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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Osceola County is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) study to evaluate the widening of Old Lake Wilson Road from two to four lanes. The purpose of this PD\&E study is to evaluate engineering and environmental data and document information that will aid the County in determining the location, type, and preliminary design of the proposed improvements. The total project length is approximately 2.5 miles. The study includes capacity improvements along the roadway and at intersections, a new bridge over Interstate 4 (I-4), the addition of a median, and bicycle and pedestrian features.

The project is located within the jurisdiction of the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). The project is divided into eight (8) sub-basins based on the existing roadway profile, roadside ditch profiles, and culvert and cross drain locations.

The proposed widening of Old Lake Wilson Road from two to four lanes will result in minor impacts to the adjacent Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains. The estimated magnitude of fill is negligible with respect to the relative size of the floodplain area (both upstream and downstream), therefore no adverse impacts are anticipated. However, the transverse floodplain impacts associated with the proposed culvert and bridge culvert extensions and replacements will need to be further analyzed during the design phase. The proposed bridge culvert widening over the regulatory floodway at Davenport Creek will require a FEMA No-Rise Certification be processed through Osceola County Floodplain Management. The proposed improvements will have a transverse encroachment on Davenport Creek and Davenport Creek tributary. There are no known flooding issues within the project limits.

There are two cross drains and one bridge culvert within the study limits. The necessary cross drain extensions or replacements will have transverse impacts on the existing floodplains that will need to be further analyzed during the design phase. It is recommended that bridge culvert over the FEMA regulatory floodway at Davenport Creek be replaced, as stated in the Conceptual Bridge Hydraulics Assessment, submitted under a separate cover. Replacement of or modifications to the bridge culvert will require a FEMA No-Rise Certification be processed through Osceola County Floodplain Management.

Modifications to existing drainage structures such as the extension of cross drains included in this project will result in an insignificant change in their capacity to carry floodwater. These modifications will cause minimal increases in flood heights and flood limits which will not result in any significant adverse impacts on the natural and beneficial floodplain values or any significant change in flood risks or damage. In addition, replacement drainage structures for this project will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, there will be no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. There will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes due to the modification or replacement of existing structures. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant.
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Osceola County is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD\&E) study to evaluate capacity improvements to Old Lake Wilson Road. The project limits extend from County Road 532 (CR 532) to south of Sinclair Road, a distance of approximately 2.5 miles. The project consists of the widening of Old Lake Wilson Road from two to four lanes.

Currently, Old Lake Wilson Road is a two (2) lane undivided rural roadway. There are a total of eight (8) intersections within the project limits. The anticipated scope of work at each intersection is summarized below.

- CR 532 Intersection: This intersection is anticipated to be reconstructed as part of the Polk County and/or CR 532 widening; therefore, no changes are anticipated.
- Excitement Drive Intersection: A bi-directional median may be considered to reduce the number of conflict points and to improve safety.
- Assembly Court Intersection: A bi-directional median may be considered to reduce the number of conflict points and to improve safety.
- Spine Road Intersection: Signalization or a roundabout may be considered.
- Fairfax Drive/Marker Avenue Intersection: Signalization or a roundabout may be considered.
- Pendent Court Intersection: This intersection will remain a right-out only driveway.
- Sinclair Road Intersection: This intersection is already four lanes; therefore, no changes are anticipated.
- Access Road for the Gulfstream Interconnect/booster Station: No changes are anticipated.

One (1) bridge culvert over the Davenport Creek crossing is recommended to be replaced along with the roadway, as stated in the Conceptual Bridge Hydraulics Assessment, submitted under a separate cover.

The intent of this Location Hydraulics Report (LHR) is to identify the potential 100-year (base) floodplain encroachments resulting from the roadway and bridge culvert improvements evaluated in this study. In accordance with 23 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 650 Subpart A, Section 650.111, floodplains are to be protected. The intent of these regulations is to avoid possible long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the modification of floodplains as a result of development. These regulations urge that when floodplains are anticipated, alternatives should be sought out where practical and that development incompatible with floodplain values should be avoided. Conclusions and recommendations were developed using the best available data and conceptual roadway alignment and typical sections. The cross-drain lengths and exact locations shall be verified during the design phase, when survey is available.

### 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The PD\&E study limits include Old Lake Wilson Road from CR 532 to South of Sinclair Road (SR 70). The study limits are in Osceola County. A Project Location Map is shown in Figure 2-1. Refer to Appendix C for a USGS Quadrangle Map. The project is located within the section, township, and range shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1: Section, Township, and Range Data

| Range | Township | Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 E | 25 S | 10 |



Figure 2-1: Project Location Map
The vertical datum used for this study is the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). To convert from NAVD 88 to National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD 29), add 0.87 feet. Refer to Appendix B for the datum conversion.

The study includes widening Old Lake Wilson Road from two 12-foot lanes to four 11-foot lanes, the addition of a median, and accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians.
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### 3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing Old Lake Wilson Road from CR 532 to South of Sinclair Road consists of two 12-foot travel lanes and 4-foot unpaved outside shoulders on both sides. Figure 3-1 shows the Existing Typical Section.


Figure 3-1: Existing Typical Section

## BASIN 1

Basin 1 begins at Station 106+00 and ends at Station 131+50. Stormwater runoff sheet flows from the roadway to ill-defined ditches and swales and are conveyed to onsite wetlands which discharge to Davenport Creek. Davenport Creek flows in a general direction from west to east and ultimately discharges into Reedy Creek. There are no cross drains in Basin 1.

## BASIN 2

Basin 2 begins at Station $131+50$ and ends at Station $146+00$. Stormwater runoff sheet flows from the roadway to ill-defined roadside ditches and swales, which discharge north to existing bridge culvert \#924147 (quadruple 11' x $7.5^{\prime}$ metal arch pipe) located at Station 147+00, which discharges into Davenport Creek. Davenport Creek flows in a general direction from west to east and ultimately discharges into Reedy Creek.

## BASIN 3

Basin 3 begins at Station 146+00, at Davenport Creek and ends at Station 170+00. Stormwater runoff sheet flows from the roadway to ill-defined roadside ditches, which ultimately discharge south into Davenport Creek through existing bridge culvert \#924147 located at station 147+00, or discharge north through the existing triple 42" RCP cross drain located at station 183+00, which discharges into Davenport Creek Tributary. Both Davenport Creek and its tributary flow in a general direction from west to east and ultimately discharge into Reedy Creek.

## BASIN 4

Basin 4 begins at Station 170+00, north of Davenport Creek and ends at Station 183+00, north of the Davenport Creek Tributary crossing (existing triple 42" RCP cross drain). Stormwater runoff sheet flows from the roadway to ill-defined roadside ditches and swales, discharges north to the existing triple 42" RCP cross drain located at station 183+00, which discharges into Davenport Creek Tributary and into Davenport Creek. Davenport Creek flows in a general direction from west to east and ultimately discharges into Reedy Creek.

## BASIN 5

Basin 5 begins at Station 183+00, north of the Davenport Creek Tributary crossing (existing triple $42^{\prime \prime}$ RCP cross drain) and ends at Station 197+00, the high point on the bridge over I-4. Stormwater runoff is collected by shoulder gutter inlets which discharges to existing pond G-1 within the I-4/SR 429 Interchange, discharging an existing wetland and eventually to the Davenport Creek Tributary (based on information on the I-4 Beyond the Ultimate (BtU)).

## BASIN 6

Basin 6 begins at Station 197+00, the high point on the bridge over I-4 and ends at Station 207+50, at the end of the bridge return over the l-4. Stormwater runoff from the east side of the road is collected by shoulder gutter inlets and conveyed to a concrete ditch on the on the northwest side of the bridge through an MES. The existing ditch flows east to an existing 42-inch cross drain under I-4 (CD-6) and discharges to an existing wetland and eventually to Reedy Creek (based on information on the I-4 BtU).

## BASIN 7

Basin 7 begins at Station 207+50, at the end of the bridge over the l-4 and ends at Station 219+85, the beginning of Basin D001 as described in SFWMD Permit No. 49-00954-P (Application No. 090515-5) and Permit No. 49-01107-P-38 (Application No. 150331-13). Along the right side of Old Lake Wilson Road, stormwater runoff is collected by in an ill-defined ditch and is conveyed to a concrete ditch on the north side of the bridge. Along the left side of Old Lake Wilson Road, stormwater runoff is collected in an ill-defined ditch and is conveyed beneath Old Lake Wilson Road to a concrete ditch on the north side of the bridge. Stormwater runoff collected in the concrete ditch continues flowing northwest through an existing roadway ditch along l-4 and ultimately discharges to wetland G1.

## BASIN 8

Basin 8 begins at Station 219+85, the beginning of Basin D001 as described in SFWMD Permit No. 49-00954-P (Application No. 090515-5) and Permit No. 49-01107-P-38 (Application No. 150331-13) and ends at Station $229+20$, South of Sinclair Road. Along both sides of Old Lake Wilson Road, stormwater runoff sheet flows into a concrete lined ditch where it is collected by inlets and is conveyed to dry detention pond DOO2-P and discharges to an adjacent wetland conservation area and ultimately discharges to Reedy Creek.

### 3.1 Solls

The predominant soils within and adjacent to the corridor are excessively drained sandy soils with isolated areas of moderately/poorly drained soils associated with culvert crossings. The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey of Osceola County was used to determine the soil types within the project limits.

Based on a review and evaluation of subsurface information available for the project area, it is expected that soil and groundwater conditions found along the corridor are favorable for roadway improvements. Refer to Appendix E for a Soils Map. Table 3-1 provides the soil names, as well as their hydrologic soil group and drainage condition.

Table 3-1: Soil Types

| Soil Name | NRCS Map Unit | Hydrologic Soil Group | Drainage Class, <br> Dominant Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Candler sand, 0 to 5 <br> percent slopes | 7 | A | Excessively drained |
| Candler sand, 5 to 12 <br> percent slopes | 8 | A | Excessively drained |
| Hontoon muck, <br> frequently ponded, 0 <br> to 1 percent slopes | 15 | A/D | Very poorly drained |
| Pomello fine sand, 0 <br> to 5 percent slopes | 34 | A | Moderately well |
| Pompano fine sand, <br> frequently ponded, 0 <br> to 1 percent slopes | 37 | A/D | Very poorly drained |

### 3.2 Land Use

The land use within the right-of-way throughout the study limits is classified as Roads and Highways. The areas adjacent to the project right-of-way consist of the following land uses:

- From the beginning of the project at Osceola Polk Line Road to Excitement Drive - The project area is surrounded by commercial and service area on the east side of the corridor as well as some high density residential area, and high density residential area on the west side of the corridor.
- From Excitement Drive to the overpass at Gathering Drive - The land use along both sides of the corridor are predominantly recreational and high density residential.
- From the overpass at Gathering Drive to Assembly Court - The project area is surrounded by a small commercial area as well as a hardwood forest wetland followed by a large stretch of recreational area. There is also some high density residential area on both sides of the corridor at Assembly Court.
- From Assembly Court to the I-4/SR 429 Interchange - There is a hardwood forest wetland area north of Assembly Court. The lands adjacent to the corridor are classified as transportation area and some utility area at the I-4 and SR 429 interchange.
- From the I-4/SR 429 Interchange to Sinclair Road - The adjacent land use is high density residential area.

Please refer to Appendix F for the Land Use Map.

### 3.3 Cross Culverts

There are two (2) existing culverts within the project limits. Table 3-2 provides a summary of the existing culverts.
Table 3-2: Existing Culverts within Project Limits

| Approx. Station | Cross Culvert Size | Existing Length (ft) | Existing Structure Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $183+00$ | Triple 42" RCP | 127.00 | EX-169 (per I-4 BtU Plans) |
| $201+15$ | Single 24" RCP | 247.00 | EX-255 (per I-4 BtU Plans) |

### 3.4 Bridge Culverts

There is one (1) existing bridge culvert within the culvert limits. Table 3-3 provides the information found on the National Bridge Inventory Data (NBID) for Bridge Culvert \#924147. The original bridge culvert was constructed in 1954 and it is approximately 42 ft wide with four $11^{\prime} \times 7.5^{\prime}$ arch pipes for a total bridge length of 57.4 ft . The July 2020 Bridge Inspection Report for Bridge Culvert \#924147 also notes the following issues:

- Area of undermining @ pipe 3 (see Appendix H for a plan view of pipe designations)
- Multiple sand-cement bags missing over the east end of pipe 1
- $\quad$ Sand-cement bags missing @ western waterline (approx. $4^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}$ ) between pipes 3 \& 4
- $\quad$ Sand-cement bags generally brittle with some open joints and vegetative growth (both walls)
- $\quad$ Settlement over the east end of pipe 1 with cracking up to $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$
- Delaminative corrosion and corrosion holes in pipes 3 \& 4
- Previously applied bituminous coating is failing, resulting in corrosion (all pipes)
- Miscellaneous asphalt "mowing strips" behind guardrail cracked and broken apart
- Depression in headwall over pipe 4 ( $2^{\prime}$ dia $\times 1 \frac{1 ⁄ 2}{2}$ deep)
- $75 \%$ occlusion of pipe 1 and $50 \%$ occlusion of pipe 2
- "Up to 2 ft " of sand accumulation in pipes $3 \& 4$

Refer to Appendix H for Bridge Inspection Report and NBID documentation. A Conceptual Bridge Hydraulics Assessment was submitted under a separate cover.

Table 3-3: Existing Bridge Culvert \#924147 within Project Limits

| Structure Description | Approx. <br> Station | Structure <br> Number | Cross Culvert Size | Length (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bridge Culvert over Davenport Creek | $147+00$ | 924147 | Quadruple $11^{\prime} \times 7.5^{\prime}$ metal arch pipe | 42 |

### 3.5 FLoodplains and Floodways

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for Osceola County was reviewed to determine the extents of the FEMA floodplains within the project limits. Table 3-5 lists the FEMA FIRM, including its effective date. The FEMA FIRM is provided in Appendix D.

Table 3-4: Summary of FEMA FIRMs

| FEMA Panel Name | FEMA Panel Number | Effective Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIRM Osceola County, Florida And Incorporated Areas | 12097 C0040G | June 18, 2013 |

The applicable Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for this project is the Osceola County FIS (effective June 18, 2013). There is one regulatory floodway within this project corridor: Davenport Creek. The Flood Insurance Study has information concerning the floodways' drainage area, discharge, and flood profile. The Osceola Country FIS is provided in Appendix D.

### 3.5.1 Davenport Creek Floodplain

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 12097C0040G (dated June 18, 2013) identifies a Zone AE floodplain at Davenport Creek. Davenport Creek is designated as a regulatory floodway at the crossing of Old Lake Wilson Road, with elevation 91 west of the bridge culvert and elevation 90 east of the bridge culvert.

### 3.5.2 Davenport Creek Tributary Floodplain

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 12097C0040G (dated June 18, 2013) identifies a Zone A (elevation undetermined) floodplain at the Davenport Creek Tributary.
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### 4.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

The proposed future improvements include widening Old Lake Wilson Road from two 12 -foot lanes to four 11foot lanes, the addition of a median, and accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians. All typical section alternatives maintain the existing landscape on the right side of Old Lake Wilson Road. Two (2) typical sections are being considered. Typical Section 1 includes four 11 -foot travel lanes, a 37.5 -foot median, 5 -foot bike lanes, curb and gutter, a 10 -foot sidewalk along the left (LT) side of the alignment, and a 5 -foot sidewalk along the right (RT) side of the alignment. Figure 4-1 shows Proposed Typical Section 1.


Figure 4-1: Proposed Typical Section 1

Typical Section 2 includes four 11-foot travel lanes, a 37.5-foot median, 7-foot buffered bike lanes, curb and gutter, an 8 -foot sidewalk along the left (LT) side of the alignment, and a 5 -foot sidewalk along the right (RT) side of the alignment. Figure 4-2 shows Proposed Typical Section 2.


Figure 4-2: Proposed Typical Section 2

### 4.1 Cross Culverts

The proposed roadway widening will require extension of one of the existing cross drains along Old Lake Wilson Road. Although this culvert is proposed to be replaced as part of the I-4 BtU project, the I-4 BtU project is on hold and the earliest segments of the project are projected to begin construction in greater than 10 years, thus this cross drain is included as an extension as part of this project. Table 4-1 provides a summary of the projected improvements at each cross culvert. Cross drain calculations can be found in Appendix I.

Table 4-1: Proposed Improvements and Modifications to Cross Culverts within Project Limits

| Approx. | Cross Culvert <br> Station | Number <br> of Barrels | Existing <br> Length <br> (ft) | Approx. <br> Proposed <br> Extension <br> (ft) | Proposed <br> Improvement or <br> Modification | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $183+00$ | Triple 42" RCP | 3 | 127.00 | 24.00 | Extension | Within the 100-year <br> Zone A Floodplain |
| $201+15$ | Single 24" RCP | 1 | 247.00 | 0.00 | None |  |

### 4.2 BRIDGE Culverts

The Bridge Inspection Report from July 2020 indicates several issues with the existing bridge culvert, as noted in Section 3.4. Due to the age and existing conditions of the bridge culvert, it is unlikely that simply widening to accommodate the proposed improvements will meet expectations as to future service life. In addition, hydraulic analysis of the existing crossing shows overtopping of the road in the existing condition. If the existing bridge culvert is widened to accommodate the proposed roadway improvements, the hydraulic analysis shows an increase in the upstream stages at the crossing. Since this crossing is a regulatory crossing and requires a No-Rise certification, widening the existing crossing is not a suitable alternative. For these reasons, bridge culvert \#924147 is recommended to be replaced to accommodate the proposed improvements. Table 4-2 provides a summary of the proposed improvements and modifications. Additional detail and design considerations for the replacement of this crossing are provided in the Conceptual Bridge Hydraulics Assessment memorandum submitted under separate cover.

Table 4-2: Proposed Improvements and Modifications to Bridge Culverts within Project Limits

| Structure <br> Description | Approx. <br> Location <br> (STA) | Bridge <br> Number | Recommended <br> Improvement or <br> Modification | Approximate <br> Proposed Length | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bridge Culvert <br> over Davenport <br> Creek | $146+94$ | 924147 | Replacement <br> w/Quadruple <br> $12^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ Conc. Box <br> Culvert* | 125 feet | Within 100-year <br> Floodplain Regulatory <br> Floodway |

[^0]
### 4.3 FLOODPLAINS AND FLOODWAYS

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 12097C0040G (dated June 18, 2013) identifies a Zone A floodplain at the Davenport Creek Tributary and a Zone AE floodplain at Davenport Creek. Davenport Creek is designated as a regulatory floodway at the crossing of Old Lake Wilson Road, with elevation 91 west of the bridge culvert and elevation 90 east of the bridge culvert.

The anticipated floodplain impacts due to the proposed roadway widening were estimated to determine potential impacts to the 100-year floodplains and necessary compensation volumes. The anticipated impacts are provided in Table 4-3. The impact volume from the proposed widening will need to be assessed during the design phase, when survey of the existing ground, geotechnical data for the seasonal high water table (SHWT), and proposed cross sections are available. Off-site floodplain compensation sites shall be evaluated to provide compensation for the floodplain impacts.

Table 4-3: Mainline Floodplain Encroachment Estimates

| Floodplain Description | Approximate Location <br> (STA) | Encroachment Limits | Approximate Encroachment <br> Area (ac) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Davenport Creek | $146+94$ | From Station $145+08.91$ to <br> Station $151+51.51$ | 1.29 |
| Davenport Creek Tributary | $183+16$ | From Station $181+74.63$ to <br> Station $184+51.36$ | 0.72 |

The estimated magnitude of fill is negligible with respect to the relative size of the floodplain area (both upstream and downstream), therefore no adverse impacts are anticipated. However, the transverse floodplain impacts associated with the proposed culvert and bridge culvert extensions and replacements will need to be further analyzed during the design phase. The proposed bridge culvert widening over the regulatory floodway at Davenport Creek will require a FEMA No-Rise Certification be processed through Osceola County Floodplain Management. The proposed improvements will have a transverse encroachment on Davenport Creek and Davenport Creek tributary. Exhibits showing the location of the anticipated encroachments can be found in Appendix D.

### 4.4 History Of Flooding

There is no history of flooding within the project limits. Refer to Appendix G for correspondence with Osceola County.

### 4.5 Risk Evaluation

The proposed improvements were evaluated to determine whether there would be adverse floodplain impacts. The culverts and bridge culverts will be reviewed during the design phase, once survey is available and a more thorough hydrologic and hydraulic method of analysis is utilized, to determine the impact of the extensions on the headwaters.
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Modifications to existing drainage structures such as the extension of cross drains included in this project will result in an insignificant change in their capacity to carry floodwater. These modifications will cause minimal increases in flood heights and flood limits which will not result in any significant adverse impacts on the natural and beneficial floodplain values or any significant change in flood risks or damage. In addition, replacement drainage structures for this project will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, there will be no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. There will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes due to the modification or replacement of existing structures. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant.
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### 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The proposed widening of Old Lake Wilson Road from two to four lanes will result in minor impacts to the adjacent Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains. The estimated magnitude of fill is negligible with respect to the relative size of the floodplain area (both upstream and downstream), therefore no adverse impacts are anticipated. However, the transverse floodplain impacts associated with the proposed culvert and bridge culvert extensions and replacements will need to be further analyzed during the design phase. The proposed bridge culvert widening over the regulatory floodway at Davenport Creek will require a FEMA No-Rise Certification be processed through Osceola County Floodplain Management. The proposed improvements will have a transverse encroachment on Davenport Creek and Davenport Creek tributary. There are no known flooding issues within the project limits.

There is one (1) bridge culvert within the study limits. The proposed bridge culvert replacement over the FEMA regulatory floodway at Davenport Creek will require a FEMA No-Rise Certification be processed through Osceola County Floodplain Management. The construction of this project is considered only a transverse encroachment on Davenport Creek and on Davenport Creek Tributary. Refer to the Conceptual Bridge Hydraulics Assessment memorandum submitted under separate cover for additional information and design considerations.

Modifications to existing drainage structures such as the extension of cross drains included in this project will result in an insignificant change in their capacity to carry floodwater. These modifications will cause minimal increases in flood heights and flood limits which will not result in any significant adverse impacts on the natural and beneficial floodplain values or any significant change in flood risks or damage. In addition, replacement drainage structures for this project will perform hydraulically in a manner equal to or greater than the existing structure, and backwater surface elevations are not expected to increase. Thus, there will be no significant adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. There will be no significant change in flood risk, and there will not be a significant change in the potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes due to the modification or replacement of existing structures. Therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not significant.
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## Appendix A

Drainage Maps





## ApPENDIX B <br> Vertcon Datum Conversion

Questions concerning the VERTCON process may be mailed to NGS

Latitude: $\quad 281732.640$

Longitude: 0813542.00

NGVD 29 height: 0.00 FT

Datum shift(navd 88 minus ngvd 29): $\mathbf{- 0 . 8 6 9}$ feet

## Converted to NAVD 88 height: <br> -0.869 feet

## Appendix C USGS Quadrangle Map



Appendix D
FEMA Floodplain Data

## OSCEOLA COUNTY, FLORIDA AND INCORPORATED AREAS

Community Name

KISSIMMEE, CITY OF
OSCEOLA COUNTY
(UNINCORPORATED AREAS)
REEDY CREEK IMPROVEMENT
DISTRICT
ST. CLOUD, CITY OF

Community
Number
120190
120189
120577
120191


Federal Emergency Management Agency
FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY NUMBER

## NOTICE TO FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY USERS

Communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program have established repositories of flood hazard data for floodplain management and flood insurance purposes. This Flood Insurance Study may not contain all data available within the repository. It is advisable to contact the community repository for any additional data.
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## EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles

| Bass Slough (Lower Reach) | Panels | 01P-03P |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bass Slough (Upper Reach) | Panels | 04P-05P |
| Bass Slough Tributary | Panel | 06P |
| Boggy Creek | Panel | 07 P |
| C-33 Canal | Panel | 08P |
| Canoe Creek (C-34 Canal) | Panels | 09P-10P |
| Davenport Creek | Panels | 11P-12P |
| Davenport Creek Tributary No. 1 | Panel | 13P |
| Davenport Creek Tributary No. 2 | Panel | 14P |
| East City Canal | Panels | 15P-16P |
| East City Canal Tributary 1 | Panel | 17P |
| Mill Slough | Panels | 18P-20P |
| Peg Horn Slough | Panels | $21 P-22 P$ |
| Reedy Creek | Panels | 23P-24P |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 1 | Panel | $25 P$ |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 2 | Panel | $26 P$ |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 3 | Panel | $27 P$ |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles (continued)

| Shingle Creek | Panels | 28P-29P |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| St. Johns River | Panels | 30P-31P |
| Tributary No. 1 | Panel | 32 P |
| West Branch Shingle Creek | Panels | 33P-35P |
| West City Canal | Panel | 36 P |
| WPA Canal | Panels | 37P-39P |
| WPA Canal Tributary 1 | Panels | $40 \mathrm{P}-42 \mathrm{P}$ |
| WPA Canal Tributary 1-1 | Panel | $43 P$ |

$\begin{aligned} & \text { Exhibit } 2 \text { Flood Insurance Rate Map Index (Published Separately) } \\ & \text { Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Published Separately) }\end{aligned}$

## FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY

## OSCEOLA COUNTY, FLORIDA, AND INCORPORATED AREAS

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose of Study

This Flood Insurance Study (FIS) revises and updates information on the existence and severity of flood hazards in the geographic area of Osceola County, including the Cities of Kissimmee and St. Cloud; Reedy Creek Improvement District; and the unincorporated areas of Osceola County (referred to collectively herein as Osceola County), and aids in the administration of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973. This study has developed flood-risk data for various areas of the community that will be used to establish actuarial flood insurance rates and to assist the community in its efforts to promote sound floodplain management. Minimum floodplain management requirements for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) are set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations at 44 CFR, 60.3.

The Reedy Creek Improvement District is located in more than one county; the flood hazard information for the portion of this community located in Orange County is included in the FIS report for Orange County, Florida, and Incorporated Areas (Reference 1).

In some states or communities, floodplain management criteria or regulations may exist that are more restrictive or comprehensive than the minimum Federal requirements. In such cases, the more restrictive criteria take precedence, and the State (or other jurisdictional agency) will be able to explain them.

The Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and FIS report for this countywide study have been produced in digital format. Flood hazard information was converted to meet the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FIRM database specifications and geographic information standards and is provided in a digital format so that it can be incorporated into a local Geographic Information System and be accessed more easily by the community.
1.2 Authority and Acknowledgments

The sources of authority for this FIS report are the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

For this revision of the countywide FIS, new hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by BakerAECOM, LLC, for FEMA, under Contract No. HSFEHQ-09-D-0368, Task R4-TO66. This revised study was completed in March 2011.

For the initial countywide FIS, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by Engineering Methods \& Applications, Inc., for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. EMW-95-C-4705. That work was completed in July 1996.

The initial countywide FIS was prepared to include all jurisdictions within Osceola County in a countywide FIS. Information on the authority and acknowledgements for each jurisdiction with a previously printed FIS report included in the countywide FIS is shown below:

Kissimmee, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 2, 1981, were prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Jacksonville District, for the Federal Insurance Administration (FIA), under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-1878, Project Order No. 10. That work was completed in June 1979.

Osceola County The hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated (Unincorporated areas): August 3, 1981, were prepared by the USACE, Jacksonville District, for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-1878, Project Order No. 10, Amendment No. 1. That work was completed in January 1980.

The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated March 16, 1989, were prepared by the USACE, Jacksonville District for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-1878, Project Order No. 10, Amendment No. 1. That work was completed in January 1980.

The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated November 20, 1996, were prepared by Post, Buckley, Schuh \& Jernigan, Inc.

St. Cloud, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated March 1980 were prepared by the USACE, Jacksonville District, for the FIA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-1878, Project Order No. 10. That work was completed in February 1979.

For the FIS report dated April 3, 1996, flooding information was taken from the FIS for the unincorporated areas of Osceola County because of corporate limits changes and flooding mismatches between the City of St. Cloud and the unincorporated areas of Osceola County (Reference 2).

The authority and acknowledgments for Reedy Creek Improvement District are not included because there was no previously printed FIS report for this community.

Base map information shown on the FIRM was provided in digital format by Osceola County Planning Office.

The coordinate system used for producing the FIRM is the Florida State Plane FIPS 0901. Corner coordinates shown on the FIRMs are in latitude and longitude referenced to the UTM projection, North American Datum (NAD 83) HARN and the GRS80. Distance units were measured in feet.

### 1.3 Coordination

An initial Consultation Coordination Officer (CCO) meeting (also occasionally referred to as the Scoping meeting) is held with representatives of the communities, FEMA, and the study contractors to explain the nature and purpose of the FIS and to identify the streams to be studied by detailed methods. A final CCO (often referred to as the Preliminary DFIRM Community Coordination, or PDCC, meeting) is held with representatives of the communities, FEMA, and the study contractors to review the results of the study.

For this revision of the countywide FIS, the initial CCO meeting was held on November 3, 2009, and attended by community officials, representatives of the St. Johns River and South Florida Water Management Districts, the State of Florida, FEMA Region IV, and the study contractor, Baker AECOM, LLC.

The final CCO meeting was held on August 16, 2011 to review and accept the results of this FIS. Those who attended this meeting included representatives of St. Cloud, Kissimmee, Osceola County, AECOM, and FEMA. All problems raised at that meeting have been addressed in this study.

The dates of the historical initial and final CCO meetings held for the communities within the boundaries of Osceola County are shown in Table 1, "Historical CCO Meeting Dates."

Table 1: Historical CCO Meeting Dates

| Community Name | Initial CCO Date | Final CCO Date |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Kissimmee, City of | December 13, 1977 | March 13, 1980 |
| Osceola County and <br> Incorporated Areas <br> (countywide) | September 22, 1994 | September 29, 1998 |
| Osceola County <br> (Unincorporated Areas) | February 23, 1978 | March 2, 1981 |
| St. Cloud, City of | December 13, 1977 | July 10, 1979 |

Table 2: Flooding Sources Studied by Detailed Methods (continued)

| Flooding Source | Reach Length (miles) or Area (square miles) | Limits of Study |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coon Lake | 1.8 | For its entire shoreline within Osceola County |
| Cox Creek | 1.7 | 2 |
| Cypress Lake | 0.01 sq. mi. | 2 |
| Davenport Creek | 7.5 | From its confluence with Reedy Creek to Oak Island Drive |
| Davenport Creek Tributary <br> No. 1 | 1.0 | From its confluence with Davenport Creek to Oak Island Drive |
| Davenport Creek Tributary <br> No. 2 | 1.6 | From its confluence with Davenport Creek to a point approximately 0.86 mile upstream of confluence |
| Dead River | 0.5 | 2 |
| East City Canal | 3.2 | From its confluence with Lake Tohopekaliga to just downstream of Oak Street |
| East City Canal Tributary $1^{1}$ | 0.4 | From the confluence with East City Canal to a point approximately 2,370 feet upstream |
| East Lake Tohopekaliga | 20.1 | 2 |
| Gator Bay Branch | 1.1 | 2 |
| Heart Lake | 0.01 sq. mi. | 2 |
| Jackson Canal | 1.7 | 2 |
| Jim Branch | 0.6 | 2 |
| Kissimmee River | 3.0 | 2 |
| Lake Bullock | 1.4 |  |
| Lake Cecil | 1.6 | 2 |
| Lake Center | 3.3 | For its entire shoreline within Osceola County |
| Lake Davenport | 1.0 | For its entire shoreline within Osceola County |
| Lake Gentry | 0.7 | For its entire shoreline within Osceola County |

Table 3: Flooding Sources Studied by Approximate Methods (continued)

| Flooding Source | Reach Length (miles) or Area (square miles) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crabgrass Creek | 10.7 |
| Cypress Lake | 0.1 sq. mi. |
| Davenport Creek | 0.9 |
| Dead River | 3.6 |
| Elbow Branch | 3.1 |
| Fish Lake | 0.4 sq. mi. |
| Gap Creek | 2.9 |
| Garrett Branch | 3.5 |
| Gator Branch | 6.6 |
| Hammock Branch | 1.9 |
| Hatchineha Canal | 2.4 |
| Hog Pen Slough | 0.3 sq. mi. |
| Indian Branch | 2.7 |
| Jackson Canal | 4.5 |
| Jane Green Creek | 3.6 |
| Jim Branch | 0.8 |
| Kissimmee River | 12.9 |
| Lake Jackson | 3.2 |
| Lake Marian | 8.0 |
| Little Creek | 3.2 |
| Little North Prong | 1.9 |
| Major Sloush | 0.2 sq. mi. |
| Mill Slough | 0.9 |
| North Branch Crabgrass Creek | 2.2 |
| North Fork Taylor Creek | 5.2 |
| NP (unnamed streams) | 916.0 |
| NP - Priority 1- Poinciana | 0.6 |
| NP - Priority 4 - Kennansville | 14.7 |
| Orchid Creek | 7.5 |
| Padgett Branch | 0.8 |

Table 5: Summary of Discharges (continued)

| Flooding Source and Location | Drainage Area (Square Miles) | Peak Discharge (Cubic Feet per Second) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 10-percent-annual-chance | 2-percent-annual-chance | 1-percent-annual-chance | 0.2-percent-annual-chance |
| DAVENPORT CREEK |  |  |  |  |  |
| At mouth | 27.13 | 2,126 | 3,396 | 3,991 | 5,320 |
| Approximately 0.6 mile downstream of State Route 545 | 26.73 | 1,932 | 3,099 | 3,648 | 4,866 |
| At State Route 545 | 25.56 | 1,516 | 2,524 | 2,986 | 4,066 |
| Approximately 0.4 mile upstream of State Route 545 | 25.28 | 1,496 | 2,511 | 2,970 | 4,042 |
| Approximately 0.3 mile downstream of Interstate Route 4 | 24.94 | 1,487 | 2,491 | 2,944 | 4,066 |
| Approximately 0.6 mile downstream of Keefer Trail | 22.49 | 1,417 | 2,368 | 2,798 | 3,813 |
| At Keefer Trail | 22.20 | 1,416 | 2,358 | 2,785 | 3,791 |
| Approximately 0.6 mile upstream of Keefer Trail | 14.88 | 363 | 628 | 820 | 1,346 |
| At confluence of Davenport Creek Tributary No. 2 | 8.53 | 898 | 1,466 | 1,718 | 2,341 |
| Approximately 1,000 feet downstream of confluence of Davenport Creek Tributary No. 1 | 5.54 | 389 | 578 | 663 | 871 |
| At Oak Island Road | 0.40 | 9 | 18 | 21 | 178 |
| DAVENPORT CREEK TRIBUTARY NO. 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approximately 100 feet downstream of North Goodman Road | 3.96 | 95 | 224 | 348 | 693 |

Table 5: Summary of Discharges (continued)

| Flooding Source and Location | Drainage Area (Square Miles) | Peak Discharge (Cubic Feet per Second) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 10-percent-annual-chance | 2-percent-annual-chance | 1-percent-annual-chance | 0.2-percent-annual-chance |
| DAVENPORT CREEK TRIBUTARY NO. 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approximately 0.9 mile upstream of mouth | 1.56 | 679 | 1,066 | 1,239 | 1,626 |
| EAST CITY CANAL ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| At mouth | 6.37 | 1,128 | 1,531 | 1,661 | 2,018 |
| EAST CITY CANAL TRIBUTARY 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| At confluence with East City Canal | 0.9 | 375 | 575 | 687 | 932 |
| MILL SLOUGH |  |  |  |  |  |
| At U.S. Route 441 | 11.6 | 710 | 1,040 | 1,360 | 2,050 |
| At Mill Slough Road | 10.7 | 660 | 970 | 1,300 | 1,900 |
| PEG HORN SLOUGH |  |  |  |  |  |
| At mouth | 2.28 | 714 | 1,003 | 1,090 | 1,258 |
| At Neptune Road | 2.01 | 612 | 840 | 896 | 1,008 |
| At Old Landfill entrance road | 1.19 | 351 | 416 | 420 | 427 |
| At Canoe Creek Road | 0.46 | 209 | 398 | 465 | 508 |
| REEDY CREEK |  |  |  |  |  |
| At Cypress Lake | 282.0 | 3,300 | 5,000 | 5,700 | 6,350 |
| At Lake Russell | 264.0 | 2,700 | 4,000 | 4,500 | 5,100 |
| At U.S. Route 92 bridge | 209.0 | 800 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 1,100 |

[^1]
## Table 6: Summary of Stillwater Elevations (continued)

|  | Elevation (feet NAVD88) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flooding Source and | 10-percent- <br> annual-chance | 2-percent- <br> annual-chance | 1-percent- <br> annual-chance | 0.2-percent- <br> annual-chance |
| SARDINE LAKE | 64.4 | 65.2 | 65.6 | 66.1 |
| TROUT LAKE | 64.5 | 65.3 | 65.6 | 66.2 |
| *Data not available |  |  |  |  |

### 3.2 Hydraulic Analyses

Analyses of the hydraulic characteristics of flooding from the sources studied were carried out to provide estimates of the elevations of floods of the selected recurrence intervals. Users should be aware that flood elevations shown on the FIRM represent rounded whole-foot elevations and may not exactly reflect the elevations shown on the Flood Profiles or in the Floodway Data tables in the FIS report. Flood elevations shown on the FIRM are primarily intended for flood insurance rating purposes. For construction and/or floodplain management purposes, users are cautioned to use the flood elevation data presented in this FIS in conjunction with the data shown on the FIRM.

Except where noted, cross sections were obtained from field surveys. All bridges, dams, and culverts were field surveyed to obtain elevation data and structural geometry. Cross sections were located at close intervals upstream and downstream of bridge and culverts to compute the significant backwater effects of these structures.

Locations of selected cross sections used in the hydraulic analyses are shown on the Flood Profiles (Exhibit 1). For stream segments for which a floodway was computed (Section 4.2), selected cross section locations are also shown on the FIRM (Exhibit 2).

Table 7, "Manning’s 'n’ Values," contains the channel and overbank " n " values for the streams studied by detailed methods.

Table 7: Manning's " n " Values

| Flooding Source | Channel "n" | Overbank "n" |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bass Slough | 0.025 | $0.025-0.10$ |
| Bass Slough Tributary | 0.025 | $0.035-0.075$ |
| Big Wateree Creek Tributary 4 | $*$ | $*$ |
| Boggy Creek | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| C-33 Canal | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Canoe Creek (C-34 Canal) | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Davenport Creek | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Davenport Creek Tributary No. 1 | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |

Table 7: Manning's " n " Values (continued)

| Flooding Source | Channel "n" | Overbank " $\mathbf{n}$ " |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Davenport Creek Tributary No. 2 | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| East City Canal | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| East City Canal Tributary 1 | $0.025-0.11$ | $0.035-0.11$ |
| Mill Slough in City of Kissimmee | 0.04 | 0.50 |
| Mill Slough in Osceola County <br> (Unincorporated Areas) | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| Peg Horn Slough | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Reedy Creek | 0.030 | 0.020 |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 1 | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 2 | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Reedy Creek Tributary No. 3 | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| Shingle Creek | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| St. Johns River | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| West Branch Shingle Creek* | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| West City Canal | $0.025-0.17$ | $0.03-0.18$ |
| WPA Canal | $0.025-0.095$ | $0.025-0.095$ |
| WPA Canal Tributary 1 | 0.025 | $0.045-0.095$ |
| WPA Canal Tributary 1-1 | Bres |  |

*Includes West Branch Shingle Creek Tributary listed separately in previous FIS reports

Flood profiles were drawn showing the computed water-surface elevations for floods of the selected recurrence intervals.

The hydraulic analyses for this study were based on unobstructed flow. The flood elevations shown on the Flood Profiles (Exhibit 1) are thus considered valid only if hydraulic structures remain unobstructed, operate properly, and do not fail.

### 3.2.1 Methods for Flooding Sources with New or Revised Analyses in Current Study

Water-surface profiles for the $10-$, $2-$, 1 - and 0.2 -percent-annual-chance recurrence intervals were computed for detailed analyses, and the water-surface profile for the 1-percent-annual-chance recurrence interval was computed for approximate analyses. The USACE HEC-RAS step-backwater computer program version 4.0 was utilized for hydraulic analyses of Bass Slough (Lower Reach), Bass Slough (Upper Reach), Bass Slough Tributary, WPA Canal Tributary 1,

## Revised Analyses for Countywide FIS

Cross sections were obtained from a variety of sources. The primary source was new field surveys. Other cross sections were obtained from the South Florida Water Management District and from the previous FISs.

Water-surface elevations of floods of the selected recurrence intervals were computed using the USACE UNET one-dimensional, unsteady flow and HEC-2 water-surface profile computer programs; UNET was used for C-33 Canal, Canoe Creek (C-34 Canal), East City Canal, West City Canal, and Lakes Center, Gentry, Joel, Lizzie, Myrtle, and Preston and Alligator, Brick, Coon, and Trout Lakes; HEC-2 was used for Davenport Creek, Davenport Creek Tributary No. 1, Davenport Creek Tributary No. 2, Peg Horn Slough, Reedy Creek Tributary No. 1, Reedy Creek Tributary No. 2, and Reedy Creek Tributary No. 3, Shingle Creek, West Branch Shingle Creek, West Branch Shingle Creek Tributary, and WPA Canal (References 25 and 28). For the St. Johns River, the hydraulic analyses were taken from The Mean Annual, 10-Year, 25-Year, and 100-Year Flood Profiles for the Upper St. Johns River Under Existing Conditions (Reference 19). Starting water-surface elevations for streams were taken to be normal depth; for lakes, the highest operating elevations specified by the South Florida Water Management District were used (Reference 19).

Gage data for historical storm events was used for calibration and verification of the UNET and HEC-2 models. Gage data were obtained from the South Florida Water Management District and the USGS (References 29 and 30). USGS gages were used for the Alligator Chain of Lakes at the S-60 spillway on the C-33 Canal (ID 02260800); at the S-57 culvert on the C-30 Canal (ID 02261500); on the east shore of Cypress Lake near the mouth of Canoe Creek (ID 02266600); on Shingle Creek at the Kissimmee Airport (ID 02263800); on Shingle Creek at Campbell (ID 02264495); and on Davenport Creek near Loughman (ID 02266480). South Florida Water Management District gages were used on the Kissimmee East-West Canal (ID KISSD-H and KISSD-E).

### 3.3 Vertical Datum

All FIS reports and FIRMs are referenced to a specific vertical datum. The vertical datum provides a starting point against which flood, ground, and structure elevations can be referenced and compared. Until recently, the standard vertical datum used for newly created or revised FIS reports and FIRMs was the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD). With the completion of the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD), many FIS reports and FIRMs are now prepared using NAVD as the referenced vertical datum.

All flood elevations shown in this FIS report and on the FIRM are referenced to the NAVD. These flood elevations must be compared to structure and ground elevations referenced to the same vertical datum. It is important to note that adjacent counties may be referenced to NGVD, which may result in differences in base flood elevations across county lines.

No floodway was computed Davenport Creek Tributary 1, Davenport Creek Tributary 2, St. Johns River, and Tributary No. 1.

Near the confluence of streams studied in detail, floodway computations were made without regard to flood elevations on the receiving water body. Therefore, "Without Floodway" elevations presented in Table 8, "Floodway Data," for certain downstream cross sections of Bass Slough Tributary, East City Canal Tributary 1, Reedy Creek Tributary No. 1, Reedy Creek Tributary No. 2, Shingle Creek, West City Canal, WPA Canal Tributary 1, and WPA Canal Tributary 1-1 are lower than the regulatory flood elevations in that area, which must take into account the 1-percent-annual-chance flooding due to backwater from other sources.

Encroachment into areas subject to inundation by floodwaters having hazardous velocities aggravates the risk of flood damage and heightens potential flood hazards by further increasing velocities. A listing of stream velocities at selected cross sections is provided in Table 8. To reduce the risk of property damage in areas where the stream velocities are high, the community may wish to restrict development in areas outside the floodway.

The area between the floodway and 1-percent-annual-chance floodplain boundaries is termed the floodway fringe. The floodway fringe encompasses the portion of the floodplain that could be completely obstructed without increasing the water-surface elevation (WSEL) of the base flood more than 1 foot at any point. Typical relationships between the floodway and the floodway fringe and their significance to floodplain development are shown in Figure 1.





## LOOD HAZARD INFORMATION

SEE FIS REPPRT FOR DETALIED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP
FOR DRAFT TRMM PANELLAYOUT

| SPECIAL FLOODHAZARD AREAS |  | Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) Zone A, V, A99 <br> With BFE or Depth Zone AE, AO, AH, VE, AR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | VCIL | Regulatry Floodway |
| other areas of FLOOD HAZARD |  | 0.2\% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas 1\% annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage areas of less than one square mile Zon |
|  | NHE | Future Condition $1 \%$ Annual Chance Flood hazard zone |
|  | COLA | Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee See Notes Zone $X$ |
|  | 21/1. | Area with flood Risk due to Levee zor |
| other areas | NO SCREEN | Area of Minimal Flood Hazard Zone $X$ <br> Effective LOMRs |
|  |  | ea of Undetermined F |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { GEENERAL } \\ \text { STRUCTURES } \end{gathered}$ | ------- | Channe, Culvert, or Storm Sew |
|  |  | Levee, Dike, or Flodwall |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { OTHER } \\ \text { FEATURES } \end{gathered}$ |  | Cross Sections with 1\% Annual Chance Water Surface Elevation Coastal Transect |
|  |  | Coastal Transect Baseline |
|  |  | Hydrographic eeature |
|  | \%mp | Base Flood Elevation Line (BFE) |
|  |  | Limit of Study |
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## MAP LEGEND

| Area of Interest (AOI) | $\square$ | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area of Interest (AOI) | $\square$ | C/D |
| Soils | $\square$ | D |
| Soil Rating Polygons |  |  |
| A | $\square$ | Not rated or not available |
| A/D | Water Fe | ures |
| B | $\sim$ | Streams and Canals |
|  | Transportation |  |
| B/D | H+ | Rails |
| C | ~ | Interstate Highways |
| C/D | - | US Routes |
| D | $\approx$ | Major Roads |
| Not rated or not available | D) | Local Roads |
| Soil Rating Lines | Background |  |
| $\cdots$ A |  | Aerial Photography |
| $\cdots$ A/D |  |  |
| $\cdots$ B |  |  |
| $\cdots B / D$ |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{C}$ |  |  |
| $\cdots \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}$ |  |  |
| $\cdots$ D |  |  |
| * Not rated or not available |  |  |
| Soil Rating Points |  |  |
| $\square \quad \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |
| $\square \quad \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{D}$ |  |  |
| $\square \quad \mathrm{B}$ |  |  |
| - B/D |  |  |

## MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:20,000.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey URL
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Osceola County, Florida
Survey Area Data: Version 18, Jun 9, 2020
Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Feb 2, 2020—Mar 13, 2020

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

## Hydrologic Soil Group

| Map unit symbol | Map unit name | Rating | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | Candler sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes | A | 71.4 | 62.3\% |
| 8 | Candler sand, 5 to 12 percent slopes | A | 36.7 | 32.0\% |
| 15 | Hontoon muck, frequently ponded, 0 to 1 percent slopes | A/D | 1.3 | 1.1\% |
| 34 | Pomello fine sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes | A | 2.2 | 1.9\% |
| 37 | Pompano fine sand, frequently ponded, 0 to 1 percent slopes | A/D | 3.1 | 2.7\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  |  | 114.6 | 100.0\% |

## Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group $D$ are assigned to dual classes.

## Rating Options

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition

Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified
Tie-break Rule: Higher

## Appendix F <br> Existing and Future Land Use Map



## Appendix G

Correspondence

From: Rick Cole [Rick.Cole@osceola.org](mailto:Rick.Cole@osceola.org)
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Joshua DeVries [Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG](mailto:Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG)
Cc: Susan E Gosselin [susan.gosselin@OSCEOLA.ORG](mailto:susan.gosselin@OSCEOLA.ORG); David Dangel [ddangel@inwoodinc.com](mailto:ddangel@inwoodinc.com)
Subject: RE: Old Lake Wilson Road History of Flooding

Josh,

Road \& Bridge has no history of flooding within the project limits shown on the map. Thank you

## Rick Cole

Road \& Bridge Assistant Director
Osceola County Florida
O: (407) 742-7500
F: (407) 891-1795
rick.cole@osceola.org
www.osceola.org

From: Joshua DeVries [Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG](mailto:Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG)
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 1:44 PM
To: Rick Cole [Rick.Cole@osceola.org](mailto:Rick.Cole@osceola.org)
Cc: Susan E Gosselin [susan.gosselin@OSCEOLA.ORG](mailto:susan.gosselin@OSCEOLA.ORG); David Dangel [ddangel@inwoodinc.com](mailto:ddangel@inwoodinc.com)
Subject: FW: Old Lake Wilson Road History of Flooding

Rick,

Susan mentioned that you might be able to assist with the below highlighted question asking us to verify that there is no history of flooding within the project limits. I have attached a map showing the project limits in blue. Any assistance is greatly appreciated.

Thank You,

## Joshua DeVries, AICP

Director of Planning / Sr. Planner
Department of Transportation and Transit
Osceola County Government
1 Courthouse Square, Suite 3100
Kissimmee, FL 34741
Phone: 407.742.7813
Fax: 407.742.0204
Joshua.DeVries@Osceola.org

From: David Dangel [ddangel@inwoodinc.com](mailto:ddangel@inwoodinc.com)
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:55 AM
To: Joshua DeVries [Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG](mailto:Joshua.Devries@OSCEOLA.ORG)
Subject: FW: Old Lake Wilson Road History of Flooding

# [EXTERNAL EMAIL] - This email originates outside of Osceola County Government. Do not 

 click links or open attachments unless you recognize and confirm the sender's email address. If you are unsure if an email is safe or not, please forward the email to itsecurity@osceola.orgJosh,

Please see the question below from PGA. Is there someone at the County that would be good for them to contact about any kind of flooding history on Old Lake Wilson Road?

David

From: Jen Rehrl [Jen.Rehrl@patelgreene.com](mailto:Jen.Rehrl@patelgreene.com)
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:39 AM
To: David Dangel [ddangel@inwoodinc.com](mailto:ddangel@inwoodinc.com)
Cc: Michael Holt <Michael.Holt@ patelgreene.com>
Subject: Old Lake Wilson Road History of Flooding

Good morning, David,

I am working on the Old Lake Wilson Road LHR and PSR. We received a comment during our QC that we need to contact Osceola County to verify that there is no history of flooding within the project limits. Do you have a contact at the County that could help answer this question (we will copy you on our email to the County to keep you in the loop)? If you would prefer to email the County directly, that would work too.

Thanks for your help.

Jennifer Rehrl
Engineer Intern II
Patel, Greene \& Associates, LLC (PGA)
280 W. Canton Avenue, Suite 400, Winter Park, FL 32789
Office: (407) 720-7420, Ext. 408 | Cell: (863) 242-6029 | Email: Jen.Rehrl@patelgreene.com
Follow PGA on Social Media
Website Facebook Linkedln Twitter Instagram

Please Note: Florida has a very broad Public Records Law. E-mails to this entity or its employees may be considered a public record. Your email communication, including your email address may be disclosed to the public and media at any time.

[^2]
## Appendix H <br> Bridge Inspection Report July 2020 and NBID Documentation

Bridge Inspection Report July 2020

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM <br> Inspection/CIDR Report with PDF attachment(s) Inspection 

Structure ID: 924147
DISTRICT: D5 - Deland
INSPECTION DATE: 7/20/2020 LKSP

BY: Ayres Associates
OWNER: 2 County Hwy Agency
MAINTAINED BY: 2 County Hwy Agency
STRUCTURE TYPE: 3 Steel-19 Culvert
LOCATION: 0.8 Mile North of CR-532
SERV. TYPE ON: 1 Highway
SERV. TYPE UNDER: 5 Waterway

STRUCTURE NAME: 4-11×7.5×42 CMPC<br>YEAR BUILT: 1954<br>SECTION NO.: 92570000<br>MP: 0.806<br>ROUTE: 00545<br>FACILITY CARRIED: Old Lake Wilson Rd FEATURE INTERSECTED: Davenport Creek

TYPE OF INSPECTION: Regular NBI
DATE FIELD INSPECTION WAS PERFORMED: ABOVE WATER: 7/20/2020 UNDERWATER: 7/20/2020


## FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

BRIDGE LOCATION MAP


West Elevation


Old Lake Wilson Rd over Davenport Creek
0.8 Mile North of CR-532
(4-11x7.5x42 CMPC)

## FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

SKETCHES AND PHOTOS


Photo 1: Element 8290: Build up in Pipe 1


Photo 2: Element 8477: Sand cement rip rap bags missing from the east headwall at Pipe 1

## FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

SKETCHES AND PHOTOS


Photo 3: Element 8477: Missing bags from the west headwall between Pipes 3 and 4


Photo 4: Element 8477: Settled sand cement rip rap bags in the east headwall over Pipe 1

## FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

SKETCHES AND PHOTOS


Photo 5: Element 8477: Vegetation growing through the joints of the west headwall


Photo 6: Element 240: Delaminative corrosion on pipes sidewalls and connecting hardware and failed bituminous/galvanized coatings of pipes

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT 

SKETCHES AND PHOTOS


Photo 7: Element 240: Corrosion hole at the east end of Pipe 3


Photo 8: Inspection Notes: Crack in the asphalt surfacing over and approaching the structure

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT 



Photo 9: Inspection Notes: Washout in the west asphalt mowing strip


Photo 10: Inspection Notes: Depression over Wall 4 in the asphalt mowing strip

SCOUR EVALUATION
LEFT SIDE

|  |  | ORIGINAL | PREVIOUS | CURRENT | CHANGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $12 / 18 / 90$ | $07 / 30 / 18$ | $07 / 20 / 20$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wall 1 |  |  | 3.6 | 3.8 | -0.2 |
| C/L of Pipe 1 |  |  | 4.5 | 3.9 | 0.7 |
| Wall 2 |  | 5.8 | 5.9 | 4.9 | 1.0 |
| C/L of Pipe 2 |  |  | 5.5 | 5.6 | 0.6 |
| Wall 3 |  | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.8 | -0.3 |
| C/L of Pipe 3 |  |  | 8.0 | 7.2 | 0.1 |
| Wall 4 |  | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
| C/L of Pipe 4 |  |  | 7.9 | 7.5 | 0.4 |
| Wall 5 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Waterline at C/L of Pipe 3 | 7.0 | 5.1 | 6.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

RIGHT SIDE

|  |  | ORIGINAL | PREVIOUS | CURRENT | CHANGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $12 / 18 / 90$ | $07 / 30 / 18$ | $07 / 20 / 20$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wall 1 |  |  | 3.8 | 3.6 | 0.2 |
| C/L of Pipe 1 |  | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 0.2 |
| Wall 2 |  | 4.5 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| C/L of Pipe 2 |  |  | 6.5 | 3.4 | 3.1 |
| Wall 3 |  | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 0.5 |
| C/L of Pipe 3 |  |  | 7.4 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| Wall 4 |  | 5.8 | 7.4 | 7.6 | -0.2 |
| C/L of Pipe 4 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.5 | -0.5 |
| Wall 5 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Waterline at C/L of Pipe 3 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Negative Change = Degradation; Positive Change = Aggradation
The Degradation/Aggradation measurements for this bridge do not indicate significant difference from the last inspection
All measurements are in feet.
Measurement Reference : Top of Sand-Cement Rip Rap Bags

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <br> BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT 

SCOUR EVALUATION


RIGHT SIDE SOUNDINGS


Relative Channel Plots Are Not To Scale.
Any Vertical Curvature Of Datum Point Is Not Reflective In Plot.

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM <br> BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT 

SCOUR EVALUATION


Channel Looking West


Channel Looking East

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT 

## FIELD PREPARATION

A. Tools and Equipment

| Full Size Cargo Van: Automobile: | Yes: |  | No: No: | $\frac{x}{x}$ | Pick-up Truck: | Yes: | X | No |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camera: | Yes: | $\underline{\bar{X}}$ | No: |  | Video: | Yes: |  |  |  |  |
| NDT Equipment: | Yes: | - | No: | $\underline{X}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NDT Type: N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Binoculars: | Yes: |  | No: | X |  |  | Current: < 1 fps |  |  |  |
| Diving Performed: | Yes: | X | No: |  | Max Depth: $\underline{2}^{2.6 \mathrm{ft}}$. |  |  |  |  |  |

Dive Mode: N/A
Hand Tools: (i.e. Chipping Hammer, 6' Ruler, etc.)

1. Standard Inspection Tools
2. Flashlights
3. Inspection Hand Tools

Other: $\qquad$
B. Services

Flag Crew: N/A
Electrician: N/A

Scheduling (Brief Explanation)
2. Chipping Hammers
4. Carpenter Ruler

Snooper: N/A
Other: N/A

Topside with Underwater:
Topside Hours: 2 hrs. Underwater Hours: 0 hrs. Travel Time: 2 hrs.
D. Site Conditions

Boat Needed: NO Type of Boat: N/A

Location of Boat Ramp: N/A
Lengthy Travel Required: NO
Difficult Access: NO
Water Obviously Polluted: NO
Water quality is fair (partially meets use): YES
Strong Water Current: NO
Other: NONE
E. UNDERWATER ELEMENTS INSPECTED:

N/A

NBID Documentation

## Old Lake Wilson Rd over Davenport Creek



## Facts

Source: National Bridge Inventory. Information not verified; use at your own risk.
Name: Old Lake Wilson Rd over Davenport Creek
Structure number: 924147
Location: $\quad$ 0.8 Mile North of CR-532
Purpose: Carries highway over waterway
Route classification: Minor Arterial (Urban) [16]
Length of largest span: 11.5 ft . [3.5 m]
Total length:
57.4 ft . [17.5 m]

Owner:
County Highway Agency [02]
Year built:
1954
Historic significance: Bridge is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places [5]
Design load: MS 18 / HS 20 [5]
Number of main spans: 4
Main spans material: Steel [3]
Main spans design: Culvert [19]
Deck type: Not applicable [N]

## Latest Available Inspection: July 2018

Good/Fair/Poor Fair
Condition:
Open, no restriction [A]
Average daily 8,419 [as of 2014]
traffic:
Truck traffic: 5\% of total traffic
Structural
appraisal:
Water
adequacy Equal to present minimum criteria [6]
appraisal:
Roadway
alignment appraisal:
Channel Bank protection is being eroded. River control devices and/or embankment have major damage.
protection: Trees and rush restrict the channel. [5] Moderate to major deterioration or disintegration, extensive cracking and leaching or spalls on
concrete or masonry walls and slabs. Minor settlement or misalignment. Noticeable scouring or $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { Moderate to major deterioration or disintegration, extensive cracking and leaching or spalls on } \\ \text { culvert } & \text { concrete or masonry walls and slabs. Minor settlement or misalignment. Noticeable scouring or }\end{array}$
condition: erosion at curtain walls, wingwalls or pipes. Metal culverts have significant distortion and deflection in one section, significant corrosion or deep pitting. [5]
Scour condition: Sufficiency rating: Bridge foundations determined to be stable for assessed or calculated scour condition. [5]
Somewhat better than minimum adequacy to tolerate being left in place as is [5]

Better than present minimum criteria [7]

## Previous Inspections

| Date | Condition | Culvert Condition | ADT |  | Suff. Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July 2018 | Fair | 5 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.4 |  |
| July 2016 | Fair | 5 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.4 |  |
| July 2014 | Fair | 5 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.4 |  |
| July 2012 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 96.8 |  |
| July 2010 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 96.8 |  |
| July 2008 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 76.1 |  |
| July 2006 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.2 |  |
| July 2004 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.2 |  |
| July 2002 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8419 | 85.2 |  |
| July 2000 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8364 | 85.2 |  |
| July 1998 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 8309 | 83.2 |  |
| July 1996 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 9165 | 83.3 |  |
| July 1994 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 4000 | 85.2 |  |
| July 1992 | Fair | 6 out of 10 | 4000 | 86.5 |  |
| October 1991 | Good | 7 out of 10 | 3600 | 86.7 |  |
| BridgeReports.com: National Bridge Inventory data |  |  |  |  |  |
| [ Locations $\mid$ Search $\mid$ Cities $\mid$ About $\mid$ Bridgehunter.com ] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disclaimer: All data is taken from the National Bridge Inventory and has not been verified. This page's URL is http://bridgereports.com/1088934 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix I CROSS DRAIN CALCULATIONS

FDEP Permit No. 0187636-003-El (I-4 BtU) project

## C.2.7 <br> CD-17

Prepared By:
FDOTY

|  | 99.99 | 99.99 | 99.8 |  | 99 | 98 |  | 95 | 90 |  | 80 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 10.5 |  | 0.10 .05 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \# | + |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Exis | sting |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | $\cdots$ | - |  | + |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | - | , |  | $\cdots$ | - | - |  |  |  |
| 5 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | , | , |  | - | , |  | - | - | - |  | , | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  | , |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ---2 |
|  |  | ${ }^{-}$ |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q (cfs) |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 | $\mathrm{yr}=3$ | 370.0 | .0 cfs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + |  | $\cdots$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | - | - | +1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | , |  | , | $\square$ |  |
| 6 |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | $\mathrm{yr}=$ | $=288$ | 8.8 C | cfs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | 恝 |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  | - | , |  |  |  |  |
|  | , |  | \% | - |  |  | $7$ |  |  | $\mathrm{yr}=$ | = 250. | . 0 cf | cs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | , |  | $\cdots$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |  | + | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Freq | quen | ncy (\%) | (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 111 | 1111 | 1111 | 1111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $0.01$ | $0.050 .1$ |  | 0.5 | , |  |  | 5 | 10 |  | 20 |  |  |  | $-1710$ |  |  |  |  | 90 |  |  |  | $88 \quad 99$ | 99 | 99.8 | 99.9 | 99.99 |  |

## Crossing Discharge Data

Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow
Minimum Flow: 250 cfs
Design Flow: 288.8 cfs
Maximum Flow: 370 cfs

Table 37 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: EX. CD-17

| Headwater Elevation <br> (ft) | Total Discharge (cfs) | EX CD17 Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93.45 | 250.00 | 250.00 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 93.73 | 262.00 | 262.00 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 94.00 | 274.00 | 273.36 | 0.16 | 35 |
| 94.07 | 286.00 | 275.84 | 9.79 | 8 |
| 94.08 | 288.80 | 276.23 | 12.04 | 4 |
| 94.14 | 310.00 | 278.17 | 31.52 | 6 |
| 94.17 | 322.00 | 279.57 | 41.85 | 4 |
| 94.20 | 334.00 | 280.90 | 52.66 | 4 |
| 94.23 | 346.00 | 282.15 | 63.53 | 4 |
| 94.25 | 358.00 | 283.25 | 74.50 | 4 |
| 94.27 | 370.00 | 284.21 | 85.60 | 4 |
| 94.00 | 273.19 | 273.19 | 0.00 | Overtopping |

## Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: EX. CD-17



Table 38 - Culvert Summary Table: EX CD17

| Total Discharg e (cfs) | Culvert Discharg e (cfs) | Headwat er Elevatio n (ft) | Inlet Control Depth (ft) | Outlet Control Depth (ft) | Flow Type | Normal Depth (ft) | Critical Depth (ft) | Outlet Depth (ft) | Tailwate r Depth (ft) | Outlet Velocity (ft/s) | Tailwate $r$ Velocity (ft/s) | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 250.00 | 250.00 | 93.45 | 5.306 | 5.408 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.844 | 2.844 | 1.800 | 9.953 | 0.000 |  |
| 262.00 | 262.00 | 93.73 | 5.593 | 5.688 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.904 | 2.904 | 1.800 | 10.235 | 0.000 | Straight Culvert |
| 274.00 | 273.36 | 94.00 | 5.878 | 5.964 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.957 | 2.957 | 1.800 | 10.509 | 0.000 | Outlet Elevation (invert): 87.79 ft |
| 286.00 | 275.84 | 94.07 | 5.943 | 6.025 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.968 | 2.968 | 1.800 | 10.570 | 0.000 | Culvert Length: 127.00 ft , Culvert Slope: 0.0020 |
| 288.80 | 276.23 | 94.08 | 5.953 | 6.034 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ c \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.970 | 2.970 | 1.800 | 10.579 | 0.000 | Culvert Slope. 0.0020 |
| 310.00 | 278.17 | 94.14 | 6.003 | 6.102 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.978 | 2.978 | 1.800 | 10.627 | 0.000 |  |
| 322.00 | 279.57 | 94.17 | 6.040 | 6.132 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.985 | 2.985 | 1.800 | 10.662 | 0.000 |  |
| 334.00 | 280.90 | 94.20 | 6.075 | 6.159 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.990 | 2.990 | 1.800 | 10.695 | 0.000 |  |
| 346.00 | 282.15 | 94.23 | 6.109 | 6.186 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.996 | 2.996 | 1.800 | 10.727 | 0.000 |  |
| 358.00 | 283.25 | 94.25 | 6.138 | 6.210 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ c \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.001 | 3.001 | 1.800 | 10.754 | 0.000 |  |
| 370.00 | 284.21 | 94.27 | 6.164 | 6.234 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ c \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.005 | 3.005 | 1.800 | 10.779 | 0.000 |  |

## Culvert Performance Curve Plot: EX CD17



## Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: EX CD17



S

Inlet Station: U.UU tt
Inlet Elevation: 88.04 ft
Outlet Station: 127.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 87.79 ft
Number of Barrels: 3

## Culvert Data Summary - EX CD17

Barrel Shape: Circular
Barrel Diameter: 3.50 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in
Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: Square Edge with Headwall
Inlet Depression: NONE

Table 39 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: EX. CD-17)

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 250.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 262.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 274.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 286.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 288.80 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 310.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 322.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 334.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 346.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 358.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| 370.00 | 89.59 | 1.80 |

Tailwater Channel Data - EX. CD-17
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 89.59 ft

## Roadway Data for Crossing: EX. CD-17

Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 200.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 94.00 ft
Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 47.00 ft



## Crossing Discharge Data

Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow
Minimum Flow: 244.2 cfs
Design Flow: 282.2 cfs
Maximum Flow: 368 cfs

Table 40 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: PR. CD-17

| Headwater Elevation <br> (ft) | Total Discharge (cfs) | PR CD17 Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93.38 | 244.20 | 244.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 93.71 | 256.58 | 256.58 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 94.01 | 268.96 | 268.96 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 94.33 | 281.34 | 281.34 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 94.35 | 282.20 | 282.20 | 0.00 | 1 |
| 94.97 | 306.10 | 305.12 | 0.64 | 28 |
| 95.03 | 318.48 | 307.47 | 10.48 | 7 |
| 95.07 | 330.86 | 309.10 | 21.45 | 6 |
| 95.10 | 343.24 | 310.35 | 32.53 | 5 |
| 95.14 | 355.62 | 311.46 | 43.53 | 4 |
| 95.16 | 368.00 | 312.51 | 55.01 | 4 |
| 94.96 | 304.69 | 304.69 | 0.00 | Overtopping |

## Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: PR. CD-17



Table 41 - Culvert Summary Table: PR CD17

| Total Discharg e (cfs) | Culvert Discharg e (cfs) | Headwat er Elevatio n (ft) | Inlet Control Depth (ft) | Outlet Control Depth (ft) | Flow Type | Normal Depth (ft) | Critical Depth (ft) | Outlet Depth (ft) | Tailwate r Depth (ft) | Outlet Velocity (ft/s) | Tailwate $r$ Velocity (ft/s) | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244.20 | 244.20 | 93.38 | 5.173 | 5.343 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.813 | 2.813 | 1.840 | 9.820 | 0.000 |  |
| 256.58 | 256.58 | 93.71 | 5.462 | 5.669 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.877 | 2.877 | 1.840 | 10.107 | 0.000 | Straight Culvert |
| 268.96 | 268.96 | 94.01 | 5.766 | 5.972 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.937 | 2.937 | 1.840 | 10.402 | 0.000 | Outlet Elevation (invert): 87.74 ft |
| 281.34 | 281.34 | 94.33 | 6.087 | 6.287 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.992 | 2.992 | 1.840 | 10.707 | 0.000 | Culvert Length: 149.90 ft , Culvert Slope: 0.0020 |
| 282.20 | 282.20 | 94.35 | 6.110 | 6.306 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ c \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 2.996 | 2.996 | 1.840 | 10.728 | 0.000 | Culvert Slope. 0.0020 |
| 306.10 | 305.12 | 94.97 | 6.749 | 6.931 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.087 | 3.087 | 1.840 | 11.321 | 0.000 |  |
| 318.48 | 307.47 | 95.03 | 6.818 | 6.988 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.096 | 3.096 | 1.840 | 11.384 | 0.000 |  |
| 330.86 | 309.10 | 95.07 | 6.866 | 7.030 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.102 | 3.102 | 1.840 | 11.428 | 0.000 |  |
| 343.24 | 310.35 | 95.10 | 6.903 | 7.065 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 7-M2 } \\ \text { c } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.106 | 3.106 | 1.840 | 11.462 | 0.000 |  |
| 355.62 | 311.46 | 95.14 | 6.936 | 7.096 | $\begin{gathered} 7-\mathrm{M} 2 \\ \mathrm{c} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.110 | 3.110 | 1.840 | 11.492 | 0.000 |  |
| 368.00 | 312.51 | 95.16 | 6.967 | 7.125 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 7-M2 } \\ c \end{gathered}$ | 3.500 | 3.114 | 3.114 | 1.840 | 11.521 | 0.000 |  |

## Culvert Performance Curve Plot: PR CD17



## Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: PR CD17



S

Inlet Statıon: U.UU tt
Inlet Elevation: 88.04 ft
Outlet Station: 149.90 ft
Outlet Elevation: 87.74 ft
Number of Barrels: 3

## Culvert Data Summary - PR CD17

Barrel Shape: Circular
Barrel Diameter: 3.50 ft
Barrel Material: Concrete
Embedment: 0.00 in
Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: Square Edge with Headwall
Inlet Depression: NONE

Table 42 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: PR. CD-17)

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244.20 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 256.58 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 268.96 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 281.34 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 282.20 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 306.10 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 318.48 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 330.86 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 343.24 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 355.62 | 89.59 | 1.84 |
| 368.00 | 89.59 | 1.84 |

Tailwater Channel Data - PR. CD-17
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 89.59 ft

## Roadway Data for Crossing: PR. CD-17

Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 200.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 94.96 ft
Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 117.00 ft

| Project: | $\underline{l-4 ~ B e y o n d ~ t h e ~ U l t i m a t e ~}$ | Design By: $\underline{M O L}$ | Date: $\underline{3 / 19 / 2018}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FDIP No.: | $\underline{431456-1}$ | Check by: REC | Date: $\underline{2 / 20 / 2018}$ |
| Subject: | $\underline{C D-17 ~ C u l v e r t ~ H y d r o l o g i c a l ~ A n a l y s i s ~(E x i s t i n g ~ \& ~ P r o p o s e d) ~}$ |  |  |

## Existing Culvert

Note: $\quad$ The existing culvert information was obtained from the existing survey. In DEP number 49-187636001, CD17 is named CD-1D. The tailwater elevation used matches the ICPR routing done with the permitted calculations for the SR 429 plans. The roadway elevation, at this location in the downstream end, is around 94.00 ft which is higher than the crown of pipe (tailwater) elevation. The crest length is 200 ft , the crest elevation is 94.00 NAVD and the top width is 47 ft . In the proposed condition the crest elevation is 94.96 NAVD and the top width is 117 ft .

## Method used:

## Rational Formula

Existing culvert information:


Estimate existing drainage area:
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Estimate existing drainage area: } \\ \begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { Runoff } \\ \text { coeff }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Sta } \\ \text { From }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Sta } \\ \text { To }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Sta } \\ \text { at Culvert }\end{array} & \text { Area } & \text { Slope (s) } \\ \text { (Ac) }\end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c}\text { Tc } \\ (\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft})\end{array} \\ \hline \text { (Note 1) } \\ \text { (mins) }\end{array}\right]$

Note 1: See Tc calculations.

## Estimate existing drainage discharge:

| Frequency <br> (yr) | rainfall (i) <br> (in/hr) | Storm Frequency Factor ( $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{CiA} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{T}} \\ \text { (Rational } \\ \text { Formula) } \\ \mathrm{cu} \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Normal Depth (Dn) (ft) | Tailwater <br> Existing <br> (Note 2) <br> (Navd) | HW Stage Existing (Note 3) (Navd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 1.83 | 1.20 | 250.0 |  |  | 93.45 |
| 100 | 2.03 | 1.25 | 288.8 |  |  | 94.08 |
| 500 |  |  | 370.0 |  |  | 94.27 |

Note 1: $Q_{500}$ has been extrapolated from Discharge vs Frequency graph
Note 2: $\quad D_{n}$ estimated from std channel geometry with side slopes 6 and 4, bott width $5^{\prime}$ and long slope $0.05 \%$. TW = Dn + Invert
Note 3: Values obtained from HY 8 model of existing pipe

## C-1691

| Project: | $\underline{l-4 ~ B e y o n d ~ t h e ~ U l t i m a t e ~}$ | Design By: $\underline{M O L}$ | Date: $\underline{3 / 19 / 2018}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FDIP No.: | $\underline{431456-1}$ | Check by: REC | Date: $\underline{2 / 20 / 2018}$ |
| Subject: | $\underline{C D-17 ~ C u l v e r t ~ H y d r o l o g i c a l ~ A n a l y s i s ~(E x i s t i n g ~ \& ~ P r o p o s e d) ~}$ |  |  |

## Proposed Culvert Replacement

Note: $\quad$ Culvert replacement span and rise to match existing
Proposed Information

|  | Length | Invert <br> (Navd) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upstream: |  | 88.04 |
| Downstream: |  | 87.74 |
| Total length of proposed culvert: | 149.9 ft |  |

## Estimate proposed drainage area:

|  | Runoff <br> coeff | Sta <br> From | Sta <br> To |  | Area <br> Note 1 <br> (Ac) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sotal (s) | Tc <br> (ft/ft) | (Note 1) <br> (mins) |  |  |  |  |
| Elev | 0.25 | $4328+64.79$ | $4363+37.00$ | 436.94 |  |  |
| Perv |  |  |  |  | 0.0064 | 187 |
| Wetland | 0.20 |  |  | 348.90 |  |  |
| Impv | 0.40 |  |  | 76.76 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11.28 |  |  |

Note 1: See Tc Calculations

## Estimate proposed discharge:

| Frequency | rainfall (i) | Factor <br> (Rational <br> Formula) | Q = CiA <br> (Rational <br> Formula) <br> $(\mathrm{cu} \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s})$ | Normal <br> Depth <br> $(\mathrm{Dn})$ <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Tailwater <br> Proposed <br> (Note 2) <br> (Navd) | HW Stage <br> (in/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 1.8 | 1.20 | 244.2 |  |  | (Noposed <br> (Navd) 3) |
| 100 | 2.0 | 1.25 | 282.2 |  |  | 93.38 |
| 500 |  |  | 368.0 |  |  | 95.35 |

Note 1: $Q_{500}$ has been extrapolated from Discharge vs Frequency graph
Note 2: $\quad D_{n}$ estimated from std channel geometry with side slopes 6 and 4, bott width 5 ' and long slope $0.05 \%$. TW = Dn + Invert
Note 3: Values obtained from HY 8 model of proposed extension pipe

## Flood Hydraulic Data Comparison

| Frequency <br> $(\mathrm{yr})$ | Existing <br> HW stage | Proposed <br> HW Stage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 93.45 | 93.38 |
| 100 | 94.08 | 94.35 |
| 500 | 94.27 | 95.16 |


| Overtopping |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing | Proposed |
| Elev (Navd) | 94.00 | 94.96 |
| Q* $^{*}$ (cfs) | 273.2 | 304.7 |
| Freq (Yr) | 91 | 147 |

* From HY 8 culvert analysis and Discharge vs Frequency graph


## C-1692



CROSS DRAIN CALCULATIONS

| Designed By: | J. Rehrl |
| :--- | :---: |
| Date: | $6 / 17 / 2022$ |
| Checked By: | M. Holt |
| Date: |  |

Subject:
Reconstruction of Old Lake Wilson Road (CR 545)
Cross Drain Analysis

## Structure Number:

Station:

## Existing Cross Drain

| Culvert Height/Pipe Size: (D | 3.50 ft | (42-in Pipe) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Culvert Depth: | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| Number of pipes: | 3 |  |
| Pipe Type: | RCP |  |
| Outfall: | Davenport Creek Tributary |  |
| Flow Direction: | East |  |
| Culvert Length: | 127.00 ft |  |
| Upstream Invert El.: | 88.04 ft |  |
| Downstream Invert El.: | 87.79 ft |  |
| Pipe Slope (ft/ft): | 0.0020 |  |
| Road Pop-Over El.: | 94.00 ft |  |
| Basin Pop-Over El.: | N/A | (Rough Approximation) |

## Proposed Cross Drain

| Culvert Height/Pipe Size: (D | 3.50 ft | (42-in Pipe) |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Culvert Depth: | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| Number of pipes: | 3 |  |
| Pipe Type: | RCP |  |
| Outfall: | Davenport Creek Tributary |  |
| Flow Direction: | East |  |
| Upstream End Treatment: | $\mathrm{ST}-\mathrm{EW}$ | (If using a metered-end section, enter MES as text) |
| Downstream End Treatment | $\mathrm{ST}-\mathrm{EW}$ | (If using a metered-end section, enter MES as text) |
| Culvert Length: | 151.00 ft |  |
| Upstream Invert El.: | 88.06 ft |  |
| Downstream Invert El.: | 87.77 ft |  |
| Pipe Slope (ft/ft): | 0.0019 |  |
| Road Pop-Over El.: | 94.96 ft | (Assumed 2" Asphalt-Overlay) |
| Basin Pop-Over El.: | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
| Proposed Typical Section: |  |  |
| Number of Lanes: | 4 |  |
| Lane Width: | 11.0 ft | (FDM 122.5.2.1) |
| Required Clear Zone: | 24.0 ft | (FDM 215.2.3, See FDM Table 215.2.1) |
| Median Width: | 37.5 ft |  |
| Additional Clearance: | 9.8 ft |  |

## HY-8 Culvert Analysis Report

## Crossing Discharge Data

Discharge Selection Method: Specify Minimum, Design, and Maximum Flow
Minimum Flow: 244.20 cfs
Design Flow: 282.20 cfs
Maximum Flow: 368.00 cfs
Table 1 - Summary of Culvert Flows at Crossing: CD-17

| Headwater <br> Elevation <br> (ft) | Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Exist CD-17 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Prop. CD-17 <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Roadway <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Iterations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 2 1}$ | 244.20 | 122.89 | 121.30 | 0.00 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 3 1}$ | 256.58 | 129.12 | 127.46 | 0.00 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 4 1}$ | 268.96 | 135.34 | 133.62 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 5 1}$ | 282.20 | 141.99 | 140.21 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 6 0}$ | 293.72 | 147.78 | 145.94 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 7 0}$ | 306.10 | 154.02 | 152.08 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 8 0}$ | 318.48 | 160.21 | 158.27 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 8 9}$ | 330.86 | 166.46 | 164.40 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 9 9}$ | 343.24 | 172.68 | 170.56 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 2 . 0 9}$ | 355.62 | 178.93 | 176.69 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 2 . 1 9}$ | 368.00 | 185.18 | 182.84 | 0.00 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 . 9 6}$ | 613.79 | 310.74 | 303.06 | 0.00 | Overtopping |

Rating Curve Plot for Crossing: CD-17

## Total Rating Curve

Crossing: CD-17


## Culvert Data: Exist CD-17

Table 2 - Culvert Summary Table: Exist CD-17

| Total <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Culvert <br> Discharge <br> (cfs) | Headwater <br> Elevation <br> (ft) | Inlet <br> Control Depth <br> (ft) | Outlet <br> Control Depth <br> (ft) | Flow Type | Normal Depth (ft) | Critical <br> Depth <br> (ft) | Outlet <br> Depth <br> (ft) | Tailwater Depth (ft) | Outlet <br> Velocity <br> (ft/s) | Tailwater <br> Velocity <br> (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244.20 cfs | 122.89 cfs | 91.21 | 3.00 | 3.174 | 2-M2c | 2.47 | 1.99 | 1.99 | 1.80 | 7.25 | 0.00 |
| 256.58 cfs | 129.12 cfs | 91.31 | 3.10 | 3.272 | 2-M2c | 2.57 | 2.04 | 2.04 | 1.80 | 7.38 | 0.00 |
| 268.96 cfs | 135.34 cfs | 91.41 | 3.19 | 3.369 | 2-M2c | 2.67 | 2.09 | 2.09 | 1.80 | 7.51 | 0.00 |
| 282.20 cfs | 141.99 cfs | 91.51 | 3.30 | 3.472 | 2-M2c | 2.80 | 2.15 | 2.15 | 1.80 | 7.65 | 0.00 |
| 293.72 cfs | 147.78 cfs | 91.60 | 3.39 | 3.562 | 7-M2c | 2.93 | 2.19 | 2.19 | 1.80 | 7.77 | 0.00 |
| 306.10 cfs | 154.02 cfs | 91.70 | 3.48 | 3.659 | 7-M2c | 3.11 | 2.24 | 2.24 | 1.80 | 7.89 | 0.00 |
| 318.48 cfs | 160.21 cfs | 91.80 | 3.58 | 3.756 | 7-M2c | 3.50 | 2.29 | 2.29 | 1.80 | 8.02 | 0.00 |
| 330.86 cfs | 166.46 cfs | 91.89 | 3.68 | 3.853 | 7-M2c | 3.50 | 2.33 | 2.33 | 1.80 | 8.15 | 0.00 |
| 343.24 cfs | 172.68 cfs | 91.99 | 3.79 | 3.951 | 7-M2c | 3.50 | 2.38 | 2.38 | 1.80 | 8.28 | 0.00 |
| 355.62 cfs | 178.93 cfs | 92.09 | 3.89 | 4.051 | 7-M2c | 3.50 | 2.42 | 2.42 | 1.80 | 8.41 | 0.00 |
| 368.00 cfs | 185.18 cfs | 92.19 | 4.00 | 4.151 | 7-M2c | 3.50 | 2.46 | 2.46 | 1.80 | 8.53 | 0.00 |

## Culvert Barrel Data

Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert
Inlet Elevation (invert): 88.04 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 87.79 ft
Culvert Length: 127.00 ft ,
Culvert Slope: 0.0020

## Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Exist CD-17

## Performance Curve

Culvert: Exist CD-17


Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: Exist CD-17
Crossing - CD-17, Design Discharge - 282.2 cfs
Culvert - Exist CD-17, Culvert Discharge - 142.0 cfs


## Site Data - Exist CD-17

Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 88.04 ft
Outlet Station: 127.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 87.79 ft
Number of Barrels: 3

## Culvert Data Summary - Exist CD-17

Barrel Shape: Circular
Barrel Diameter: 3.50 ft
Barrel Material:
Embedment: 0.00 in
Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120
Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: Square Edge with Headwall ( $\mathrm{Ke}=0.5$ )
Inlet Depression: None

## Culvert Data: Prop. CD-17

Table 3 - Culvert Summary Table: Prop. CD-17

| Total <br> Discharge (cfs) | Culvert Discharge (cfs) | Headwater Elevation (ft) | Inlet Control Depth (ft) | Outlet Control Depth <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flow } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Normal Depth <br> (ft) | Critical Depth (ft) | Outlet Depth (ft) | Tailwater Depth (ft) | Outlet Velocity (ft/s) | Tailwater Velocity (ft/s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 244.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 121.30 cfs | 91.21 | 2.98 | 3.154 | $\begin{aligned} & 2- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 2.47 | 1.98 | 1.98 | 1.80 | 7.21 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 256.58 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 127.46 cfs | 91.31 | 3.07 | 3.251 | $\begin{aligned} & 2- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 2.57 | 2.03 | 2.03 | 1.80 | 7.34 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 268.96 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 133.62 cfs | 91.41 | 3.17 | 3.349 | $\begin{aligned} & 2- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 2.67 | 2.08 | 2.08 | 1.80 | 7.47 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 282.20 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 140.21 cfs | 91.51 | 3.27 | 3.452 | $\begin{aligned} & 2- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 2.80 | 2.13 | 2.13 | 1.80 | 7.61 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 293.72 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 145.94 cfs | 91.60 | 3.36 | 3.542 | $\begin{aligned} & 7- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 2.93 | 2.18 | 2.18 | 1.80 | 7.73 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 306.10 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 152.08 cfs | 91.70 | 3.45 | 3.639 | $\begin{aligned} & 7- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.11 | 2.23 | 2.23 | 1.80 | 7.85 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 318.48 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 158.27 cfs | 91.80 | 3.55 | 3.736 | $\begin{aligned} & 7- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 2.27 | 2.27 | 1.80 | 7.98 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 330.86 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 164.40 cfs | 91.89 | 3.65 | 3.834 | $\begin{aligned} & 7- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 2.32 | 2.32 | 1.80 | 8.11 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 343.24 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 170.56 cfs | 91.99 | 3.75 | 3.932 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7- } \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 2.36 | 2.36 | 1.80 | 8.23 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 355.62 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 176.69 cfs | 92.09 | 3.85 | 4.031 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7- } \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 1.80 | 8.36 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 368.00 \\ & \text { cfs } \end{aligned}$ | 182.84 cfs | 92.19 | 3.96 | 4.131 | $\begin{aligned} & 7- \\ & \text { M2c } \end{aligned}$ | 3.50 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 1.80 | 8.49 | 0.00 |

## Culvert Barrel Data

Culvert Barrel Type Straight Culvert
Inlet Elevation (invert): 88.06 ft ,
Outlet Elevation (invert): 87.77 ft
Culvert Length: 151.00 ft ,
Culvert Slope: 0.0019

Culvert Performance Curve Plot: Prop. CD-17


Water Surface Profile Plot for Culvert: Prop. CD-17
Crossing - CD-17, Design Discharge - 282.2 cfs
Culvert - Prop. CD-17, Culvert Discharge - 140.2 cfs


Site Data - Prop. CD-17
Site Data Option: Culvert Invert Data
Inlet Station: 0.00 ft
Inlet Elevation: 88.06 ft
Outlet Station: 151.00 ft
Outlet Elevation: 87.77 ft
Number of Barrels: 3
Culvert Data Summary - Prop. CD-17
Barrel Shape: Circular
Barrel Diameter: 3.50 ft
Barrel Material:
Embedment: 0.00 in
Barrel Manning's n: 0.0120

Culvert Type: Straight
Inlet Configuration: Square Edge with Headwall ( $\mathrm{Ke}=0.5$ )
Inlet Depression: None
Tailwater Data for Crossing: CD-17
Table 4 - Downstream Channel Rating Curve (Crossing: CD-17)

| Flow (cfs) | Water Surface Elev (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 244.20 | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 6 . 5 8}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8 . 9 6}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 8 2 . 2 0}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 9 3 . 7 2}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 6 . 1 0}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 1 8 . 4 8}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 3 0 . 8 6}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 3 . 2 4}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 5 . 6 2}$ | 89.59 | 1.80 |
|  | 89.59 | 1.80 |

Tailwater Channel Data - CD-17
Tailwater Channel Option: Enter Constant Tailwater Elevation
Constant Tailwater Elevation: 89.59 ft
Roadway Data for Crossing: CD-17
Roadway Profile Shape: Constant Roadway Elevation
Crest Length: 200.00 ft
Crest Elevation: 94.96 ft
Roadway Surface: Paved
Roadway Top Width: 117.00 ft


[^0]:    *Estimated size based on preliminary HY-8 Analysis. Exact replacement configuration to be determined during design phase based on No-Rise Analysis.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Peak discharges computed with UNET (Reference 25)

[^2]:    Please Note: Florida has a very broad Public Records Law. E-mails to this entity or its employees may be considered a public record. Your email communication, including your email address may be disclosed to the public and media at any time.

