DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

RIVERINE STRUCTURES FORM (FORM 3)

OMB Control Number: 1660-0016 Expiration: 1/31/2024

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 3.5 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 it displays a valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding the

accuracy of the burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing this burden to: Information Collections Management, 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. **PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT** AUTHORITY: The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, Public Law 90-448, as amended by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S): This information is being collected for the purpose of determining an applicant's eligibility to request changes to National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). ROUTINE USE(S): The information on this form may be disclosed as generally permitted under 5 U.S.C § 552a(b) of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended. This includes using this information as necessary and authorized by the routine uses published in DHS/FEMA/NFIP/LOMA-1 National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) February 15, 2006, 71 FR 7990. DISCLOSURE: The disclosure of information on this form is voluntary; however, failure to provide the information requested may delay or prevent FEMA from processing a determination regarding a requested change to a (NFIP) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). Flooding Source: Snohomish River **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 Modeled Structure** Name of Structure: Smith Island Set-back Dike 1. Type (check one): Channelization Bridge/Culvert **x** Levee/Floodwall Dam Location of Structure: Snohomish River / Union Slough, RM 1.08 to 2.91 Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Approximately Section D Upstream Limit/Cross Section: Approximately Section G 2. Name of Structure: Type (check one): Channelization Bridge/Culvert Levee/Floodwall Dam Location of Structure: Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Upstream Limit/Cross Section: ____ 3. Name of Structure: Type (check one): ☐ Dam Channelization Bridge/Culvert Levee/Floodwall Location of Structure: Downstream Limit/Cross Section: Upstream Limit/Cross Section: NOTE: FOR MORE STRUCTURES, ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NEEDED.

	B. CHANNELIZATION						
Floodin	Flooding Source:						
Name o	Name of Structure:						
1.	Hydraulic Considerations						
	The channel was designated to carry (cfs) and/o	er the - vear flood					
	The design elevation in the channel is based on (check one						
	Subcritical flow Critical flow Supercritic						
		ocations, check all that apply and attach an explanation of how the					
	☐ Inlet to channel ☐ Outlet to channel ☐ At Drop	Structures At Transitions					
	Other locations (specify):						
2.	Channel Design Plans						
	Attach the plans of the channelization certified by a register	ed professional engineer, as described in the instructions.					
3.	Accessory Structures						
	`	op structures Superelevated sections Energy dissipater asin/detention basin [Attach Section D (Dam/Basin)] Weir					
	Other (Describe):	Confidence of the control of the con					
4.	Sediment Transport Considerations						
	Are the hydraulics of the channel affected by sediment trans	sport? Yes No					
	If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport) of Form 3. If No, then attach your explanation for why sediment transport was not considered.						
	C. BRIDGE/CULVERT						
Flooding Source:							
Name 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 i	n 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, ju analyze the structures. Attach justification.	stify why the hydraulic analysis used for the flooding source could not					
3.	Attach plans of the structures certified by a registered profe following (check the information that has been provided):	ssional engineer. The plan detail and information should include the					
	Dimensions (height, width, span, radius, length)	Distance between Cross Sections					
	Shape (culverts only)	Erosion Protection					
	Material	Low Chord Elevations - Upstream and Downstream					
	Beveling and Rounding	Top of Road Elevations - Upstream and Downstream					
	Wink Wall Angle	Structure Invert Elevations - Upstream and Downstream					
	Skew Angle	Stream Invert Elevations - Upstream and Downstream					
4.	Sediment Transport Considerations	Cross-Section Locations					
	Are the hydraulics of the channel affected by sediment trans	sport? Yes No					
	If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport) of Form 3. If No, then attach your explanation for why						
	sediment transport was not considered.						

D. DAM/BASIN							
Floodi	Flooding Source:						
Name	Name of Structure:						
1.	1. This request is for (check one): Existing Dam/Basin New Dam/Basin Modification of	This request is for (check one): Existing Dam/Basin New Dam/Basin Modification of existing Dam/Basin					
2.	2. The Dam/Basin was designed by (check one): Federal Agency State Agency Private	e Organization					
	Local Government Agency Name of the Agency or Organization:						
3.	3. The Dam was permitted as (check one): Federal Dam State Dam						
	Provide the permit or identification number (ID) for the dam and the appropriate permitting agency or orga	anization					
	Permit or ID number Permitting Agency or Organization						
	a Local Government Dam Private Dam						
	Provided related drawings, specification and supporting design information.						
4.	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? (must account for the maximum volume of rur	off)					
	Yes, provide supporting documentation with your completed Form 2.						
	No, provide a written explanation and justification for not using the critical duration storm.						
5.	5. 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/sec not considered?	liment analysis was					
6.	Does the Base Flood Elevation behind the dam/basin or downstream of the dam/basin change? Yes No						
	If Yes, complete the Riverine Hydrology & Hydraulics Form (Form 2) and complete the table below.						
	Stillwater Elevation Behind the Dam/Basin						
	FREQUENCY (% annual chance) FIS REVISED						
	10-year (10%)						
	50-year (2%)						
	100-year (1%)						
	500-year (0.2%)						
	Normal Pool Elevation						
7.	7. Please attach a copy of the formal Operation and Maintenance Plan						
	E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL						
1.	1. <u>System Elements</u>						
	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):						
		68+00					
	Other (describe): to						

c. Structural Typ	e (check one): Monolit	hic cast-in place reinforced c	oncrete Reinforced	concrete masonry block					
	☐ Sheet p	oiling Other (describe):							
	las this levee/floodwall system been certified by a Federal agency to provide protection from the base flood? ⁄es 🕱 No								
If Yes, by which a									
e. Attach certifie									
	e levee embankment and floo	`	Sheet Numbers: SP01 (Sheet 06)						
Elevation closure lo	of the levee/floodwall system (BFE), levee and/or wall cres cations for the total levee sys	Sheet Numbers: PP01-06 (SHEETS 18-23)							
Elevation	of the levee/floodwall system (BFE), levee and/or wall crest cations for the total levee sys	st and foundation, and	Sheet Numbers: N/A	Sheet Numbers: N/A					
	letail for the embankment pro		Sheet Numbers: XS01 (SHEET 16)						
5. Location, features,	layout, and size and shape of foundation treatment, Floodwards, and pump stations.	of the levee embankment	Sheet Numbers: PP01-	PP06 (SHEETS 18-23					
<u>Freeboard</u>	, ,		SF01-	SF11 (SHEETS 26-36)					
a. The minimum	freeboard provided above th	e BFE is:							
0.8 FEET (*	15.0' ELEV - 14.2 ELEV)								
<u>Riverine</u>									
3.0 feet or more at	the downstream end and the		′es 🗶 No						
3.5 feet or more at			′es 🗶 No						
	feet upstream of all structure	Y	′es 🕱 No						
<u>Coastal</u>									
	1.0 foot above the height of the one percent wave associated with the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation or maximum wave runup (whichever is greater).								
	2.0 feet above the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation Yes No								
		e to the minimum freeboard re aragraph 65.10(b)(1)(ii) of the		is					
b. Is there an inc	to any of the above, please a lication from historical record	ttach an explanation. s that ice-jamming can affect	the BFE?	es 🗶 No					
<u>Closures</u>									
	ough the levee system (check	cone): x Exists	Does not exist						
If opening exists, li			Highest Elevation for						
Channel Station	Left or Right Bank	Opening Type	Opening Invert	Type of Closure Device					
DIKE STA 68+00 LEFT		CULVERT		In-Line Check Valve					
KE STA 51+00	LEFT	CULVERT		In-Line Check Valve					
IKE STA 51+00	LEFT	PUMP FORCE MAINS		Duckbill Tide Gates (3)					
	1	1	1						

[USACE] EM-1110-2-1906 Form 2086.)

4.	Emb	o el co	ant Drata	otion	E. LE	VEE/FLOOD	WALL (CON	rinued)			
4.	a.		ent Protec	oum levee slope	land eide ie	· 3H:1V					
				•							
	b.			num levee slope				O E foo		1 1 fp a	
	C.		•	of velocities alc	-	•		0.5 fps		n) to 1.1 fps	(max)
	d.			ent material is p		•	=	iprap Rocl	K — e Stress		
	e.		ttach refe	ign Parameters rrences	(check one)): [x] Ve	elocity	Tractive	e Suess		
	Re	each		Sideslope	Flow	Velocity	Curve or		Stone F	Riprap	Depth of Toedown
		acii		Sidesiope	Depth	Velocity	Straight	D100	D50	Thickness	
Sta	10+00	_ to	49+50	3H:1V			Curved	30"	_ 22"	2.0 ft	3.0 ft
Sta	49+50	_ to	68+00	3H:1V			Curved	30"	22"	2.0 ft	5.0 ft
Sta		_ to							_	_	
Sta		_ to									
Sta		_ to									
Sta		to									
(Ex	tend table		n added s	sheet as neede	d and referer	nce each entr	y)		- I.	<u> </u>	-1
	f.	ls	a beddin	g/filter analysis	and design a	attached?	X Yes [No			
	g.	D	escribe th	e analysis used	d for other kir	nds of protect	ion used (incl	ude copies	s of the des	ign analysis):	
				otection used in		•	,	,		,	
Atta	ach engin	eering	g analysis	to support cons	struction plar	ns.					
5.	Emb	arkm	ent and F	oundation Stab	ility						
	a.	lo	lentify loca	ations and desc	ribe the basi	s for selection	n of critical loc	ation for a	ınalysis:		
	Cros	ss Se	ctions A-A	' through E-E'							
				all baiabt. C	ΤΛ.		ft				
	Overall height: STA:, heightft.										
	Limiting foundation soil strength:										
	Strength ϕ = degrees, c = psf										
	Slope: SS =(v)										
	(Repeat as needed on an added sheet for additional locations)										
	b.	S	·					,	arc sliding	block infinite slo	ne etc.):
	 Specify the embankment stability analysis methodology used (e.g., circular arc, sliding block, infinite slope, etc.): Circular Arc with optimization yielding a non-circular surface. See Geotechnical Report (Shannon and Wilson, 2015). 										
	c. Summary of stability analysis results: Exceed criteria										

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)						
5. <u>Embarkment a</u>	and Foundation Stability (continue	ed)				
Case	Loading Conditions	Critical Safety Factor			Criteria (Min.)	
I	End of construction	1.3			1.3	
II	Sudden drawdown	2A SS=1.2 2B High Tide	e = 1.7		1.0	
III	Critical flood stage	Flood Stage < 15.0 ft = 1	1.6		1.4	
IV :	Steady seepage at flood stage	1.6	1.4			
VI	Earthquake (Case I)	N/A	N/A			
(Reference: USACE	EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1)			'		
If Yes	a seepage analysis for the embar , describe methodology used: 005, See Final Geotechnical Rep		🗷 Yes 🗌 No			
f. Were g. Were h. The d	f. Were uplift pressures at the embankment landside toe checked? X Yes					
a. Descr	ribe analysis submittal based on	Code (check one):] UBC (1988)	ther (specify):		
b. Stabil						
c. Loadii	ng included in the analyses were	: Lateral earth (D P _A = psf;	P _p =	_ psf	
	Surcharge-Slope @	_, surface	psf			
	Wind @ P _w =psf					
	Seepage (Uplift);	Earthquake @ P _{eq} =	%g			
1%-annua	al-chance significant wave height	: ft.				
1%-annua	al-chance significant wave period	: sec.				
 d. Summary of Stability Analysis Results: Factors of Safety. Itemize for each range in site layout dimension and loading condition limitation for each respective reach. 						
	Criteria (Min)		То	Sta	То	
Loading Condition		Sliding Overturn		Overturn	Sliding	
Dead & Wind	1.5	1.5				
Dead & Soil	1.5	1.5				
Dead, Soil, Flood, & Imp	pact 1.5	1.5				
Dead, Soil, & Seismic	1.3	1.3				
(Ref: FEMA 114 Sept 1986; USACE EM 1110-2-2502) Note: (Extend table on an added sheet as needed and reference)						

		E 1 E 1/2	E/F/ CODWALL (CONTIN	LIED)			
	E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)						
	e.	Foundation bearing strength for each soil type:					
		Bearing Pressure	Sustained Load	(psf)	Short Term Load (psf)		
Compu	ted desi	gn maximum					
Maximu	ım allow	able					
	f.	Foundation scour protection is,	is not provided. If provided.	ded, attach exp	lanation and supporting documentation:		
		Attach engineering analysis to support co	onstruction plans.				
7.	Settlen	<u>nent</u>					
	a.	Has anticipated potential settlement been determined and incorporated into the specified construction elevations to maintain the established freeboard margin? Yes					
	b.	The computed settlement range is 2.17	ft. to 3.5	ft.			
	c.	Settlement of the levee crest is determine	ed to be primarily from :	F oundation	consolidation		
		Embankment compression	Other (Describe):				
	d.	Differential settlement of floodwalls] has $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	accommodated	in the structural design and construction		
		Attach engineering analysis to support	construction plans.				
8.	<u>Interior</u>	<u>Drainage</u>					
	a.	Specify size of each interior watershed:					
		Drainage to pressure conduit: 143	acres				
		Drainage to ponding area: 143	acres				
	b.	Relationship Established:					
		Ponding elevation vs. storage	X	Yes No	0		
		Ponding elevation vs. gravity flow	<u> </u>	Yes N			
		Differential head vs. gravity flow	X	Yes N			
	c.	The river flow duration curve is enclosed:		Yes 🗶 N	0		
	d.	Specify the discharge capacity of the hea	d pressure conduit: 9.	.3 cfs			
	e.	Which flooding conditions were analyzed					
		Gravity flow (Interior Watershed)	X	Yes N	0		
		Common storm (River Watershed)	X	Yes N			
		Historical ponding probability		Yes 🗶 No			
		Coastal wave overtopping		Yes 🗶 No			
		If No for any of the above, attach expla	nation				
	f.	Interior drainage has been analyzed base	ed on joint probability of inte		r flooding and the capacities		
		of pumping and outlet facilities to provide the established level of flood protection. X Yes No If No, attach explanation.					
	g.	The rate of seepage through the levee sy	stem for the base flood is :	0.5	cfs		
	h.	The length of levee system used to drive	this seepage rate in item g:	5800	ft.		

		E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)			
8.	Interior Drainage (continued)				
	i. Will pumping plants be used for	r interior drainage?	No		
	If Yes, include the number of	pumping plants: 1 For each pumpin	g plant, list:		
		Plant #1	Plant #2		
The num	ber of pumps	3			
The pon-	ding storage capacity	50.5 Ac-ft			
The max	rimum pumping rate	9.3 cfs			
The max	rimum pumping head	25.5 ft			
The pur	nping starting elevation	-0.6 ft			
The pum	nping stopping elevation	-2.14 ft			
Is the dis	scharge facility protected?	Yes			
Is there a	a flood warning plan?	No			
How mu	ch time is available between warning ding?	N/A			
Will the	operation be automatic?	X Yes No			
If the pu	mps are electric; are there backup powe				
Înclude a	nce: USACE EM-1110-2-3101, 3102, 3 a copy of supporting documentation of d terior watersheds that result in flooding.	103, 3104, and 3105) ata and analysis. Provide a map showing the fl	ooded area and maximum ponding elevations		
9.	Other Design Criteria				
	a. The following items have been	addressed as stated:			
	Liquefaction 🗷 is 🗌	is not a problem			
	Hydrocompaction 🗌 is	x is not a problem			
	Heave differential movement	due to soils of high shrink/swell is 🗶	is not a problem		
	b. For each of these problems, st	ate the basic facts and corrective action taken:			
	Alluvial (Ha) deposits below the dike footprint are potentially liquifiable under design seismic ground motions. 5 mitigation measures were evaluated. The selected alternative is to perform repairs as needed following an earthquake.				
	Attach supporting documenta	tion			
	c. If the levee/floodwall is new or of the structure? Yes	enlarged, will the structure adversely impact flow $\boxed{\textbf{\textit{x}}}$ No	od levels and/or flow velocities floodside		
	d. Sediment Transport Considera	tions:			
	Was sediment transport cons	idered? Yes [X No		
	If Yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport). If No, then attach your ex	xplanation for why sediment transport was		
10.	Operational Plan and Criteria				
	a. Are the planned/installed works	s in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP l	Regulations? Yes 🗶 No		
	b. Does the operation plan incorp Paragraph 65.10(c)(1) of the N	orate all the provisions for closure devices as re FIP regulations?	equired in		
	c. Does the operation plan incorp Paragraph 65.10(c)(2) of the N	orate all the provisions for interior drainage as r FIP regulations?	equired in Yes 🗶 No		
	If the answer is No to any of t	he above, please attach supporting documentat	ion.		

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED) 11. Maintenance Plan Please attach a copy of the fomal maintenance plan for the levee/floodwall 12. Operational and Maintenance Plan Please attach a copy of the formal Operations and Maintenance Plan for the levee/floodwall. **CERTIFICATION OF THE LEVEE DOCUMENTATION** This certification is to be signed and sealed by a licensed registered professional engineer authorized by law to certify elevation information data, hydrologic and hydraulic analysis, and any other supporting information as per NFIP regulations paragraph 65.10(e) and as described in the MT-2 Forms Instructions. All documents submitted in support of this request are correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that any false statement may be punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1001. Certifier's Name: David Stewart License No.: 50687 Expiration Date: 3/8/2024 Company Name: Snohomish County DCNR Telephone No.: 425-388-5497 Fax No.: Signature: Stewart, David Stewart. David Date: 12/15/2022 E-mail Address: david.stewart@snoco.org SECTION F. SEDIMENT TRANSPORT Flooding Source: N/A Name of Structure: N/A 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 N/A acres-feet Volume N/A acres-feet Debris load associated with the base flood discharge: Sediment transport rate N/A (percent concentration by volume) Method used to estimate sediment transport: N/A 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: N/A Method used to revise hydraulic or hydrologic analysis (model) to account for sediment transport: None 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.