

§ 65.11

the maintenance activities to be performed, the frequency of their performance, and the person by name or title responsible for their performance.

(e) *Certification requirements.* Data submitted to support that a given levee system complies with the structural requirements set forth in paragraphs (b)(1) through (7) of this section must be certified by a registered professional engineer. Also, certified as-built plans of the levee must be submitted. Certifications are subject to the definition given at § 65.2 of this subchapter. In lieu of these structural requirements, a Federal agency with responsibility for levee design may certify that the levee has been adequately designed and constructed to provide protection against the base flood.

[51 FR 30316, Aug. 25, 1986]

§ 65.11 Evaluation of sand dunes in mapping coastal flood hazard areas.

(a) *General conditions.* For purposes of the NFIP, FEMA will consider storm-induced dune erosion potential in its determination of coastal flood hazards and risk mapping efforts. The criterion to be used in the evaluation of dune erosion will apply to primary frontal dunes as defined in § 59.1, but does not apply to artificially designed and constructed dunes that are not well-established with long-standing vegetative cover, such as the placement of sand materials in a dune-like formation.

(b) *Evaluation criterion.* Primary frontal dunes will not be considered as effective barriers to base flood storm surges and associated wave action where the cross-sectional area of the primary frontal dune, as measured perpendicular to the shoreline and above the 100-year stillwater flood elevation and seaward of the dune crest, is equal to, or less than, 540 square feet.

(c) *Exceptions.* Exceptions to the evaluation criterion may be granted where it can be demonstrated through authoritative historical documentation that the primary frontal dunes at a specific site withstood previous base flood storm surges and associated wave action.

[53 FR 16279, May 6, 1988]

44 CFR Ch. I (10–1–03 Edition)

§ 65.12 Revision of flood insurance rate maps to reflect base flood elevations caused by proposed encroachments.

(a) When a community proposes to permit encroachments upon the flood plain when a regulatory floodway has not been adopted or to permit encroachments upon an adopted regulatory floodway which will cause base flood elevation increases in excess of those permitted under paragraphs (c)(10) or (d)(3) of § 60.3 of this subchapter, the community shall apply to the Administrator for conditional approval of such action prior to permitting the encroachments to occur and shall submit the following as part of its application:

(1) A request for conditional approval of map change and the appropriate initial fee as specified by § 72.3 of this subchapter or a request for exemption from fees as specified by § 72.5 of this subchapter, whichever is appropriate;

(2) An evaluation of alternatives which would not result in a base flood elevation increase above that permitted under paragraphs (c)(10) or (d)(3) of § 60.3 of this subchapter demonstrating why these alternatives are not feasible;

(3) Documentation of individual legal notice to all impacted property owners within and outside of the community, explaining the impact of the proposed action on their property.

(4) Concurrence of the Chief Executive Officer of any other communities impacted by the proposed actions;

(5) Certification that no structures are located in areas which would be impacted by the increased base flood elevation;

(6) A request for revision of base flood elevation determination according to the provisions of § 65.6 of this part;

(7) A request for floodway revision in accordance with the provisions of § 65.7 of this part;

(b) Upon receipt of the Administrator's conditional approval of map change and prior to approving the proposed encroachments, a community shall provide evidence to the Administrator of the adoption of flood plain management ordinances incorporating the increased base flood elevations and/

or revised floodway reflecting the post-project condition.

(c) Upon completion of the proposed encroachments, a community shall provide as-built certifications in accordance with the provisions of § 65.3 of this part. The Administrator will initiate a final map revision upon receipt of such certifications in accordance with part 67 of this subchapter.

[53 FR 16279, May 6, 1988]

§ 65.13 Mapping and map revisions for areas subject to alluvial fan flooding.

This section describes the procedures to be followed and the types of information FEMA needs to recognize on a NFIP map that a structural flood control measure provides protection from the base flood in an area subject to alluvial fan flooding. This information must be supplied to FEMA by the community or other party seeking recognition of such a flood control measure at the time a flood risk study or restudy is conducted, when a map revision under the provisions of part 65 of this subchapter is sought, and upon request by the Administrator during the review of previously recognized flood control measures. The FEMA review will be for the sole purpose of establishing appropriate risk zone determinations for NFIP maps and shall not constitute a determination by FEMA as to how the flood control measure will perform in a flood event.

(a) The applicable provisions of §§ 65.2, 65.3, 65.4, 65.6, 65.8 and 65.10 shall also apply to FIRM revisions involving alluvial fan flooding.

(b) The provisions of § 65.5 regarding map revisions based on fill and the provisions of part 70 of this chapter shall not apply to FIRM revisions involving alluvial fan flooding. In general, elevations of a parcel of land or a structure by fill or other means, will not serve as a basis for removing areas subject to alluvial fan flooding from an area of special food hazards.

(c) FEMA will credit on NFIP maps only major structural flood control measures whose design and construction are supported by sound engineering analyses which demonstrate that the measures will effectively eliminate alluvial fan flood hazards from the area

protected by such measures. The provided analyses must include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

(1) Engineering analyses that quantify the discharges and volumes of water, debris, and sediment movement associated with the flood that has a one-percent probability of being exceeded in any year at the apex under current watershed conditions and under potential adverse conditions (e.g., deforestation of the watershed by fire). The potential for debris flow and sediment movement must be assessed using an engineering method acceptable to FEMA. The assessment should consider the characteristics and availability of sediment in the drainage basin above the apex and on the alluvial fan.

(2) Engineering analyses showing that the measures will accommodate the estimated peak discharges and volumes of water, debris, and sediment, as determined in accordance with paragraph (c)(1) of this section, and will withstand the associated hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces.

(3) Engineering analyses showing that the measures have been designed to withstand the potential erosion and scour associated with estimated discharges.

(4) Engineering analyses or evidence showing that the measures will provide protection from hazards associated with the possible relocation of flow paths from other parts of the fan.

(5) Engineering analyses that assess the effect of the project on flood hazards, including depth and velocity of floodwaters and scour and sediment deposition, on other areas of the fan.

(6) Engineering analyses demonstrating that flooding from scources other than the fan apex, including local runoff, is either insignificant or has been accounted for in the design.

(d) *Coordination.* FEMA will recognize measures that are adequately designed and constructed, provided that: evidence is submitted to show that the impact of the measures on flood hazards in all areas of the fan (including those not protected by the flood control measures), and the design and maintenance requirements of the measures, were reviewed and approved