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)		
6. <u>Flo</u>	oodwall And Found	ation Stability					
a.	a. Describe analysis submittal based on Code (check one):						
☐ UBC (1988) or ☐ Other (specify):							
b. Stability analysis submitted provides for:							
	☐ Overturning	☐ Sliding	If not, explain	:			
C.	Loading included	in the analyses	were:				
	☐ Lateral earth	@ P _A = ps	sf; P _p =	psf			
	☐ Surcharge-SI	ope @ , [surface	psf			
	☐ Wind @ P _w =	psf					
	☐ Seepage (Up	lift);	☐ Earth	quake @ P _{eq} =	%g		
	☐ 1%-annual-ch	nance significant	wave height:	ft.			
	☐ 1%-annual-ch	ance significant	wave period:	sec.			
d.	Summary of Sta	bility Analysis Re	esults: Factors o	f Safety.			
	Itemize for each	range in site laye	out dimension ar	nd loading condition lin	nitation for each resp	ective reach.	
Load	ling Condition	Criteria	a (Min)	Sta	То	Sta	То
	J	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Sliding
Dead &	Wind	1.5	1.5				
Dead &	Soil	1.5	1.5				
Dead, S Impact	oil, Flood, &	1.5	1.5				
Dead, S	oil, & Seismic	1.3	1.3				
	(Ref: F	FEMA 114 Sept 1	986; USACE EN	Л 1110-2-2502)			
	(Note:	Extend table on	an added sheet	as needed and referer	nce)		
e.	Foundation bear	ring strength for e	each soil type:				
	Bearing	g Pressure		Sustained	Load (psf)	Short Terr	m Load (psf)
Compute	ed design maximun						. ,
Maximu	m allowable						
f.	Foundation scour	r protection □ is	☐ is not provid	led If provided attach	explanation and sur	pporting documentation:	
	Attach engineerin	•		•	ospialiation and sup	porting accumentation.	•
	Allach engineem	y analysis to sup	port construction	i piano.			

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 $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $
		Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.
8.	Inte	erior 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 Ponding elevation vs. gravity flow Ponding elevation vs. gravity flow Yes No Yes No 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 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.

8.	8. Interior Drainage (continued) i. Will pumping plants be used for interior drainage? ☐ Yes ☐ No					
		If Yes, include the number of pumping For each pumping plant, list:	plants:			
			Plant #1			Plant #2
The	num	ber of pumps				
The	pond	ling storage capacity				
The	maxi	mum pumping rate				
The	maxi	mum pumping head				
The	pum	ping starting elevation				
The	pum	ping stopping elevation				
Is th	e dis	charge facility protected?				
Is th	ere a	ı flood warning plan?				
	muc flood	th time is available between warning ling?				
		peration be automatic?			☐ Yes	□ No
If the	e pun	nps are electric, are there backup power	sources?		☐ Yes	□ No
(Ref	eren	ce: USACE EM-1110-2-3101, 3102, 31	03, 3104, and 3105)			
		copy of supporting documentation of da atersheds that result in flooding.	ita and analysis. Provide a ma	o showing	the floode	d area and maximum ponding elevations for all
9.	<u>Oth</u>	ner Design Criteria				
	a.	The following items have been address	sed as stated:			
		Liquefaction ☐ is ☐ is not a problem Hydrocompaction ☐ is ☐ is not a problem Heave differential movement due to so	oblem] is not a	problem	
	b.	For each of these problems, state the b	pasic facts and corrective action	taken:		
		Attach supporting documentation				
	C.	If the levee/floodwall is new or enlarged ☐ Yes ☐ No	d, will the structure adversely in	npact flood	d levels an	d/or flow velocities floodside of the structure?
		Attach supporting documentation				
	d.	Sediment Transport Considerations:				
		Was sediment transport considered? If No, then attach your explanation for				(Sediment Transport).

		E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)
10.	Оре	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? Yes
		If the answer is No to any of the above, please attach supporting documentation.
11.	Mai	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
Floo	ding	Source:
Nam	e of	Structure:
Base a po	Floo tentia	any indication from historical records that sediment transport (including scour and deposition) can affect the od Elevation (BFE); and/or based on the stream morphology, vegetative cover, development of the watershed and bank conditions, there is all for debris and sediment transport (including scour and deposition) to affect the BFEs, then provide the following information along with the g documentation:
Sedi	ment	load associated with the base flood discharge: Volume acre-feet
Deb	ris loa	ad associated with the base flood discharge: Volume acre-feet
Sedi	ment	transport rate (percent concentration by volume)
Meth	nod u	sed to estimate sediment transport:
		iment transport formulas are intended for a range of hydraulic conditions and sediment sizes; attach a detailed explanation for using the method.
Meth	nod u	sed to estimate scour and/or deposition:
Plea	se no	sed to revise hydraulic or hydrologic analysis (model) to account for sediment transport: ote that bulked flows are used to evaluate the performance of a structure during the base flood; however, FEMA does not map BFEs based if flows.
		nent analysis has not been performed, an explanation as to why sediment transport (including scour and deposition) will not affect the BFEs res must be provided.