DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
Federal Emergency Management Agency

OVERVIEW & CONCURRENCE FORM

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

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 1 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 Law 93-234.
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).

A. REQUESTED RESPONSE FROM DHS-FEMA

This request is for a (check one):

☒ CLOMR: A letter from DHS-FEMA commenting on whether a proposed project, if built as proposed, would justify a map revision, or proposed hydrology changes (See 44 CFR Ch. 1, Parts 60, 65 & 72). All CLOMRs require documentation of compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Refer to the Instructions for details.

☐ LOMR: A letter from DHS-FEMA officially revising the current NFIP map to show the changes to floodplains, regulatory floodway or flood elevations. (See 44 CFR Ch. 1, Parts 60, 65 & 72).

B. OVERVIEW

1. The NFIP map panel(s) affected for all impacted communities is (are):

Community No.	Community Name	State	Map No.	Panel No.	Effective Date
060180	Town of San Anselmo	CA	06041C0 452E	0452E	3/17/2014
060180	Town of San Anselmo	CA	06041C0 456F	0456F	3/16/2016
060179	Town of Ross	CA	06041C0 454E; 0458F	0454E; 0458F	3/17/2014; 3/16/2016

2. a. Flooding Source: San Anselmo Creek

b. Types of Flooding: ☒ Riverine ☐ Coastal ☐ Shallow Flooding (e.g., Zones AO and AH) ☐ Alluvial Fan ☐ Lakes ☐ Other (Attach Description)

3. Project Name/Identifier: Removal of Building Bridge #2 over San Anselmo Creek

4. FEMA zone designations (choices: A, AH, AO, A1-A30, A99, AE, AR, V, V1-V30, VE, B, C, D, X)

a. Effective: AE

b. Revised: AE

5. Basis for Request and Type of Revision:

a. The basis for this revision request is (check all that apply)

[x] Physical Change	[ ] Improved Methodology/Data	[x] Regulatory Floodway Revision	[ ] Base Map Changes
[ ] Coastal Analysis	[x] Hydraulic Analysis	[ ] Hydrologic Analysis	[ ] Corrections
[ ] Weir-Dam Changes	[ ] Levee Certification	[ ] Alluvial Fan Analysis	[ ] Natural Changes
[x] New Topographic Data	[ ] Other (Attach Description)		

Note: A photograph and narrative description of the area of concern is not required, but is very helpful during review.

b. The area of revision encompasses the following structures (check all that apply)

Structures:	[ ] Channelization	[ ] Levee/Floodwall	[x] Bridge/Culvert
	[ ] Dam	[ ] Fill	[x] Other (Attach Description)

6. [x] Documentation of ESA compliance is submitted (required to initiate CLOMR review). Please refer to the instructions for more information.

C. REVIEW FEE

Has the review fee for the appropriate request category been included? [x] Yes Fee amount: $ 6,500.00

[ ] No, Attach Explanation

- **Please see the DHS-FEMA Web site at http://www.fema.gov/forms-documents-and-software/flood-map-related-fees for Fee Amounts and Exemptions.**

D. SIGNATURES

1. REQUESTOR'S SIGNATURE

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.

Name: Christopher Blunk, Interim Public Works Director	Company: Marin County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
Mailing Address: Marin County - Administration P.O. Box 4186 San Rafael, CA 94913-4186	Daytime Telephone: 415) 473-6528 Fax No.: none E-mail Address: Christopher.Blunk@marincounty.gov Date: 07/21/2025
Signature of Requestor (required):	

2. COMMUNITY CONCURRENCE

As the community official responsible for floodplain management, I hereby acknowledge that we have received and reviewed this Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) or conditional LOMR request. Based upon the community's review, we find the completed or proposed project meets or is designed to meet all of the community floodplain management requirements, including the requirements for when fill is placed in the regulatory floodway, and that all necessary Federal, State, and local permits have been, or in the case of a conditional LOMR, will be obtained. For Conditional LOMR requests, the applicant has documented Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance to FEMA prior to FEMA's review of the Conditional LOMR application. For LOMR requests, I acknowledge that compliance with Sections 9 and 10 of the ESA has been achieved independently of FEMA's process. For actions authorized, funded, or being carried out by Federal or State agencies, documentation from the agency showing its compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA will be submitted. In addition, we have determined that the land and any existing or proposed structures to be removed from the SFHA are or will be reasonably safe from flooding as defined in 44CFR 65.2(c), and that we have available upon request by FEMA, all analyses and documentation used to make this determination.

Community Official's Name and Title: Sean Condry, Public Works Director/Flood Plain Manager	
Mailing Address: Town of San Anselmo 525 San Anselmo Ave. San Anselmo, CA 94960-2682	Community Name: Town of San Anselmo Daytime Telephone:(415) 258-4600 Fax No.: none E-mail Address: scondry@sananselmo.gov
Community Official's Signature (required): See attached 07/07/25 Town of San Anselmo letter	Date: 07/21/2025

3. CERTIFICATION BY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER AND/OR LAND SURVEYOR

This certification is to be signed and sealed by a licensed land surveyor, registered professional engineer, or architect authorized by law to certify elevation information data, hydrologic and hydraulic analysis, and any other supporting information as per NFIP regulations paragraph 65.2(b) 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: James Reilly, PE	License No.: C 37084	Expiration Date: 6/30/2026
Company Name: Stetson Engineers Inc.	Mailing Address: 2171 E. Francisco Blvd, Suite K San Rafael, CA 94901	
Telephone No.: (415)457-0701 Fax No.: (415)457-1638		
E-mail Address: jamesr@stetsonengineers.com		
Signature: James Reilly		Date: 7/21/2025

Ensure the forms that are appropriate to your revision request are included in your submittal.

Form Name and (Number)	Required if …
[x] Riverine Hydrology and Hydraulics Form (Form 2)	New or revised discharges or water-surface elevations
[x] Riverine Structures Form (Form 3)	Channel is modified, addition/revision of bridge/culverts, addition/revision of levee/floodwall, addition/revision of dam
[ ] Coastal Analysis Form (Form 4)	New or revised coastal elevations
[ ] Coastal Structures Form (Form 5)	Addition/revision of coastal structure
[ ] Alluvial Fan Flooding Form (Form 6)	Flood control measures on alluvial fans

Seal (Optional)

July 7, 2025

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 304
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 473-6680

To Flood Zone 9:

The Town of San Anselmo received the draft MT-2 application from Marin County Flood Control as part of FEMA's CLOMR process on June 13, 2025. The Town is unable to sign the Community Concurrence section of the FEMA MT-2 Form 1 until staff (and our consultants) complete our review, as well as conduct a robust community process on this project's impacts and proposed mitigations described in the MT-2 application. The draft application is currently under review as is the planning to engage the community.

Sincerely,

Scott Schmidt for STC

Sean Condry, Public Works Director / Flood Plain Manager
Town of San Anselmo
525 San Anselmo Avenue,
San Anselmo, CA 94960-2682
(415) 258-4600
www.sananselmo.gov

COUNTY OF MARIN

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Quality, Excellence, Innovation

Christopher Blunk, P.E.
INTERIM DIRECTOR

Administration
PO Box 4186
San Rafael, CA 94913-4186
415 473 6528 T
415 473 3232 TTY
CRS Dial 711

Publicworks.marincounty.gov

Accounting

Administrative Services

Airport

Capital Projects

Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)

County Facilities

Construction Engineering

Disability Access

Engineering & Survey

Fleet Operations

Flood Control & Water Resources

Land Development

Printing Services

Procurement

Radio Communications

Real Estate

Road Maintenance

Stormwater Program

Transportation & Traffic Operations

Waste Management

July 23, 2025

Sean Condry, Public Works Director / Flood Plain Manager
Town of San Anselmo
525 San Anselmo Avenue
San Anselmo, CA 94960-2682

Re: Response to Comment Letter for Building Bridge 2 (BB2) Removal
Community Concurrence MT-2 Form 1

Dear Mr. Condry,

Thank you for providing your comment letter on behalf of the Town of San Anselmo. The Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) understands the Town is unable to sign the Community Concurrence section of the FEMA MT-2 Form 1 at this time.

In response to your comment letter, the District has addressed all review comments received from the Town and its consultants (for both the May 20, 2025 and June 13, 2025 draft CLOMR applications) and has provided responses. On July 30, the district plans to submit the CLOMR application with the July 7, 2025 letter by the Town in lieu of the Town's Concurrence Form signature. The District is coordinating with the Town's DPW staff to present to Town Council on the project's potential impacts and proposed mitigations described in the MT-2 application. We've worked with your office and the presentation is tentatively planned for August 26, 2025. September 9, 2025 is an alternative date.

Please know how much we appreciate the Town's ongoing collaboration in all of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Judd Goodman, PE

Senior Civil Engineer
Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 304
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 473 - 6680
judd.goodman@marincounty.gov

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
Federal Emergency Management Agency

OVERVIEW & CONCURRENCE FORM

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

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 1 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 Law 93-234.
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).

A. REQUESTED RESPONSE FROM DHS-FEMA

This request is for a (check one):

☒ CLOMR: A letter from DHS-FEMA commenting on whether a proposed project, if built as proposed, would justify a map revision, or proposed hydrology changes (See 44 CFR Ch. 1, Parts 60, 65 & 72). All CLOMRs require documentation of compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Refer to the Instructions for details.

☐ LOMR: A letter from DHS-FEMA officially revising the current NFIP map to show the changes to floodplains, regulatory floodway or flood elevations. (See 44 CFR Ch. 1, Parts 60, 65 & 72).

B. OVERVIEW

1. The NFIP map panel(s) affected for all impacted communities is (are):

Community No.	Community Name	State	Map No.	Panel No.	Effective Date
060180	Town of San Anselmo	CA	06041C0 452E	0452E	3/17/2014
060180	Town of San Anselmo	CA	06041C0 456F	0456F	3/16/2016
060179	Town of Ross	CA	06041C0 454E; 0458F	0454E; 0458F	3/17/2014; 3/16/2016

2. a. Flooding Source: San Anselmo Creek

b. Types of Flooding: ☒ Riverine ☐ Coastal ☐ Shallow Flooding (e.g., Zones AO and AH) ☐ Alluvial Fan ☐ Lakes ☐ Other (Attach Description)

3. Project Name/Identifier: Removal of Building Bridge #2 over San Anselmo Creek

4. FEMA zone designations (choices: A, AH, AO, A1-A30, A99, AE, AR, V, V1-V30, VE, B, C, D, X)

a. Effective: AE

b. Revised: AE

5. Basis for Request and Type of Revision:

a. The basis for this revision request is (check all that apply)

[x] Physical Change	[ ] Improved Methodology/Data	[x] Regulatory Floodway Revision	[ ] Base Map Changes
[ ] Coastal Analysis	[x] Hydraulic Analysis	[ ] Hydrologic Analysis	[ ] Corrections
[ ] Weir-Dam Changes	[ ] Levee Certification	[ ] Alluvial Fan Analysis	[ ] Natural Changes
[x] New Topographic Data	[ ] Other (Attach Description)		

Note: A photograph and narrative description of the area of concern is not required, but is very helpful during review.

b. The area of revision encompasses the following structures (check all that apply)

Structures:	[ ] Channelization	[ ] Levee/Floodwall	[x] Bridge/Culvert
	[ ] Dam	[ ] Fill	[x] Other (Attach Description)

6. [x] Documentation of ESA compliance is submitted (required to initiate CLOMR review). Please refer to the instructions for more information.

C. REVIEW FEE

Has the review fee for the appropriate request category been included? [x] Yes Fee amount: $ 6,500.00

[ ] No, Attach Explanation

- **Please see the DHS-FEMA Web site at http://www.fema.gov/forms-documents-and-software/flood-map-related-fees for Fee Amounts and Exemptions.**

D. SIGNATURES

1. REQUESTOR'S SIGNATURE

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.

Name: Christopher Blunk, Interim Public Works Director	Company: Marin County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
Mailing Address: Marin County - Administration P.O. Box 4186 San Rafael, CA 94913-4186	Daytime Telephone: (415) 473-6528 Fax No.: none E-mail Address: Christopher.Blunk@marincounty.gov Date: 07/21/2025
Signature of Requestor (required):	

2. COMMUNITY CONCURRENCE

As the community official responsible for floodplain management, I hereby acknowledge that we have received and reviewed this Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) or conditional LOMR request. Based upon the community's review, we find the completed or proposed project meets or is designed to meet all of the community floodplain management requirements, including the requirements for when fill is placed in the regulatory floodway, and that all necessary Federal, State, and local permits have been, or in the case of a conditional LOMR, will be obtained. For Conditional LOMR requests, the applicant has documented Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance to FEMA prior to FEMA's review of the Conditional LOMR application. For LOMR requests, I acknowledge that compliance with Sections 9 and 10 of the ESA has been achieved independently of FEMA's process. For actions authorized, funded, or being carried out by Federal or State agencies, documentation from the agency showing its compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA will be submitted. In addition, we have determined that the land and any existing or proposed structures to be removed from the SFHA are or will be reasonably safe from flooding as defined in 44CFR 65.2(c), and that we have available upon request by FEMA, all analyses and documentation used to make this determination.

Community Official's Name and Title: Christa Johnson, Town Manager	
Mailing Address: Town of Ross P.O. Box 320 Ross, CA 94957 - 0320	Community Name: Town of Ross Daytime Telephone: (415) 453-1453 Fax No.: (415) 453-1950 E-mail Address: cjohnson@townofrossca.gov
Community Official's Signature (required): See attached 06/23/2025 Town of Ross letter	Date: 07/21/2025

3. CERTIFICATION BY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER AND/OR LAND SURVEYOR

This certification is to be signed and sealed by a licensed land surveyor, registered professional engineer, or architect authorized by law to certify elevation information data, hydrologic and hydraulic analysis, and any other supporting information as per NFIP regulations paragraph 65.2(b) 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: James Reilly, PE	License No.: C 37084	Expiration Date: 6/30/2026
Company Name: Stetson Engineers Inc.	Mailing Address: 2171 E. Francisco Blvd, Suite K San Rafael, CA 94901	
Telephone No.: (415)457-0701 Fax No.: (415)457-1638		
E-mail Address: jamesr@stetsonengineers.com		
Signature: James Reilly		Date: 7/21/2025

Ensure the forms that are appropriate to your revision request are included in your submittal.

Form Name and (Number)	Required if …
[x] Riverine Hydrology and Hydraulics Form (Form 2)	New or revised discharges or water-surface elevations
[x] Riverine Structures Form (Form 3)	Channel is modified, addition/revision of bridge/culverts, addition/revision of levee/floodwall, addition/revision of dam
[ ] Coastal Analysis Form (Form 4)	New or revised coastal elevations
[ ] Coastal Structures Form (Form 5)	Addition/revision of coastal structure
[ ] Alluvial Fan Flooding Form (Form 6)	Flood control measures on alluvial fans

Seal (Optional)

June 23, 2025

Berenice Davidson
Assistant Director
Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 304
San Rafael, California 94903

Re: Town of Ross Statement of Concerns for the Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District application for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) for the Proposed Removal of Building Bridge #2 on San Anselmo Creek.

Dear Ms. Davidson,

The Town of Ross is in receipt of the Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (the District) application materials for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) for the Proposed Removal of Building Bridge #2 on San Anselmo Creek in San Anselmo, California (the Project).

The CLOMR application and supporting documents and appendices were provided to The Town of Ross for review on June 13, 2025 at 5:18PM PST. The Town of Ross (NFIP Community No. 060179) is listed in the CLOMR application as an impacted community. The District has requested that all communities impacted by the CLOMR submit their responses to the CLOMR application by June 27, 2025.

As the Town Manager for the Town of Ross, I am submitting this letter in lieu of signing the MT-2 form 1 "Overview and Concurrence" form. It is my understanding that the concerns and comments stated in this letter will be considered by FEMA during its review of the District's CLOMR application. Town staff has the following comments:

44 CFR 65.2(c) reads: *For the purposes of this part, "reasonably safe from flooding" means base flood waters will not inundate the land or damage structures to be removed from the SFHA and that any subsurface waters related to the base flood will not damage existing or proposed buildings.*

1. There is no data that demonstrates that any of the impacted homes in Ross that are currently in the SFHA are being removed from the SFHA as a result of the Project.

2. Of the eleven structures that require mitigation as a result of the Project, ten are located within the Town of Ross' jurisdiction. One of the ten structures in Ross has a floor elevation below the base flood but Town staff has not yet determined if the space qualifies as storage or conditioned living space. This makes it difficult to determine if the subsurface waters related to the base flood will not damage it.
3. It is unclear how the Town can evaluate whether or not the proposed mitigation, which although may be compliant with NFIP floodproofing requirements, will actually protect the structures from damage with respect to the subsurface waters related to the base flood.

And lastly, the District provided the Town of Ross with an insufficient amount of time, only eight business days, to review the extensive materials in its final CLOMR application packet. Due to the disproportionate number of structures affected by the rise compared to the Town of San Anselmo where the project is located, the Ross Town Council must be presented with this information, including a recommendation from staff, for consideration at a regular Town Council meeting in order to provide the appropriate direction to staff with respect to certifying the MT-2 Form 1. District staff have been informed of the upcoming Town Council meeting dates and have been invited to make a presentation regarding the CLOMR application at an upcoming Town Council meeting of their choosing.

Please contact me or Ross Public Works Director Richard Simonitch at 415-453-1453 ext 115 should you have questions regarding this correspondence.

Sincerely,

Christa Johnson
Town Manager

cc: Ross Town Council
Marin County Supervisor, District 2
Town Attorney
Marin County Chief Executive Officer

COUNTY OF MARIN

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Quality, Excellence, Innovation

Christopher Blunk, P.E.
INTERIM DIRECTOR

Administration
PO Box 4186
San Rafael, CA 94913-4186
415 473 6528 T
415 473 3232 TTY
CRS Dial 711

Publicworks.marincounty.gov

Accounting

Administrative Services

Airport

Capital Projects

Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)

County Facilities

Construction Engineering

Disability Access

Engineering & Survey

Fleet Operations

Flood Control & Water Resources

Land Development

Printing Services

Procurement

Radio Communications

Real Estate

Road Maintenance

Stormwater Program

Transportation & Traffic Operations

Waste Management

July 23, 2025

Christa Johnson, Town Manager
Town of Ross
P.O. Box 320
Ross, CA 94957-0320

Re: Response to Comment Letter for Building Bridge 2 (BB2) Removal
Community Concurrence MT-2 Form 1

Dear Ms. Johnson,

Thank you for providing your comment letter on behalf of the Town of Ross. The Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) understands the Town is unable to sign the Community Concurrence section of the FEMA MT-2 Form 1 at this time.

The District has addressed all review comments received from the Town and its consultants (for both the May 20, 2025 and June 13, 2025 draft CLOMR applications) and has provided responses. On July 30, the District plans to submit the final CLOMR application with the June 23, 2025 letter by the Town in lieu of the Town's Concurrence Form signature.

The District provides the following responses to the Town's comments.

- Comment: *1. There is no data that demonstrates that any of the impacted homes in Ross that are currently in the SFHA are being removed from the SFHA as a result of the Project.*

  Response: Maps in CLOMR application indicate the reduction in SFHA. Those maps show parcels completely removed, which provides demonstration sought consistent with FIRM standards. Per request, a map of parcels which would benefit from removal of BB2 has been developed and was shared with the Towns on July 9, 2025. The map indicates the number of parcels removed from the 100-year floodplain (23), partially removed (54), and with a decrease in Base Flood Elevation within the CLOMR Reach (315). This map is not required for the CLOMR, but results are mentioned in Appendix B.

- Comment: *2. Of the [twelve] structures that require mitigation as a result of the Project, ten are located within the Town of Ross' jurisdiction. One of the ten structures in Ross has a floor elevation below the base flood but Town staff has not yet determined if the space qualifies as storage or conditioned living space. This makes it difficult to determine if the subsurface waters related to the base flood will not damage it.*

  Response: The Town of Ross will need to confirm whether the space in question is classified as storage or conditioned living space. The District will continue to work with the Town to address and resolve this matter following submittal.

- Comment: *3. It is unclear how the Town can evaluate whether or not the proposed mitigation, which although may be compliant with NFIP floodproofing requirements, will actually protect the structures from damage with respect to the subsurface waters related to the base flood.*

  Response: The District assessed the effect and proposed appropriate measures based on guidance provided in FEMA's NFIP Technical Bulletins. These measures, developed and approved by FEMA for NFIP, are recognized as effectively approved methods of wet floodproofing to satisfy NFIP's requirements. The District will comply with NFIP flood proofing requirements as required by FEMA.

  The Community Concurrence statement reads, "...we have determined that the land and any existing or proposed structures to be removed from the SFHA are or will be reasonably safe from flooding as defined in 44CFR 65.2(c), and that we have available upon request by FEMA, all analyses and documentation used to make this determination." The statement only focuses on structures removed from the SFHA, not those which will remain within the SFHA. Those structures proposed for mitigation would remain in the SFHA after BB2 is removed.

- Comment: *4. And lastly, the District provided the Town of Ross with an insufficient amount of time, only eight business days, to review the extensive materials in its final CLOMR application packet. Due to the disproportionate number of structures affected by the rise compared to the Town of San Anselmo where the project is located, the Ross Town Council must be presented with this information, including a recommendation from staff, for consideration at a regular Town Council meeting in order to provide the appropriate direction to staff with respect to certifying the MT- 2 Form 1. District staff have been informed of the upcoming Town Council meeting dates and have been invited to make a presentation regarding the CLOMR application at an upcoming Town Council meeting of their choosing*

  Response: The District will submit the June 23, 2025 letter by the Town in lieu of the Concurrence Form signature. The District is coordinating with the Town's DPW director to present on the CLOMR to Town Council. This presentation is tentatively planned for August 14, 2025. September 11, 2025 is an alternative date.

Please know how much we appreciate the Town's ongoing collaboration in all of these efforts.

Sincerely,

Judd Goodman, PE
Senior Civil Engineer
Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 304
San Rafael, CA 94903
(415) 473 - 6680
judd.goodman@marincounty.gov

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

RIVERINE HYDROLOGY & HYDRAULICS FORM (FORM 2)

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 Law 93-234.
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: San Anselmo Creek

Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied

A. HYDROLOGY

1. Reason for New Hydrologic Analysis (check all that apply):

☒ Not revised (skip to section B) ☐ No existing analysis ☐ Improved data

☐ Alternative methodology ☐ Proposed Conditions (CLOMR) ☐ Changed physical condition of watershed

2. Comparison of Representative 1%-Annual-Chance Discharges

Location	Drainage Area (Sq. Mi.)	Effective/FIS (cfs)	Revised (cfs)

3. Methodology for New Hydrologic Analysis (check all that apply)

☐ Precipitation/Runoff Model → Specify Model: _____ Duration: _____ Rainfall Amount: _____

☐ Statistical Analysis of Gage Records

☐ Regional Regression Equations ☐ Other (please attach description)

Please enclose all relevant models in digital format, maps, computations (including computation of parameters), and documentation to support the new analysis.

4. Review/Approval of Analysis

If your community requires a regional, state, or federal agency to review the hydrologic analysis, please attach evidence of approval/review. 4. HEC-RAS File Description**:

5. Impacts of Sediment Transport on Hydrology

Is the hydrology for the revised flooding source(s) affected by sediment transport? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport) of Form 3. If No, then attach your explanation.

B. HYDRAULICS

1. Reach to be Revised

	Description	Cross Section	Water-Surface Elevation (ft.)	
			Effective	Proposed/Revised
Downstream Limit*	RS 20367	C	38.3	38.7
Upstream Limit*	RS 24117	H	54.9	54.4

*Proposed/Revised elevations must tie-into the Effective elevations within 0.5 foot at the downstream and upstream limits of revision.

2. Hydraulic Method/Model Used: FEMA duplicate effective HEC-RAS model, corrected for project site calculations.

☒ Steady State ☐ Unsteady State ☒ One-Dimensional ☐ Two-Dimentional

3. Pre-Submittal Review of Hydraulic Models*

DHS-FEMA has developed two review programs, CHECK-2 and CHECK-RAS, to aid in the review of HEC-2 and HEC-RAS hydraulic models, respectively. We recommend that you review your HEC-2 and HEC-RAS models with CHECK-2 and CHECK-RAS.

4. HEC-RAS File Description**:

Models Submitted	Natural Run		Floodway Run		Datum
Duplicate Effective Model*	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		A17:Duplicate			NAVD88
Corrected Effective Model*	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		C12:Corrected			NAVD88
Existing or Pre-Project Conditions Model	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
Revised or Post-Project Conditions Model	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		C13:PRJ		F23:PRJ Floodway	NAVD88
Other - (attach description)	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	

* For details, refer to the corresponding section of the instructions.
**See instructions for information about modeling other then HEC-RAS. ☒ Digital Models Submitted? (Required)

C. MAPPING REQUIREMENTS

A **certified topographic work map** must be submitted showing the following information (where applicable): the boundaries of the effective, existing, and proposed conditions 1%-annual-chance floodplain (for approximate Zone A revisions) or the boundaries of the 1%- and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplains and regulatory floodway (for detailed Zone AE, AO, and AH revisions); location and alignment of all cross sections with stationing control indicated; stream, road, and other alignments (e.g., dams, levees, etc.); current community easements and boundaries; boundaries of the requester's property; certification of a registered professional engineer registered in the subject State; location and description of reference marks; and the referenced vertical datum (NGVD, NAVD, etc.).

Topographic Information: ☒ Digital Mapping (GIS/CADD) Data Submitted (preferred)

Source: Topo survey for the project area; Topo data received from FEMA | Date: Jan 1, 2017

Vertical Datum: NAVD88 | Spatial Projection: California State Coordinate System 83 Zone 3

Accuracy:

Note that the boundaries of the existing or proposed conditions floodplains and regulatory floodway to be shown on the revised FIRM and/or FBFM must tie-in with the effective floodplain and regulatory floodway boundaries. Please attach **a copy of the effective FIRM and/or FBFM**, at the same scale as the original, annotated to show the boundaries of the revised 1%-and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplains and regulatory floodway that tie-in with the boundaries of the effective 1%-and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplain and regulatory floodway at the upstream and downstream limits of the area on revision.

☒ Annotated FIRM and/or FBFM (Required)

D. COMMON REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS*

1. For LOMR/CLOMR requests, do Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) increase compared to the effective BFEs? ☒ Yes ☐ No

   See Section 11.0 of the MT-2 Application

   If Yes, please attach **proof of property owner notification**. Examples of property owner notifications can be found in the MT-2 Form 2 Instructions.

2. For CLOMR requests, if either of the following is true, please submit **evidence of compliance with Section 65.12 of the NFIP regulations**:

   See Section 9.0 of the MT-2 Application

   - The proposed project encroaches upon a regulatory floodway and would result in increases above 0.00 foot compared to pre-project conditions.
   - The proposed project encroaches upon a SFHA with or without BFEs established and would result in increases above 1.00 foot compared to pre-project conditions.

3. Does the request involve the placement or proposed placement of fill? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   If Yes, the community must be able to certify that the area to be removed from the special flood hazard area, to include any structures or proposed structures, meets all of the standards of the local floodplain ordinances, and is reasonably safe from flooding in accordance with the NFIP regulations set forth at 44 CFR 60.3(A)(3), 65.5(a)(4), and 65.6(a)(14). Please see the MT-2 instructions for more information.

4. Does the request involve ~~the placement or proposed placement of fill~~ a floodway revision? ☒ Yes ☐ No

   See Section 11.0 of the MT-2 Application

   If Yes, attach **evidence of regulatory floodway revision notification**. As per Paragraph 65.7(b)(1) of the NFIP Regulations, notification is required for requests involving revisions to the regulatory floodway Elements and examples of regulatory floodway revision notification can be found in the MT-2 Form 2 Instructions.

5. For CLOMR requests, please submit documentation to FEMA and the community to show that you have complied with Sections 9 and 10 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). For actions authorized, funded, or being carried out by Federal or State agencies, please submit documentation from the agency showing its compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Please see the MT-2 instructions for more detail.

   See Section 10.0 of the MT-2 Application

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

RIVERINE HYDROLOGY & HYDRAULICS FORM (FORM 2)

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 Law 93-234.
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: San Anselmo Creek Overflow

Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied

A. HYDROLOGY

1. Reason for New Hydrologic Analysis (check all that apply):

☒ Not revised (skip to section B) ☐ No existing analysis ☐ Improved data
☐ Alternative methodology ☐ Proposed Conditions (CLOMR) ☐ Changed physical condition of watershed

2. Comparison of Representative 1%-Annual-Chance Discharges

Location	Drainage Area (Sq. Mi.)	Effective/FIS (cfs)	Revised (cfs)

3. Methodology for New Hydrologic Analysis (check all that apply)

☐ Precipitation/Runoff Model → Specify Model: _____ Duration: _____ Rainfall Amount: _____

☐ Statistical Analysis of Gage Records

☐ Regional Regression Equations ☐ Other (please attach description)

Please enclose all relevant models in digital format, maps, computations (including computation of parameters), and documentation to support the new analysis.

4. Review/Approval of Analysis

If your community requires a regional, state, or federal agency to review the hydrologic analysis, please attach evidence of approval/review. 4. HEC-RAS File Description**:

5. Impacts of Sediment Transport on Hydrology

Is the hydrology for the revised flooding source(s) affected by sediment transport? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, then fill out Section F (Sediment Transport) of Form 3. If No, then attach your explanation.

B. HYDRAULICS

1. Reach to be Revised

	Description	Cross Section	Water-Surface Elevation (ft.)	
			Effective	Proposed/Revised
Downstream Limit*	RS 1002	B	39.6	39.2
Upstream Limit*	RS 5061		53.2	52.8

*Proposed/Revised elevations must tie-into the Effective elevations within 0.5 foot at the downstream and upstream limits of revision.

2. Hydraulic Method/Model Used: FEMA duplicate effective HEC-RAS model, corrected for project site calculations.

☒ Steady State ☐ Unsteady State ☒ One-Dimensional ☐ Two-Dimentional

3. Pre-Submittal Review of Hydraulic Models*

DHS-FEMA has developed two review programs, CHECK-2 and CHECK-RAS, to aid in the review of HEC-2 and HEC-RAS hydraulic models, respectively. We recommend that you review your HEC-2 and HEC-RAS models with CHECK-2 and CHECK-RAS.

4. HEC-RAS File Description**:

Models Submitted	Natural Run		Floodway Run		Datum
Duplicate Effective Model*	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		A17:Duplicate			NAVD88
Corrected Effective Model*	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		C12:Corrected			NAVD88
Existing or Pre-Project Conditions Model	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
Revised or Post-Project Conditions Model	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	
		C13:PRJ		F23:PRJ Floodway	NAVD88
Other - (attach description)	File Name:	Plan Name:	File Name:	Plan Name:	

* For details, refer to the corresponding section of the instructions.
**See instructions for information about modeling other then HEC-RAS. ☒ Digital Models Submitted? (Required)

C. MAPPING REQUIREMENTS

A **certified topographic work map** must be submitted showing the following information (where applicable): the boundaries of the effective, existing, and proposed conditions 1%-annual-chance floodplain (for approximate Zone A revisions) or the boundaries of the 1%- and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplains and regulatory floodway (for detailed Zone AE, AO, and AH revisions); location and alignment of all cross sections with stationing control indicated; stream, road, and other alignments (e.g., dams, levees, etc.); current community easements and boundaries; boundaries of the requester's property; certification of a registered professional engineer registered in the subject State; location and description of reference marks; and the referenced vertical datum (NGVD, NAVD, etc.).

Topographic Information: ☒ Digital Mapping (GIS/CADD) Data Submitted (preferred)

Source: Topo survey for the project area; Topo data received from FEMA | Date: Jan 1, 2017

Vertical Datum: NAVD88 | Spatial Projection: California State Coordinate System 83 Zone 3

Accuracy:

Note that the boundaries of the existing or proposed conditions floodplains and regulatory floodway to be shown on the revised FIRM and/or FBFM must tie-in with the effective floodplain and regulatory floodway boundaries. Please attach **a copy of the effective FIRM and/or FBFM**, at the same scale as the original, annotated to show the boundaries of the revised 1%-and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplains and regulatory floodway that tie-in with the boundaries of the effective 1%-and 0.2%-annual-chance floodplain and regulatory floodway at the upstream and downstream limits of the area on revision.

☒ Annotated FIRM and/or FBFM (Required)

D. COMMON REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS*

1. For LOMR/CLOMR requests, do Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) increase compared to the effective BFEs? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   See Section 11.0 of the MT-2 Application

   If Yes, please attach **proof of property owner notification**. Examples of property owner notifications can be found in the MT-2 Form 2 Instructions.

2. For CLOMR requests, if either of the following is true, please submit **evidence of compliance with Section 65.12 of the NFIP regulations**:

   See Section 9.0 of the MT-2 Application

   - The proposed project encroaches upon a regulatory floodway and would result in increases above 0.00 foot compared to pre-project conditions.
   - The proposed project encroaches upon a SFHA with or without BFEs established and would result in increases above 1.00 foot compared to pre-project conditions.

3. Does the request involve the placement or proposed placement of fill? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   If Yes, the community must be able to certify that the area to be removed from the special flood hazard area, to include any structures or proposed structures, meets all of the standards of the local floodplain ordinances, and is reasonably safe from flooding in accordance with the NFIP regulations set forth at 44 CFR 60.3(A)(3), 65.5(a)(4), and 65.6(a)(14). Please see the MT-2 instructions for more information.

   See Section 11.0 of the MT-2 Application

4. Does the request involve ~~the placement or proposed placement of fill~~ a floodway revision? ☒ Yes ☐ No

   If Yes, attach **evidence of regulatory floodway revision notification**. As per Paragraph 65.7(b)(1) of the NFIP Regulations, notification is required for requests involving revisions to the regulatory floodway Elements and examples of regulatory floodway revision notification can be found in the MT-2 Form 2 Instructions.

5. For CLOMR requests, please submit documentation to FEMA and the community to show that you have complied with Sections 9 and 10 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). For actions authorized, funded, or being carried out by Federal or State agencies, please submit documentation from the agency showing its compliance with Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Please see the MT-2 instructions for more detail.

   See Section 10.0 of the MT-2 Application

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 Law 93-234.

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: San Anselmo Creek

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

1. Name of Structure: Removal of BB2 over San Anselmo Creek

   Type (check one): ☐ Channelization ☒ Bridge/Culvert ☐ Levee/Floodwall ☐ Dam

   Location of Structure: 634-636 San Anselmo Ave, San Anselmo, CA

   Downstream Limit/Cross Section: RS20367; Cross Section C on FIRM

   Upstream Limit/Cross Section: RS24117; Cross Section H on FIRM

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): ☐ Channelization ☐ Bridge/Culvert ☐ Levee/Floodwall ☐ Dam

   Location of Structure: _____

   Downstream Limit/Cross Section: _____

   Upstream Limit/Cross Section: _____

NOTE: FOR MORE STRUCTURES, ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NEEDED.

B. CHANNELIZATION

Flooding Source: _____

Name of Structure: _____

1. Hydraulic Considerations

The channel was designated 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 to channel ☐ At Drop Structures ☐ At Transitions

☐ Other locations (specify): _____

2. Channel Design Plans

Attach the plans of the channelization certified by a registered professional engineer, as described in the instructions.

3. Accessory Structures

The channelization includes (check one):

☐ Levees [Attach Section E (Levee/Floodwall)] ☐ Drop structures ☐ Superelevated sections ☐ Energy dissipater

☐ Transitions in cross sectional geometry ☐ Debris basin/detention basin [Attach Section D (Dam/Basin)] ☐ Weir

☐ Other (Describe): _____

4. Sediment Transport Considerations

Are the hydraulics of the channel affected by sediment transport? ☐ 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: San Anselmo Creek

Name of Structure: Removal of BB2 over San Anselmo

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): FEMA eff.

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 and Rounding
☐ Wink Wall Angle
☒ Skew Angle
☒ Distance between Cross Sections
☒ Erosion Protection
☒ Low Chord Elevations - Upstream and Downstream
☒ Top of Road Elevations - Upstream and Downstream
☒ Structure Invert Elevations - Upstream and Downstream
☒ Stream Invert Elevations - Upstream and Downstream
☒ Cross-Section Locations

4. Sediment Transport Considerations

Are the hydraulics of the channel affected by sediment transport? ☐ 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

Flooding Source: _____

Name of Structure: _____

1. This request is for (check one): ☐ Existing Dam/Basin ☐ New Dam/Basin ☐ Modification of existing Dam/Basin

2. The Dam/Basin was designed by (check one): ☐ Federal Agency ☐ State Agency ☐ Private Organization

   ☐ Local Government Agency Name of the Agency or Organization: _____

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 organization

   Permit or ID number _____ Permitting Agency or Organization _____

   a. ☐ Local Government Dam ☐ Private Dam

   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? (must account for the maximum volume of runoff)

   ☐ 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

   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/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. Please attach a copy of the formal Operation and Maintenance Plan

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL

1. System 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 Stationed _____ to _____

   ☐ Structured floodwall Stationed _____ to _____

   ☐ Other (describe): _____ Stationed _____ to _____

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

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 agency to provide protection from the base flood?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, by which agency? _____

e. Attach certified drawings containing the following information (indicate drawing sheet numbers):

1. Plan of the levee embankment and floodwall structures. Sheet Numbers: _____
2. 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: _____
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: _____
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: _____

2. Freeboard

a. The minimum freeboard provided above the BFE is:

_____

Riverine

3.0 feet or more at the downstream end and throughout	☐ Yes	☐ No
3.5 feet or more at the upstream end	☐ Yes	☐ No
4.0 feet within 100 feet upstream of all structures and/or constrictions	☐ Yes	☐ No

Coastal

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).	☐ Yes	☐ No
2.0 feet above the 1%-annual-chance stillwater surge elevation	☐ Yes	☐ No

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

3. Closures

a. Openings through the levee system (check one): ☐ Exists ☐ Does not exist

If opening exists, list all closures:

Channel Station	Left or Right Bank	Opening Type	Highest Elevation for Opening Invert	Type of Closure Device

(Extend table on an added sheet as needed and reference)

Note: Geotechnical and geologic data

In addition to the required detailed analysis reports, data obtained during field and laboratory investigations and used in the design analysis for the following system features should be submitted in a tabulated summary form. (Reference U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] EM-1110-2-1906 Form 2086.)

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

4. Embarkment Protection

a. The maximum levee slope land side is: _____

b. The maximum levee slope flood side is: _____

c. The range of velocities along the levee during the base flood is: _____ (min) to _____ (max)

d. Embankment material is protected by (describe what kind): _____

e. Riprap Design Parameters (check one): ☐ Velocity ☐ Tractive Stress
Attach referrences

Reach	Sideslope	Flow Depth	Velocity	Curve or Straight	Stone Riprap			Depth of Toedown
					D_{100}	D_{50}	Thickness	
Sta _____ to _____								
Sta _____ to _____								
Sta _____ to _____								
Sta _____ to _____								
Sta _____ to _____								
Sta _____ to _____								

(Extend table on an added sheet as needed and reference each entry)

f. Is a bedding/filter analysis and design attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

g. Describe the analysis used for other kinds of protection used (include copies of the design analysis):

Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.

5. Embarkment and Foundation Stability

a. Identify locations and describe the basis for selection of critical location for analysis:

☐ Overall height: STA:_____ , height _____ ft.

☐ Limiting foundation soil strength:

Strength ϕ = _____ degrees, c = _____ psf

Slope: SS = _____ (h) to _____ (v)

(Repeat as needed on an added sheet for additional locations)

b. Specify the embankment stability analysis methodology used (e.g., circular arc, sliding block, infinite slope, etc.):

c. Summary of stability analysis results: _____

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

5. Embarkment and Foundation Stability (continued)

Case	Loading Conditions	Critical Safety Factor	Criteria (Min.)
I	End of construction		1.3
II	Sudden drawdown		1.0
III	Critical flood stage		1.4
IV	Steady seepage at flood stage		1.4
VI	Earthquake (Case I)		1.0

(Reference: USACE EM-1110-2-1913 Table 6-1)

d. Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performed? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, describe methodology used:

e. Was a seepage analysis for the embankment performed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

f. Were uplift pressures at the embankment landside toe checked? ☐ Yes ☐ No

g. Were seepage exit gradients checked for piping potential? ☐ Yes ☐ No

h. The duration of the base flood hydrograph against the embankment is _____ hours.

Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.

6. Floodwall and Foundation Stability

a. Describe analysis submittal based on Code (check one): ☐ UBC (1988) ☐ Other (specify): _____

b. Stability analysis submitted provides for: ☐ Overturning ☐ Sliding ☐ If not, explain: _____

c. Loading included in the analyses were: ☐ Lateral earth @ P_A = _____ psf; P_p = _____ psf

☐ Surcharge-Slope @ _____, ☐ surface _____ psf

☐ Wind @ P_w = _____ psf

☐ Seepage (Uplift); _____ ☐ Earthquake @ P_{eq} = _____ %g

☐ 1%-annual-chance significant wave height: _____ ft.

☐ 1%-annual-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.

Loading Condition	Criteria (Min)		Sta	To	Sta	To
	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Sliding	Overturn	Sliding
Dead & Wind	1.5	1.5				
Dead & Soil	1.5	1.5				
Dead, Soil, Flood, & Impact	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. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

e. Foundation bearing strength for each soil type:

Bearing Pressure	Sustained Load (psf)	Short Term Load (psf)
Computed design maximum		
Maximum allowable		

f. Foundation scour protection ☐ is, ☐ is not provided. If provided, attach explanation and supporting documentation:

Attach engineering analysis to support construction plans.

7. Settlement

a. Has anticipated potential settlement been determined and incorporated into the specified construction elevations to maintain the established freeboard margin?

b. The computed settlement range 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. Interior Drainage

a. Specify size of each interior watershed:

Drainage to pressure conduit: _____ acres

Drainage to ponding area: _____ acres

b. Relationship 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: ☐ Yes ☐ No

d. Specify the discharge capacity of the head pressure conduit: _____ cfs

e. Which flooding conditions were analyzed?

Gravity flow (Interior Watershed)	☐ Yes	☐ No
Common storm (River Watershed)	☐ Yes	☐ No
Historical ponding probability	☐ Yes	☐ No
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.
☐ Yes ☐ No 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.

E. LEVEE/FLOODWALL (CONTINUED)

8. Interior Drainage (continued)

i. Will pumping plants be used for interior drainage? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, include the number of pumping plants: _____ For each pumping plant, list:

	Plant #1	Plant #2
The number of pumps		
The ponding storage capacity		
The maximum pumping rate		
The maximum pumping head		
The pumping starting elevation		
The pumping stopping elevation		
Is the discharge facility protected?		
Is there a flood warning plan?		
How much time is available between warning and flooding?		

Will the operation be automatic? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If the pumps are electric; are there backup power sources? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(Reference: USACE EM-1110-2-3101, 3102, 3103, 3104, and 3105)
Include a copy of supporting documentation of data and analysis. Provide a map showing the flooded area and maximum ponding elevations for all interior watersheds that result in flooding.

9. Other Design Criteria

a. The following items have been addressed as stated:

Liquefaction ☐ is ☐ is not a problem

Hydrocompaction ☐ is ☐ 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, state the basic facts and corrective action taken:

Attach supporting documentation

c. If the levee/floodwall is new or enlarged, will the structure adversely impact flood levels and/or flow velocities floodside of the structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No

d. 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 why sediment transport was not considered.

10. Operational Plan and Criteria

a. Are the planned/installed works in full compliance with Part 65.10 of the NFIP Regulations? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Does the operation plan incorporate all the provisions for closure devices as required in Paragraph 65.10(c)(1) of the NFIP regulations? ☐ Yes ☐ No

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 ☐ No

If the answer is No to any of the above, please attach supporting documentation.

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: _____ License No.: _____ Expiration Date: _____

Company Name: Telephone No.: _____ Fax No.: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____ E-mail Address: _____

CERTIFICATION OF THE LEVEE DOCUMENTATION

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 _____ acres-feet

Debris load associated with the base flood discharge: Volume _____ acres-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.