



FEMA



Pre-QR3 Submission Questionnaire and Self-Certification Form

(Page 1)

Study Name	Morgan County, UT PMR
MIP Case Number	12-08-0134S
Mapping Partner	AECOM (URS) - Salt Lake City
Sub-consultant(s)	None
Project Manager (Name, email, phone)	Remmet deGroot, remmet.degroot@aecom.com, 303-796-4633
QR2 Passing Date	1/14/2016
Planned QR3 Submittal Date	1/15/2016
What is the Project's present SPI? If out of FEMA tolerance, please describe any quality factors you feel contribute to the variance.	0.94
What is the Project's present CPI? If out of FEMA tolerance, please describe any quality factors you feel contribute to the variance.	1.00
Please list the flooding source(s) that are newly studied or restudied with this map action. Please also indicate those flooding sources where redelineation was performed (using updated terrain data) without new engineering analysis.	Restudied: Cottonwood Creek, East Canyon Creek, Weber River
Please describe your pre-QR3 internal validation (inspection) activities. You may use the Comments section as needed. Please also attach your quality records (checklists, call sheets, etc) that demonstrate how your internal reviews were conducted.	Performed detail checks and independent technical review on all tasks. A completed summary review form from the independent technical review (including comments and dispositions) is included.



FEMA



Pre-QR3 Submission Questionnaire and Self-Certification Form

(Page 2)

Please provide any FEMA-approved project-related decisions that directly affect the results shown on the study being submitted for independent review.	None
Please itemize issues or concerns you wish to be known before the QR3 review begins. If your comments are extensive, please use the "Comments" section below or create a separate document to attach to this form.	None
To the best of your knowledge, does this study comply with all FEMA standards identified in the project Mapping Activity Statement and/or Scope of Work and has passed the QR2 review stage?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If you selected "No", please provide an explanation in the "Comments" section below.

Comments:

Self-Certification

I certify that the information provided on this form is complete and correct and the study being submitted for QR3 is ready for independent review.		1/15/16
	Mapping Partner Signature Date	
	Remmet degraat Printed Name	

RiskMAP
Increasing Resilience Together



REVIEW COMMENT FORM

ORIGINATOR	CLIENT	UTAH CTP		PROJECT NUMBER:	PROJECT NAME		Morgan County, UT PMR	
	DOCUMENT BEING REVIEWED: Morgan County PMR Deliverables							
	DETAILED LIST OF REVIEW PACKAGE CONTENTS (e.g., Report, CD, TSDN, Profiles, etc.): Preliminary FIS, FIRMS, DB, Letters, SOMA						REVIEWER'S INITIALED VERIFICATION OF REVIEW PACKAGE CONTENTS:	
	REVIEW TYPE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed Check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ITR <input type="checkbox"/> FEMA/NSP							
	DATE: 12/30/2015		COMMENTS DUE DATE: 1/6/2016			RETURN COMMENTS TO:		URS SLC
	RESOLUTION MEETING DATE AND TIME:				RESOLUTION MEETING LOCATION:			
See also QR3 Checklist								

REVIEWER: Sean O'Melveny	ORGANIZATION: <input type="checkbox"/> URS-SLC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URS ABQ
--------------------------	--

RESOLUTION MEETING FINAL CONCURRENCE	ORIGINATOR  Sign & Date: 1/13/2016	REVIEWER  Sign & Date: 1/14/2016
--------------------------------------	--	--

PROJECT MANAGER/ PRINCIPLE-IN-CHARGE/DESIGNEE
Sign & Date:

No.	Reference	Comment	Disp.	Response	Ver.
1	CTP vs Panels	Should Panels have a Panel Index per CTP requirements (i.e. like effective)?	C	Added panel index	SCO
2	CTP vs Panels	Does CTP seal need to be on Panels as well as Index?	C	Added CTP seal	SCO
3	CNMS	Recommend one line each for each revised study stream as opposed to multi lines for East Canyon Creek and Weber River	D	If addressed during QR3, will incorporate	N/A
4	Metadata	Name shows "Prelim", <geoform> shows "Draft"	C	Changed to "Preliminary"	SCO

NOTES:

INITIAL DISPOSITION CODES: C = Will Comply D = Delete Comment F = Further Clarify	FINAL DISPOSITION CODES: C D	Ver: Incorporation of C (Initials)**
---	------------------------------	--------------------------------------

**Verification must only be completed by reviewer, or by a reviewer specifically delegated, requested, and designated by the Project Manager to perform the review.

cc: PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE FILE, OFFICE QUALITY ASSURANCE OFFICE



No.	Reference	Comment	Disp.	Response	Ver.
5	Metadata	<i>Change <pubdate> and <caldate> to "20160325"</i>	C	Changed to 20160325	SCO
6	FBS	<i>No Comments</i>			SCO
7	Prelim Letters	<i>No Comments</i>			SCO

NOTES:

INITIAL DISPOSITION CODES: **C** = Will Comply **D** = Delete Comment **F** = Further Clarify

FINAL DISPOSITION CODES: **C D**

Ver: Incorporation of **C** (Initials)**

****Verification must only be completed by reviewer, or by a reviewer specifically delegated, requested, and designated by the Project Manager to perform the review.**

cc: PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE FILE, OFFICE QUALITY ASSURANCE OFFICE

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>		
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015		
ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments	
Flood Insurance Rate Map Review						
1	Areas Not Included are properly identified in the database and mapped correctly on the FIRM	Pass	No ANIs			SCO
2	All political area lines are present on the FIRM		See Line 3			SCO
3	Political areas are labeled with correct CID and community name on the FIRM	Fail	See Panel 115 Markup for National Forest and 262 Markup for Wildlife Area.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Added to FIRM	SCO
4	Hydraulic structures mapped correctly and agree with Flood Profiles. If flooding is contained in the hydraulic structure, proper map notes used.	Fail	1) Bridge Symbols appear to be missing. See FIRM markups 2) See FIRM and FIS Markups for additional comments.	Will Comply and Make Correction	1) Bridge symbols added 2) Completed	SCO
5	All hydrologic features inside of 1 percent annual chance floodplain (streams, lakes, ponds, oceans, etc) are properly labeled on the FIRM	Pass	See FIRM markups for some DB vs FIRM disconnects.			SCO
6	Transportation features properly symbolized and labeled on the FIRM	Fail	See FIRM and FIS Markups and Line 4	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed	SCO
7	Bench Marks are labeled and correct on the FIRM	Pass				SCO
8	River mile markers are labeled on the FIRM and agree with Flood Profile		No River Mile Markers shown			N/A
9	Gaging stations are labeled on the FIRM and agree with Flood Profile		No Gaging Stations shown			N/A
10	FIRM BFEs or depths are indicated/depicted in all AE, VE, AO, and AH flood zones	Pass				SCO
11	Floodway widths on the FIRM are accurate and agree with Floodway Data table	Pass	Spot Checked			SCO
12	Floodplains and floodways on the FIRM properly symbolized and labeled per the FEMA G&S	Fail	1) Revision of East Canyon Creek causes some changes on Panel 400. This panel will have to be added to PMR. See also markups on Index.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Added panel 400 and revised Index accordingly	SCO
13	Cross section placement on the FIRM agrees with Flood Profiles and the labeling is correct	Fail	1) XS Labels off on Panel 264 2) Weber Restudy Area from Panel 255 to Panel 286 are a lettered incorrectly. Should Start at "K" and end at "BE" to match profiles and FDT. Need to correct DB as well.	Will Comply and Make Correction	1) Fixed XS 2) Fixed XS	SCO

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>	
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015	
ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments
14	"Backwater" and "Flooding controlled by" on the FIRM is depicted properly and agrees with Flood Profiles and Floodway Data tables	Pass			
15	Limit of Study on the FIRM is properly labeled	Pass	No LoS in PMR area		
16	The Limit of Moderate Wave Action (LiMWA) line and note are correct on the FIRM		Not a coastal county		
17	Streams and lakes on the FIRM are contained within the floodway and/or floodplain	Fail	1) See Panel 115 for a handful of places to verify	Disagree – See Originator Comments	Effective area - did not revise flooding
18	Zone breaks (gutters) properly depicted on the FIRM	Pass			
19	All FIRM notes present and correct	Fail	Notes to Users for MSC are incorrect and need to be updated. See markups on Panel 93 and apply to all.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Corrected notes to users
20	Coastal Transects are labeled on the FIRM and agree with Coastal Tables in the FIS		Not a coastal county		
21	FIRM BFEs agree with Flood Profiles and Floodway Data tables	Pass			
22	All cross sections on the FIRM are in alphabetical/numerical order	Pass			
23	CBRS boundaries, screens and notes/labels on the FIRM are correct (including CBRS Legend and FWS' telephone numbers)		Not a coastal county		
24	Horizontal reference grid labels present and correct (including PLSS labels) on the FIRM	Pass			
25	Corner coordinates correct and legible on the FIRM	Pass			
26	Levees mapped in accordance with FEMA guidance and proper levee notes present on the FIRM	Fail	1) Accredited levee notes are not correct on Panel 93. (See FIRM Markups, PM 45 and LOMR 15-08-0603P) 2) Verify that levees are still accredited in area outside of LOMR 15-08-0603P for this PMR. 3) See notes in FIS markup	Will Comply and Make Correction	1) Added notes from PM 45 2) FEMA/PTS verified Dry Creek and Gordon Creek levees are still accredited levees in the database: "The Compass levee database manager (Dan Curley) looked in the MLI database, and found an entry in the MLI indicating that the Gordon Creek LOMR is to be accredited via the subject LOMR (15-08-0603P). These segments are not currently tracked in FAST, but he will add them. The Dry Creek levees were previously accredited. Both levees should be shown on the preliminary products as providing protection. Please include associated "Accredited Levee" notes to users on the panel."
27	FIRM map label halos are present	Pass			

SCO

SCO

N/A

N/A

SCO

SCO

N/A

SCO

SCO

N/A

SCO

SCO

SCO

SCO

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>	
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015	
ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments
28	Joins panel numbers are present and correct on the FIRM	Fail	See FIS Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed
29	Breakout panels within smaller scale panels are properly labeled on the FIRM	Pass			
30	No overprints on the FIRM that obscure features within or near flooding	Pass			
31	FIRM coincident line hierarchy correct	Pass			
32	All NFIP Program dates on the FIRM collar are correct	Fail	1) Missing Countywide Effective Date 2) Recommend noting reasons for Revision 3) See markups on Panel 93 and apply to all.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed all
33	Horizontal and vertical datum is listed and correct on the FIRM collar	Pass			
34	Map Number / Panel Number is present and correct on FIRM title block	Pass			
35	Map scale is correct in FIRM Legend	Pass			
36	Projection information is present and correct on FIRM collar	Pass			
37	Base map source note is present and correct in Notes to User of the FIRM	Pass			
38	North arrow is present in FIRM Legend	Pass			
39	Reference to FIS report is present in FIRM legend (if applicable)	Pass			
40	"See Map Index" note is present in FIRM title block	Pass			
41	Title Block correct (Community names, Study Name, CIDs, Map Number and Panel Number)	Pass			
42	"Panel__of__" number is correct in FIRM title block	Pass			
43	Title block lists "Effective Date" for a first time FIRM or lists "Map Revised" for a revised FIRM	Pass			
44	DHS logo and agency title are present on the FIRM and Index	Pass			
Sub-total of failure citations for this QR3 review sub-section		10			
Flood Insurance Rate Map Index Review					
45	"Panel Not Printed" note and asterisks correct on FIRM Index	Fail	Missing PNP reason footnote on Index	Will Comply and Make Correction	Added PNP footnote
46	FIRM Index title block correct (study name, panel number, and listing of printed panels)	Fail	Needs to be "MAP REVISED" not "EFFECTIVE DATE"	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed
47	NSFHA communities are correctly noted on the Listing of Communities table on the FIRM Index	Pass	No NSFHA Communities		
48	Major surface water features are present on the FIRM Index	Pass			
49	North arrow is present on the FIRM Index	Pass			

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>	
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015	
ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments
50	All FIRM Index notes are correct	Fail	1) Missing Prelim Note about CCO Meetings 2) See line xx about adding and dropping panels to PMR.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed
51	Map repositories for all communities are present and correct on the FIRM Index	Pass	Recommend updating L_COMM_INFO to match INDEX	Will Comply and Make Correction	
52	Transportation features properly symbolized and labeled on the FIRM Index	Pass	See Index for minor markup.		
53	All information on Listing of Communities table on the FIRM Index is correct	Pass	Recommend updating L_COMM_INFO to match INDEX		
Sub-total of failure citations for this QR3 review sub-section		3			
Flood Insurance Study Report Review					
54	Correct vertical and horizontal scale on Flood Profiles in the FIS Report	Pass			
55	All FIS Report Cover Sheets show correct community names listing and CIDs, print volume number, suffix and date	Fail	Remove all references to Volume, since this is a single volume FIS.	Will Comply and Make Correction	Removed Volume reference
56	Map history dates on Notice to User page of FIS Report are correct	Pass			
57	Intro paragraph correct in the FIS Report (communities listed, multi-county communities and No Special Flood Hazard Areas identified)	Pass	<i>See FIS markup for recommendations</i>	Will Comply and Make Correction	
58	Detailed study streams are included in FIS Report Summary of Discharges table and, if applicable, Floodway Data table	Pass	<i>See FIS markup for recommendations</i>	Will Comply and Make Correction	
59	Hydrologic and Hydraulic sections in the FIS Report describe the methods and modeling used for each detailed study stream	Pass			
60	Vertical Datum Conversion information in the FIS Report is correct (if applicable)	Pass	Carried over from effective		
61	Stream stationing note is correct on Flood Profile in the FIS Report	Pass			
62	Footnotes on Floodway Data tables are correct and agree with Flood Profiles in the FIS Report	Pass			
63	FIS Report Table of Contents is accurate	Fail	See FIS Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Corrected
64	All structures and cross sections on the Flood Profiles in the FIS Report agree with the FIRM	Fail	See FIS and FIRM Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Corrected
65	Flood Profile line symbology, notes, and labels are correct in the FIS Report	Fail	See FIS Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Corrected where noted in pdf

SCO

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>	
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015	
ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments
66	Flood Profiles in the FIS Report agree with FIRM (all notes such as county boundary, corporate limits, limit of detailed study, railroad, roads, "Confluence With", etc.)	Fail	See FIS Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Corrected
67	Flood Profile title block and collar information is correct	Pass			
68	"Backwater" and "Flooding controlled by" depicted properly on the Flood Profiles and Floodway Data tables in the FIS Report and agree with the FIRM	Pass			
69	Vertical datum is listed correctly on the Floodway Data table and Flood Profile in the FIS Report	Pass			
70	All information on Community Map History table in the FIS Report is correct	Pass	Carried over from Effective		
Sub-total of failure citations for this QR3 review sub-section		5			
Summary of Map Actions Review					
71	All effective LOMCs within the project footprint are included in the SOMA. (Note: dropped cases, conditional cases, informational letters and denial determinations should be excluded).	Fail	See SOMA Markups		92-08-016B: MIP shows the determination as Unknown, and the case file is missing. Per discussion, added 92-08-016B to SOMA as Superseded Reason 1 - Insufficient Information Removed 11-08-0112A from SOMA Added partial LOMR footnote
72	Structure removals are not included in Category 1 on the SOMA.	Pass			
73	LOMRs are not included in Category 2 on the SOMA.	Pass			
74	LOMRs and single-determination LOMCs are not included in Category 4 for redetermination/reissuance on the SOMA.	Pass	No Category 4		
75	When multiple determination LOMAs and LOMR-Fs include both removal and non-removal determinations, and all determinations remain the same based on the new or revised mapping, the case is included in Category 2 and the new zone is listed as 'X' in the MIP SOMA Tool; on the Revalidation Letter the new zone has been changed to 'Multiple' if it was formerly shown as "X".	Pass			
76	The correct map number and map suffix are listed in the new map panel field for each LOMC and the correct old map panel is listed for the old panel field.	Fail	See SOMA Markups	Will Comply and Make Correction	Fixed; verified 98-08-149A should be on panel 261
77	All cases included on the SOMA in Category 2 are listed with the new zone listed as 'X' in MIP SOMA Tool.	Pass			
78	LOMCs issued prior to the effective date of the current respective FIRM panel are included on the SOMA only if they are listed on a current revalidation letter for the community.	Fail	See SOMA Markups		Per discussion, disregarded comment regarding 09-08-0739A
79	Case number, date issued and project identifier are correct for each LOMC listed. The project identifier should have a complete and correct legal description and address.	Pass			
80	Community name and CID number are correct.	Pass			

QR3 Checklist / Quality Record

<u>Study Name</u>		<u>Reviewer</u>		<u>Date</u>	
Morgan County, UT FIS and FIRM Updates		Sean O'Melveny		12/30/2015	

ID	FIS/FIRM Quality Standard	Pass / Fail	Reviewer Comment	Originator Disposition	Originator Comments
Sub-total of failure citations for this QR3 review sub-section		3			

Other

81	LOMRs properly incorporated	Pass				SCO
82	Vertical Datum conversion factor(s) properly applied to the FIRM, Flood Profiles, and Floodway Data tables	Pass	New Study in new datum or carried over from effective.			SCO
Sub-total of failure citations for this QR3 review sub-section		0				
Total failure citations for this QR3 review		21				

Other Comments

See additional comments on FIS and FIRM Markups and on separate comment sheet.