



MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENT, GREAT LAKES, AND ENERGY

Hydraulic Report Guidelines




Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Hydraulic Analysis and Report Submittal Requirements.....	4
Projects in FEMA mapped floodplains.....	5
When is a Hydraulic Analysis Needed?.....	6
The Hydraulic Report.....	7
Introduction	7
Method of Analysis.....	7
Upstream and Downstream Modeling Limits.....	8
Variables, Coefficients, and Modeling Strategies	8
Discussion	9
Conclusion	9
Supporting Documents to Include with Report	9
Requesting a Flood Discharge.....	10
Damage Assessment Guidelines	11
Sample Damage Assessment Certification	12
Sample Affected Property Owner Statement.....	13
Sample Affected Property Owner Statement - (Transportation Version)	14
References and Resources	15
Cross-Section Guidelines	16
General Requirements	16
Cross-Section Location and Spacing	17
Bridges and Culvert Cross-Sections.....	19

This publication is intended for guidance only and does not have the force and effect of law. Any information presented could be impacted by changes in legislation, rules, policies, and procedures adopted after the date of publication. Although this publication makes every effort to teach users how to meet applicable compliance obligations, use of this publication does not constitute the rendering of legal advice, nor does it serve to supersede any legal requirements developed elsewhere.

EGLE does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, national origin, color, marital status, disability, political beliefs, height, weight, genetic information, or sexual orientation in the administration of any of its programs or activities, and prohibits intimidation and retaliation, as required by applicable laws and regulations.

To request this material in an alternate format, contact EGLE-Accessibility@Michigan.gov or 800-662-9278.

Introduction

A hydraulic analysis is required on streams/drains with a drainage area of two square miles or more when a proposed project may cause an increase in flood elevations or change in the direction of flow. When it is not definitive as to whether a project will or will not cause an increase, then an analysis should be provided to show that there will be no increase.

When a hydraulic analysis is required, a \$1,500 hydraulic review fee for each analysis should be submitted in addition to the normal application fee. If multiple analyses are submitted for multiple locations, a \$1,500 fee must be provided for each.

The hydraulic analysis should compare the existing floodplain energy grade line elevations with the proposed energy grade line elevations for a range of discharges up to and including the 100-year flood frequency discharge. Flood discharges for watercourses may be requested free of charge from the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) (page 10). If you develop discharges, they must be approved by EGLE prior to submittal of the model.

If you are considering using a hydraulic model other than a 1D, steady state Hydrologic Engineering Center's - River Analysis System (HEC-RAS), you should contact the district floodplain engineer prior to starting the modeling to discuss if the hydraulic program is appropriate for the project and if the particular staff has access to properly review the model.

Do not include printouts from the digital hydraulic model in the report unless making a specific reference.

If the proposed project causes an increase in the floodplain elevations, then an engineer licensed in Michigan must certify that the increase is non-harmful. Harmful interference is defined as "causing an increase stage or change in the direction of flow that causes or is likely to cause damage to property; a threat to life; pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources." A copy of the damage assessment guidelines and certification language is found on pages 11-13.

If the project causes an increase in flood elevations that are above the stream banks and occurs outside of the applicant's property, then affected property owner statements (pages 13-14) need to be sent by certified mail to all the affected property owners, or the project must be redesigned.

A project that is determined by EGLE to cause a harmful interference cannot be permitted.

These guidelines are designed to assist those submitting a hydraulic analysis and report for state permitting under the State's Floodplain Regulatory Authority found in Part 31, Water Resources Protection, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended (NREPA), for state concurrence of a Letter of Map Revision, or any other modeling that is submitted for review. The guidelines are intended for professional engineers familiar with floodplain management and hydraulic modeling. They do not provide instructions for using hydraulic modeling programs.

Hydraulic Analysis and Report Submittal Requirements

ALL the following information must be included as part of the submittal of a hydraulic model/report to EGLE. Failure to supply ALL the items listed below will result in an incomplete application.

- ☐ A \$1,500 hydraulic review fee (in addition to the normal application fee) for each model submitted.
- ☐ A functioning digital copy of the modeling runs for existing, and proposed conditions; and the duplicate effective, corrected effective conditions if located in a detailed FEMA mapped floodplain. Each run should be labeled appropriately and referenced in the hydraulic report. Extraneous runs should not be included.
- ☐ A detailed Hydraulic Report (including supporting data, plans, and other documentation) prepared and sealed by an engineer licensed in Michigan.
- ☐ Location map(s) showing the project location, all model cross-sections (with labels), existing and proposed grades and all existing structures in/near the floodplain that could potentially be impacted by the project.
- ☐ For projects where there is an increase in the energy grade (an increase of 0.005 feet or greater) for the proposed versus the existing conditions, the following requirements apply:
 - The engineer must certify that the increase does not interfere harmfully with the discharge or stage characteristics of the stream.
 - If any increase extends beyond the banks of the main channel and occurs outside of the applicant's property, affected property owner statements need to be sent by certified mail to all the affected property owners (or the project must be redesigned to eliminate the increase).
 - A project that causes a harmful interference cannot be permitted. When determining harmful interference in Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplains, where base flood elevations (BFE's) have been published; the basis of comparison for "increased stage" is the effective FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)/ Flood Insurance Study (FIS).
- ☐ For projects located within a detailed floodplain study area mapped by FEMA, the following modeling runs are generally required:
 - **Duplicate effective model (DEM)** – this is the currently effective FEMA model with **zero** changes. To obtain the effective Flood Insurance Study (FIS) models, see FEMA's Mapping Information Platform at hazards.fema.gov/wps/portal/frisel
 - **Corrected effective model (CEM)** – this model could correct any errors that occur in the DEM; adds any additional cross-sections to the DEM, or incorporates more detailed topographic information. *The CEM must not reflect any man-made changes since the date of the first effective FEMA model.* An error could be a technical error in the modeling procedures, or any construction in the floodplain that occurred prior to the

Hydraulic Report Guidelines

date of the effective model but was not included in the effective model. *All* differences between the models need to be documented and explained.

- **Existing conditions model** – Most of the time, this is the same as the CEM. This could reflect any changes to the floodplain since the date of the effective study. Any changes between existing conditions model and CEM need to be documented and explained in detail.
- **Proposed conditions** – encroachments added to reflect proposed project. If the proposed 100-year flood elevations are higher than the DEM for any reason, the applicant must obtain a conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA prior to issuance of the state floodplain permit.
- **Construction models** – may be needed to evaluate the impacts of temporary floodway obstructions during the construction process, such as sheet piling. Sheet pile height and locations need to be specified in plans. Plans to remove sheet piling above certain flow rates can be used to offset potential increases; but details on who removes the sheet piles, which sheet piles are to be removed, what type of equipment will be used, if equipment is onsite, time it takes to remove sheet piles, and flowrates when this will occur, should be provided.

Changes to the hydraulic models should be limited to the stream reach for which the revision is being requested. Cross-sections upstream and downstream of the revised reach should be identical to those in the effective model.

Projects in FEMA mapped floodplains

If a project is going to cause any increase in published BFE's, A CLOMR approved by FEMA is required prior to the issuance of a permit (44 CFR Part 65.12). A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) would also be required as a condition of the permit to officially modify the FIRMs upon completion of the project.

If an applicant wants to use starting or existing conditions that are higher than the effective FIRM/ FIS for any reason (including if the existing FIRM/ FIS is inaccurate), they will need a CLOMR or LOMR approved by FEMA before EGLE can issue the permit (44 CFR Part 60.2(h)).

Under Part 31, EGLE staff must determine if a project constitutes a "harmful interference." "Harmful interference" means causing an increased stage or change in direction of flow of a river or stream that causes, or is likely to cause, any of the following: (i) Damage to property, (ii) A threat to life, (iii) A threat of personal injury, (iv) Pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources.

When determining harmful interference in FEMA mapped floodplains, where BFE's have been published; the basis of comparison for "increased stage" is the effective FEMA FIRM/ FIS.

When is a Hydraulic Analysis Needed?

This is a general list of when a hydraulic analysis is needed for review under the State's Floodplain Regulatory Authority found in Part 31 of the NREPA. It does not indicate when a hydraulic analysis may be required by other agencies such as the county drain commissioner or the local community.

A hydraulic analysis is required for the following:

1. Any filling or construction within the FEMA mapped floodway that does not meet minor project criteria under Part 31.
2. Filling or construction in the floodways not mapped by FEMA, that exceeds one percent of the cross-sectional area of the 100-year floodway unless the construction is directly in-line, adjacent to and on the downstream side of an existing obstruction.
3. Stream relocation.
4. Changing the FEMA floodway boundary line.
5. Culvert or bridge replacement projects that have the following characteristics (with all other items remaining equal):
 - a. An increase in road grade unless the existing road grade is above the 100-year floodplain elevation
 - b. A reduction in end area.
 - c. An increase in the Manning's roughness coefficient (i.e., going from a concrete to metal culvert).
 - d. A reduction in the efficiency of the entrance condition (i.e., going from a headwall condition to a projecting or mitered end section.
 - e. An extension onto an existing structure that exceeds 24 feet.
 - f. A new culvert/bridge that is longer/wider than the existing structure.
 - g. A change in slope.
6. Developing a floodway boundary in an area without a mapped floodway.

A hydraulic analysis is generally not needed under Part 31 for the following:

1. If the stream/drain has a drainage area of less than two square miles.
2. If a project meets a minor project category found in Part 31 of the NREPA.
3. Projects located outside of the mapped floodway.
4. In areas where FEMA has not mapped the floodway, encroachments representing one percent or less of the floodway cross-sectional area. The one percent must be an equal and opposite encroachment.
5. Culvert or bridge replacement where the opening is increased below the 100-year floodplain elevation with all other hydraulic factors remaining the same- i.e., same road grade unless the existing road grade is above the 100-year floodplain elevation, same culvert length/bridge width, same or improved roughness condition, same or improved entrance conditions, same slope.

Hydraulic Report Guidelines

6. A temporary bridge that is not more than 24 feet in width and that matches or exceeds and is directly adjacent to upstream bridge crossing.
7. A temporary culvert that is not more than 24 feet in length and that matches or exceeds and is directly adjacent to the upstream culvert crossing.
8. Removal of a dam outside of a FEMA mapped floodplain and where no grade control structures (cross vanes, rock ramps, J hooks, weirs) are being added.

When in doubt on other types of projects please contact your district floodplain engineer.

Federal National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations and the Michigan construction codes require a hydraulic model for ALL man-made changes within the FEMA mapped floodway. There are no exceptions to this requirement and the decision of EGLE to require a model or not under Part 31 does not waive this requirement.

The Hydraulic Report

The Hydraulic Report provides an analysis of the proposed project compared to the existing conditions, on the floodplain and floodway for a range of discharges up to and including the 100-year discharge. The report should contain the following information.

Introduction

- ☐ Preparers name, company name, telephone number, and email.
- ☐ Describe the watercourse and location of investigation.
- ☐ Name for whom the report is being prepared.
- ☐ Date of report and topographic data used in model.
- ☐ Name and type of project.
- ☐ Describe the scope of investigation including the alternatives analyzed and evaluated.
- ☐ Describe the scope of the analysis.
- ☐ Identify any existing studies or any history of work on the watercourse in the vicinity of the project including past flooding events.

Method of Analysis

- ☐ A description of ALL modeling runs submitted must be included in the report.
- ☐ Explain why the modeling method was chosen and why it is appropriate for the project evaluation.
- ☐ Explain any assumptions made in the application of the chosen method.
- ☐ Include references and provide a description and source of any computer programs used.
- ☐ Use EGLE generated or approved discharges in the analysis.
- ☐ Explain any modeling iterations including the use of previous data (i.e., FEMA study), the addition of updated/corrected geometry, etc.

Upstream and Downstream Modeling Limits

- ☐ Show the location of the modeling limits on the site development plan.
- ☐ The model needs to start sufficiently downstream of the project (page 18 for more details).
- ☐ The analysis must extend upstream to the point where any increase caused by the proposed project is dissipated, for all flood profiles.
- ☐ The location of all cross-sections should be shown on the plans. Cross-sections should all be labeled.
- ☐ Explain why the location was selected and the method used to determine the starting water surface elevation. Include an analysis of calibration of the model(s) to existing FEMA FIS profiles if they exist or other methods used to develop stable boundary downstream water surface conditions if no FIS is available.
- ☐ Describe all modeling boundary conditions.

Variables, Coefficients, and Modeling Strategies

- ☐ Discuss all modeling variables and coefficients. Indicate references and explain all assumptions for the variables used in the model.
- ☐ Ineffective Flow Areas – should be included when appropriate – up and downstream of crossings, encroachments, and ponding areas.
- ☐ Culvert modeling approaches should not show flow below the stream bottom.
- ☐ Expansion and contraction
- ☐ Orifice
- ☐ Weir discharge
- ☐ Friction
- ☐ Provide photographs of present conditions and any other supporting information to justify modeling variable values selected for existing and/or proposed conditions.
- ☐ Describe and provide supporting justification for the bridge/culvert modeling options used.
- ☐ When a floodway is defined as part of the analysis, list the encroachment method used and provide justification of the encroachment method.
- ☐ For encroachments located in the floodway, equal and opposite encroachment into the floodway should be modeled in the proposed conditions run. Assume an equal percent reduction in conveyance in both overbanks if overbank areas are not uniform.

Discussion

- ☐ Discuss and evaluate the computations and analysis.
- ☐ Provide a description of the present channel and floodway, the nature and distribution of flow, and the proposed alterations and their resultant effect.
- ☐ Explain any unusual conditions that occur, and all assumptions not previously addressed that were part of the analysis.
- ☐ Address all model error reports.

Conclusion

- ☐ The conclusion must include the definition of “harmful interference.” Harmful interference is defined as “causing an increase stage or change in the direction of flow that causes or is likely to cause damage to property; a threat to life; pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources.”
- ☐ The conclusion must include the engineer’s opinion as to whether or not the project will cause harmful interference, based on the model results.
- ☐ Evaluate the effects of the proposed conditions on the watercourse, floodplain, floodway and potentially affected properties (including upstream and, where appropriate, downstream effects) for the range of discharges up to and including the 100-year discharge.

Supporting Documents to Include with Report

- ☐ A site plan for existing and proposed conditions. Note: The dimensions and work depicted in the model must match the permit plans and information in the application.
 - Scaled plan view drawing(s) at sufficient scale to show proposed work and elevations.
 - Location map of all cross-sections used in the analysis. Cross-sections should be labeled with the same names as in the digital model.
 - Flood Insurance Rate Map and flood profile (if available).
 - Existing and proposed topography.
 - Property boundaries.
 - Floodway delineation.
 - Floodway alterations.
 - Proposed floodway obstruction.
 - River channel.
 - Fill, excavation and grading limits.
 - Existing and proposed bridges and culverts. Include the profiles of the road grade along its highest points. (The information provided should be sufficient to analyze the crossings.)
 - The elevation datum used. Plans and the model should be in the same datum.

Hydraulic Report Guidelines

- ☐ Cross-sections showing existing conditions and the proposed alterations. Cross-sections should include the following information. Do not include printouts from the HEC-RAS model.
 - Channel limits (the channel limits can be defined by the ordinary high-water mark of the watercourse).
 - Floodway limits, if mapped or modeled.
 - Floodplain boundary limits.
 - Roughness coefficients.
 - The coordinates of plotted points.
- ☐ If the proposed project causes an increase in the energy grade elevation (greater than an increase of 0.005 feet or greater), you must provide a Damage Assessment Certificate (see example on page 11) to certify that the increase does not interfere harmfully with the discharge or stage characteristics of the stream.
 - A harmful interference is defined as an increased stage or change in the discharge or direction of flow that causes or is likely to cause any of the following: damage to property; a threat to life; a threat to personal injury; pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources.
- ☐ If the proposed increase extends beyond the banks of the main channel and goes off the owner's property, then you must also send by certified mail the "Affected Property Owner Statements" to all upstream property owners impacted by the proposed increase. Verification that the letters were sent out by certified mail must be provided to EGLE.
- ☐ A copy of EGLE discharge or discharge approval letter.

Requesting a Flood Discharge

Part 31 of the NREPA addresses flooding up to and including the 100-year (one percent annual chance) flood. The Hydrologic Studies and Floodplain Management Unit (HSFMU) of the Water Resources Division calculates flood and low flow discharges and conducts other types of hydrologic analyses in support of EGLE's water-related programs.

You can request flood discharges by going to Michigan.gov/Hydrology and clicking "Request a flood discharge or low flow form."

Discharge values are only valid for the specific location and are valid for one year after the date the response was sent.

In areas with a detailed FEMA FIS, the discharge from the FIS is typically used and can be verified by the HSFMU.

Hydraulic Report Guidelines

If you have additional data that may be helpful in updating a discharge, contact the HSFMU. The engineer reviewing the hydraulic model will not be able to approve a discharge that differs from HSFMU values.

If you calculate your own discharges, you must submit your hydrologic analyses, including all models, calculations, and GIS data, to HSFMU for review and concurrence prior to submitting the model and application. If you have questions about requesting a flood discharge, you can contact HSFMU at the contact information listed at:

Michigan.gov/EGLE/About/Organization/Water-Resources/Hydrologic-Data

Damage Assessment Guidelines

Proposed projects which cause an increase in flood stage (0.005 feet or greater) or change in the direction of flow that is not confined entirely within the applicant's property, require the following additional information to be submitted to EGLE. Submittal of this information does not guarantee that a permit can be issued.

- ☐ Property location map and a list of all property owners located within the area affected by the increase in flood stage.
- ☐ A map showing the existing and proposed floodplain and all structures within and near the affected area. For each structure, include the lowest ground elevation adjacent to the building (including deck stairs or supports), the lowest floor elevation (including basement), and the lowest sill elevation of a window or door of all structures located within the affected area.
- ☐ A written damage assessment certification from a licensed engineer indicating that the increase caused by the project will not cause a harmful interference and that the increase will not affect any insurable structures.
- ☐ Notification shall be sent by certified mail to the affected property owners indicating the extent of additional flooding and advising them to return the form to EGLE within 10 days.
- ☐ Copies of the letter(s) sent to the affected property owners and the certified mail receipts must be submitted to EGLE.
- ☐ Photographs of the affected properties and floodplain areas.

Sample Damage Assessment Certification

{Project Name}

{Stream Name}

{Town, Range, Section}

{Community}

{County}

"I, {Certifying Engineers Name & P.E. #}, do hereby certify that I have inspected the upstream adjoining properties and find that the reduction in hydraulic capacity and resulting {____} foot increase to upstream flood stages or diversion of flow will not cause a harmful interference or damage to adjacent structures or crop lands. Harmful interference is defined as an increased stage or change in the discharge or direction of flow that causes or is likely to cause any of the following: damage to property; a threat to life; a threat of personal injury; pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources."

Provide an explanation as to why the increase or change in flow direction is not a harmful interference.

(Affected Property Owner Statements must be sent to all property owners impacted by the proposed flood stage increase.)

Sample Affected Property Owner Statement

Date:

Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy
{District Floodplain Engineer Address}

Dear :

SUBJECT: File {File Number}, Project Name, Stream Name

I/we (circle one) have been informed by the {Applicant/Agent} of a potential increased flood risk on my property. The increased risk would be caused by {describe project}. This project will cause an additional increase in the floodplain elevation at the upstream limits of the applicant's property of {___} feet (elevation = {____}) over existing floodplain conditions.

I understand that this increased floodplain elevation could cause flooding on my property during a {100-year} flood which has a {one percent chance} of occurring or being exceeded in any given year. I also understand that the proposed structure could increase flooding on my property during lesser flood frequencies.

It is my opinion that this project will/will not (circle one) cause any of the following to my property: a) damage to property, b) threat to life, c) a threat to personal injury, d) pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources.

I **can / cannot** (circle one) recall any past flooding which has caused flood damage to my property. I **can / cannot** (circle one) recall that water has overtopped the existing road grade at the bridge/culvert location. I have the following additional comments:

Should additional information be required of me, I can be reached by email {____} or telephone {telephone number}.

Sincerely,

{Property Owner(s) Signature(s)}

{Address}

{Phone}

{Property Tax ID}

(Form must be returned to EGLE within 10 days)

Sample Affected Property Owner Statement - (Transportation Version)

Date:

Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy
Water Resources Division
Transportation and Flood Hazard Unit
P.O. Box 30458
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7958

Dear :

SUBJECT: File {File Number}, Project Name, Stream Name

I / **we** (circle one) have been informed by representatives of the {county name} County Road Commission of a potential increased flood risk on my property. The increased risk would be caused by replacing the existing ____ ft. span by ____ ft. rise (structure type) at the _____ Road crossing of _____ Creek with a ____ ft. span by ____ ft. rise (structure type). Installation of this structure will cause an additional increase in the floodplain elevation at the upstream limits of the road right-of-way of ____ feet (elevation = ____) over existing floodplain conditions.

I understand that this increased floodplain elevation could cause flooding on my property during a {100-year} flood which has a {one percent chance} of occurring or being exceeded in any given year. I also understand that the proposed structure could increase flooding on my property during lesser flood frequencies.

It is my opinion that this project **will** / **will not** (circle one) cause any of the following to my property: a) damage to property, b) threat to life, c) a threat to personal injury, d) pollution, impairment, or destruction of water or other natural resources.

I **can** / **cannot** (circle one) recall any past flooding which has caused flood damage to my property. I **can** / **cannot** (circle one) recall that water has overtopped the existing road grade at the bridge/culvert location. Should additional information be required of me, I can be reached by writing or telephone.

Sincerely,

Property Owner(s) Signature(s)

Address

Phone

Property Tax ID

(Form must be returned to EGLE within 10 days)

References and Resources

EGLE Floodplain Management Websites:

[Michigan.gov/EGLETransportationReview](https://www.michigan.gov/EGLE/TransportationReview) or
[Michigan.gov/FloodplainManagement](https://www.michigan.gov/FloodplainManagement)

Michigan Department of Transportation Drainage Manual

[Michigan.gov/MDOT/Business/Design/Drainage-Manual](https://www.michigan.gov/MDOT/Business/Design/Drainage-Manual)

FEMA's Map Service Center -- 877-FEMA-MAP

msc.fema.gov

FEMA Engineering Library -- to obtain model data for published flood studies

hazards.fema.gov/wps/portal/frisel

Numerical Hydraulic Models Meeting the Minimum Requirement of the National Flood Insurance Program

fema.gov/flood-maps/products-tools/numerical-models

The Hydrologic Engineering Center

hec.usace.army.mil/

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Hydraulics

highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/hydraulics

Chow, V. T., Open Channel Hydraulics, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1959
Mays, Larry W., Hydraulic Design Handbook, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1999

Cross-Section Guidelines

The computation of water surface profiles requires cross-sections at representative locations throughout the river reach. Cross-sections provided as part of a hydraulic report should be generated from surveyed data. A printout from a hydraulic modeling program is not sufficient.


Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) data is generally acceptable data for creating cross-sections. The source of elevation data should be discussed in the report.

General Requirements

Cross-section stations should increase from downstream to upstream.

Each cross-section should be located on a topographic map of sufficient detail in order that the channel and overbank distances between sections can be measured accurately.

Cross-sections should be taken perpendicular to the direction of the estimated center of mass of the flood flow. This direction, in some instances, may differ materially from that of the normal flow in the channel. Every effort should be made to obtain cross-sections that accurately represent the river geometry at all stages.



Cross-sections may not be uniform across the valley due to elevation or other geographic constraints. Bent or “dog leg” cross-sections may be appropriate.


Cross-sections should not intersect.

Cross-sections must fully define transitional elements of a stream and floodplain such as the cross-sectional area increasing or decreasing, channel or overbank roughness changes, or marked breaks in bottom slope.

Each cross-section should be plotted at a reasonable scale with the left and right corresponding to that when viewed in the direction of flow (looking downstream).

Hydraulic Report Guidelines

For each plotted point, the distance measured from a reference point on the left, and elevation should be shown. The water surface elevation, date taken, and cross-section station number label should be included on each of the plotted cross-sections.



A profile of the channel bottom and water surface should be plotted from the cross-section data. The plotted distance between cross-sections is measured along the main channel during normal flow.


Cross-Section Location and Spacing

Downstream - Cross-sections must start sufficiently downstream of the project or study area. The downstream cross-sections should typically be on the downstream side of any bridges. If normal depth is used as a boundary condition, the downstream cross-sections should be a minimum of 500 feet downstream of the project area.


Upstream - For cross-sections upstream of the project, locate upstream cross-section(s) at any property boundaries and any city, township, county boundaries. The cross-sections should extend far enough upstream so that any increases between existing and proposed conditions dissipate to zero.

The distance between cross-sections varies based on the stream slope, the floodplain width, and the uniformity of the channel. In general, cross-section spacing of 500 feet is used when a river reach is straight and uniform. Additional cross-sections are required when there are changes in the features of the watercourse. The number of cross-sections should be in proportion of the magnitude of the changes to the channel. The report or cross-section map should identify which cross-sections are interpolated vs. based on actual survey data.

Hydraulic Report Guidelines



- Bends and meanders.
- Changes in channel slope.
- Changes in channel or floodplain geometry, such as encroachments, expansions, or contractions.
- Abrupt changes in cross-section or profile occurs, such as at bridges, dams or other manmade or natural restrictions, enough cross-sections should be used to describe the change.
- Changes in channel or overbank roughness.



Bridges and Culvert Cross-Sections

Generally, a minimum of six cross-sections are required to model a bridge or culvert. However, more cross-sections may be required to adequately represent site conditions in a model.

At a minimum, cross-sections should be located:

- At the upstream and downstream bridge faces (not in road ditch line or on road shoulder).
- At a location one bridge-span upstream.
- At a location four bridge-spans downstream.
- 100-feet beyond the above cross-sections both upstream and downstream.
- The cross-section should not show flow below the stream bottom.
- Depending on where the analysis starts and the boundary conditions, there should be a cross-section at least 500 feet downstream of the first bridge/culvert so that the model is stable at the point where the bridge/culvert will be analyzed.

