DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

COASTAL ANALYSIS FORM

O.M.B. NO. 1660-0016
Expires August 31, 2007

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 1 hour 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 vaild 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, 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 Source: _____

Note: Fill out one form for each flooding source studied.

A. COASTLINE TO BE REVISED

Describe limits of study area: _____

B. EFFECTIVE FIS

The area being revised in the effective FIS was studied by detailed methods using (check all that apply):

- ☐ Storm surge modeling
- ☐ Wave height computations
- ☐ Wave overtopping computations
- ☐ Primary Frontal Dune Assessment
- ☐ Wave setup computations
- ☐ Wave runup computations
- ☐ dune erosion computations
- ☐ N/A (area not studied by detailed methods)

C. REVISED ANALYSIS

1. Number of transects in revised analyses: _____

2. Information used to prepare the revision (check all that apply):

- ☐ Wave setup analyses (complete items 3,4, and 5 below)
- ☐ Stillwater elevation determinations (complete item 3)
- ☐ Erosion considerations (complete item 4)
- ☐ Wave runup analysis (complete items 4 and 5)
- ☐ Wave height analysis (complete items 4 and 5)
- ☐ Wave overtopping assessment (complete items 4 and 5)
- ☐ More detailed topographic information (complete Section E)
- ☐ Shore protection structures (attach completed Coastal Structures Form - Form 5)
- ☐ Primary frontal dune assessment (complete item 5)
- ☐ Other, attach basis of revision request with an explanation

3. Stillwater Elevation Determination

a. How were Stillwater elevations determined?

- ☐ Gage analysis (if revised gage analysis was used, provide copies of gage data and revised analysis)
- ☐ Storm surge analysis
- ☐ Other (describe): _____

b. Specify what datum was used in the calculions: _____

If not the FIS datum, have the calculations been adjusted to the FIS datum? ☐ Yes ☐ No Conversion factor: _____

c. If revised storm surge analysis, was FEMA's storm surge model utilized? ☐ Yes ☐ No

d. If FEMA's storm surge model was used, attach a detailed description of the difference between the current and the revised analysis, and why the revised analysis should replace the current analysis.

e. If wave setup was computed, attach a description of methodology used.

Amount of wave setup added to stillwater elevation: _____ feet

C. REVISED ANALYSIS (continued)

4. Revised Analysis (i.e., erosion, wave height, wave runup, primary frontal dune, and wave overtopping)

If FEMA procedures were utilized to perform the revision, attach a detailed description of differences between the current and the revised analysis, and why the revised analysis should replace the current analysis.

If FEMA procedures were not utilized to perform the revision, provide full documentation on methodology and/or models used; including operational program, and detailed difference between methodology and/or models utilized and FEMA's methodology and/or models. Also, attach an explanation ofwhy new methodology and/or models should replace current methodology and/or models.

If revision reflects more detailed topographic information and fill has bee/will be placed in a V-Zone, and is not protected from erosion by a shore protection structure, provide a detailed description of how the fill has been treated in the revised analysis.

5. Wave Runup, Wave Height, an Wave Overtopping Analysis

Wave height analysis along a transect are greatly affected by starting wave conditions that propagate inland. Wave runup and overtopping analysis are typically considered when wave heights and/or wave runup are close to or greater than the crest of shore protection structures or natural land forms.

a. Was an analysis performed to determine starting wave height and period for input into WHAFIS?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Was wave setup included in wave height analysis and removed for erosion and wave runup analysis?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. Was an overtoping analysis performed for any coastal shore protection structures or natural land forms that may be overtopped?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, attach an explanation ofth methodology utilized and describe in detail the results of the analysis.
If overtopping was not analyzed, attach an explanation for why these analysis were not performed.

D. RESULTS

1. Stillwater storm surge elevation: _____feet _____Datum

2. Wave setup: _____feet

3. Starting deep-water significant wave condition:

height _____ period _____

4. Maximum wave runup height elevation: _____feet

5. Maxium wave runup elevation: _____feet

6. Estimated amount of maximum overtopping: _____cfs/feet

7. The areas designated as coastal high hazard areas V-Zone have:

☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ both

Attach a description where they have increased and/or decreased

8. As a result of the revised analysis, the V-Zone location has shifted a maximum of ____feet seaward and ____feet landward of its existing positon.

9. The Base Flood Elevations have:

☐ increased ☐ decreased

a. What was the greatest increase? ____feet

b. What was the greatest decrease? ____feet

10. The special flood hazard area has:

☐ increased ☐ decreased ☐ both

Attach a description where it has increased or decreased

E. MAPPING REQUIREMENTS

A certified topographic map must be submitted showing the following information (where applicable): effective, existing conditions, and proposed conditions 1%-annual-chance floodplain boundaries, revised shoreline due to either erosion or accretion, location and alignment of all transects, correct location and alignment of any structures, current community easements and boundaries, boundary of the requester's property, certification of a professional engineer registered in the subject State, location and description of reference marks, and the referenced vertical datum (NGVD, NAVD, etc.).

Note that the existing or proposed conditions floodplain boundaries to be shown on the revised FIRM must tie-in with the effective floodplain boundaries. Please attach a copy of the current FIRM annotated to show the revised 1%-annual-chance floodplain boundaries that tie-in with effective 1%-annual-chance floodplain boundaries along the entire extent of the area of revision.