STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL REPORT COVERSHEET

650-050-38 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT 08/22

BRIDGE HYDRAULICS REPORT

Florida Department of Transportation

District 1

Fort Hamer Road PD&E Study

Limits of Project: Upper Manatee River Road to US 301

Manatee, Florida

Financial Management Number: XXXXX-X

ETDM Number: 14536

Date: 8/26/2024

Authorized Signature

Huseyin Demir

Print/Type Name

Senior Coastal Engineer

Title

2114 NW 40th Terrace, Suite A1

Address

Gainesville, FL 32605

Address

Seal

CIP 6054767 FPID 452856-1 FORT HAMER ROAD PD&E STUDY FROM UPPER MANATEE RIVER ROAD TO NORTH OF RIVE ISLE RUN MANATEE, FL BRIDGE HYDRAULICS REPORT

PREPARED FOR KIMLEY HORN 200 SOUTH ORANGE AVE., SUITE 600, ORLANDO, FL 32801

PREPARED BY INTERA INCORPORATED 2114 NW 40TH TERRACE, SUITE A1 GAINESVILLE, FL 32605

AUGUST 2024

PROJECT INDEX AND ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATION

- I. Project Information Fort Hamer Bridge over Upper Manatee River, Manatee County, Florida
- II. Governing Standards and Specifications
 - a. AASHTO Guide Specifications for Bridges Vulnerable to Coastal Storms (2008)
 - b. FDOT Bridge Scour Manual (2022)
 - c. FDOT Drainage Manual (2024a)
 - d. FDOT Design Manual, Design Criteria (2024b)
- III. Computer Programs Used for Calculations and Analysis
 - a. Advanced Circulation Model for Coastal Ocean Hydrodynamics (ADCIRC) V. 51.52.34
 - b. Simulation Of Waves in Near Shore Areas (SWAN) V. 40.81
 - c. Microsoft Excel for Microsoft Office 365

The official record of this report is the electronic file digitally signed and sealed under 61G15-23.004, F.A.C.



I, Huseyin Demir hereby state that this report, as listed in the following Table of Contents, is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true and correct and represents the described work in accordance with current established engineering practices. I hereby certify that I am a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of Florida practicing with INTERA Incorporated, and that I have supervised the preparation of and approve the evaluations, findings, opinions, and conclusions hereby reported.

This document has been digitally signed and sealed by <u>Huseyin Demir</u> with a Digital Signature.

Printed copies of this document are not considered signed and sealed and the signature must be verified on any electronic copies.

INTERA Incorporated 2114 NW 40th Terrace, Suite A1 Gainesville, FL 32605 Phone (352) 415-4021 Huseyin Demir P.E. Florida P.E. No. 71494

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	4	
2.0	Site Description	5	
2.1	General Site Characteristics	5	
2.2	Tidal Datums	6	
2.3	Hurricanes	7	
2.4	FEMA Flood Map and Studies	8	
2.5	Sea Level Rise	9	
2.6	Bridge Geometry and Alternative Analysis	10	
2.7	SLIP Study	10	
References		12	
Append	Appendix A: Bridge Plans		

List of Figures

Figure 2.1	Bridge Map	5
Figure 2.2	Location Map	6
Figure 2.3	NOAA Tidal Gage Location for Redfish Point, Manatee River FL 8726278.	7
Figure 2.3	Hurricanes Passing within 60 nmi of the Bridge (1850-2022) (coast.noaa.gov/hurricanes)	7
Figure 2.4	FEMA Firmette for Bridge Area (www.msc.fema.gov)	8
Figure 2.5	Coastal Transect Locations (www.msc.fema.gov)	9
Figure 2.6	NOAA station with long term SLR trends (Sea Level Trends - NOAA Tides & Currents)1	0
Figure 2.8	Florida EPA Slip Map Tool Showing the Proposed Bridge Location (https://floridadep-	
	slip.org/Map.aspx)1	1

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Tidal Datums at Redfish Point, Manatee River FL 8726278	. 6
Table 2.2	FEMA Stillwater Levels near the Bridge at Coastal Transect No. 56	. 8

1.0 Introduction

Kimley Horn under contract to Manatee County, Florida (County) is conducting a Project Development and Environment (PD&E) Study for widening the Fort Hamer Road from two lanes to four lanes from Upper Manatee River Road to US 301, approximately four miles. This section includes the two-lane Fort Hamer Bridge over Upper Manatee River (Bridge #134123). The widening would require a new bridge parallel to the existing one. The study includes a Bridge Hydraulic Report (BHR) as part of the scope of services. Kimley Horn subcontracted INTERA Incorporated (INTERA) to provide hydraulic and coastal engineering support in the development of the BHR for the proposed bridge in accordance with FDOT standards.

Complex flow patterns under extreme flood conditions at bridges located within coastal systems make such bridges susceptible to scour-related damage. To guard against scour-related damage, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the FDOT require a detailed analysis to determine design hydraulic parameters at the bridge and assess the vulnerability of bridges to flow-induced scour. Kimley Horn subcontracted INTERA for this reason.

This BHR combines the latest FHWA and FDOT technical guidelines with hydraulic modeling and coastal engineering methodologies. A two-dimensional hydrodynamic model by INTERA describing the system — including the most current survey information — provided predictions of hydraulic parameters needed to estimate various design conditions.

The following standards apply to the bridge's design.

- The design storm frequency equals 50 years (yrs) given that the AADT is larger than 1500 (FDOT, 2024a).
- The scour design flood frequency equals 100 yrs and the scour design check flood frequency equals 500 yrs (FDOT, 2024a).
- For concrete superstructures in aggressive environments (high chloride content), the FDOT (2024a) states that the minimum vertical clearance equals 12 feet (ft) between mean high water (MHW) and the low member of bridges.
- For drainage, the FDOT (2024a) states that the bridge design must incorporate a sea level rise analysis to assess the vulnerability of flooding over its design life.
- Finally, FDOT (2024a) stipulates that the bridge designer must limit the spread on the bridge deck resulting from a rainfall intensity of four inches per hour.

This report describes the study area and the results of the desktop study employing available data.

2.0 Site Description

2.1 General Site Characteristics

Fort Hamer Road crosses the Upper Manatee River (Figure 2.1) over a marshy island. The Manatee River is controlled by a dam six miles upstream of the bridge forming the Lake Manatee behind. Manatee River flows into Tampa Bay 16 miles downstream of the bridge location. The mouth is six miles from Gulf of Mexico (Figure 2.2). Given the location of the bridge in the Bay, design events will be associated with landfalling hurricanes creating storm surge within the bay.



Figure 2.1 Bridge Map



Figure 2.2 Location Map

2.2 Tidal Datums

The closest NOAA tidal gage to the bridge is Redfish Point, Manatee River FL 8726278 (Figure 2.3). The tidal datums are summarized in Table 2.1.

Tidal Datum	Elevation (ft NAVD88)
Mean Higher High Water (MHHW)	+0.81
Mean High Water (MHW)	+0.57
Mean Sea Level (MSL)	-0.26
Mean Low Water (MLW)	-1.14
Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW)	-1.47
National Geodetic Datum of 1929 (NGVD 29)	-1.61

Table 2.1Tidal Datums at Redfish Point, Manatee River FL 8726278.



Figure 2.3 NOAA Tidal Gage Location for Redfish Point, Manatee River FL 8726278.

2.3 Hurricanes

Hurricanes have significantly affected the project location. Investigation of NOAA's HURDAT database reveals that from 1850 to 2021,36 tropical storms and 35 hurricanes have passed within 60 nautical miles (nmi) of the bridge. Figure 2.3 shows the paths of the hurricanes. As the figure shows, some of the hurricanes made landfall very near the site or moved parallel to the coast.



Figure 2.4 Hurricanes Passing within 60 nmi of the Bridge (1850-2022) (coast.noaa.gov/hurricanes)

2.4 FEMA Flood Map and Studies

FEMA performs return period analyses for flood susceptibility nationwide. The results of these analyses culminate in the production of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) detailing the flood elevations for a specified return interval for a specific region. FEMA's effective FIRM 12081C0195F shows a 100-yr base flood elevation (BFE) of +10 ft NAVD88 within an AE zone (Figure 2.4).

FEMA provides still water levels (i.e., water surface elevations) at the start of select coastal transects (Figure 2.5). Table 2.2 shows FEMA's published effective still water elevations for 50-, 100-, and 500-yr return period events at the closest transect: Transects 56. Note that this transect is close to I-75 and approximately five miles downstream of the bridge.

Table 2.2	FEMA Stillwater Levels near the Bridge at Coastal Transect No. 56
	0

Return Period	Stillwater Elevation
(yr)	(ft NAVD88)
50	+6.7
100	+7.6
500	+9.9

All bridge crossings must comply with the National Flood Insurance Program. As shown on the effective FIRM, the bridge lies in a FEMA floodway. Therefore, a FEMA no-rise study is required.



Figure 2.5 FEMA Firmette for Bridge Area (<u>www.msc.fema.gov</u>)





2.5 Sea Level Rise

Future sea level rise (SLR) in the project area could adversely affect foundation scour, vertical clearances, and wave attack on upland infrastructure. Most recording stations around the world have indicated that MSL has steadily risen over the past century. The predicted values of SLR vary depending on the predicted value of anticipated temperature rise. FDOT (2024a) indicates designers should apply straight-line extrapolation of the relative sea level rise trend at the nearest NOAA station with long term SLR to determine the sea level rise magnitude over the design life of the facility, in this case, the bridge. Figure 2.6 depicts the closest gage: Port Manatee, FL (8726384) with a SLR rate of 5.5 +/- 0.68 mm/yr. Given the assumption the replacement bridge will begin service in 2030 and have a design service life of 75 yrs, the rate of rise results in 0.62 m or 2.1 ft of sea level rise. Note that this value also includes adjustment for SLR from 1992 (the midpoint of the current tidal epoch) to 2030.



Figure 2.7 NOAA station with long term SLR trends (Sea Level Trends - NOAA Tides & Currents)

2.6 Bridge Geometry and Alternative Analysis

The existing bridge is 2318 feet long with 18 spans ranging from 100 to 144 feet, has a low member elevation of +22.3 ft NAVD. The proposed bridge, located 20 feet west of the current structure, was chosen over an east alignment due to lower right-of-way impacts and construction costs.

The new bridge will be 2315.6 feet long with 18 spans, aligned with the existing bridge. Both bridges' high elevations eliminate the risk of overtopping. Although a separate structure, the new bridge functions as a widening of the existing bridge due to their aligned substructures. This configuration, combined with the high elevations, ensures minimal impact on hydraulic efficiency and no expected backwater effects.

Located in a FEMA no-flood zone, a no-rise study will be conducted employing numerical modeling to confirm minimal hydraulic impacts. Detailed bridge plans and elevations are provided in Appendix A.

2.7 SLIP Study

Section 161.551, Florida Statutes (FS), requires state agencies, among others, which "commission or manage a construction project within the coastal building zone using funds appropriated from the state", conduct a sea level impact projection (SLIP) study. Florida DEP provides an online map service showing areas that require a SLIP study. The proposed bridge is shown as "Area at Risk Due to SLR" and requires a SLIP study (Figure 2.8).



Figure 2.8 Florida EPA Slip Map Tool Showing the Proposed Bridge Location (https://floridadepslip.org/Map.aspx)

References

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2008. *Guide Specifications* for Bridges Vulnerable to Coastal Storms. Washington, DC.
- Arneson, L.A., Zevenbergen, L.W., Lagasse, P.F., and Clopper, P.E. 2012. *Evaluating Scour at Bridges*.
 Publication No. FHWA-HIF-12-003, Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 18, Federal Highway
 Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.
- Buttolph, A.M., Reed, C.W., Kraus, N.C., Ono, N., Larson, M., Camenen, B., Hanson, H., Wamsley, T. and Zundel, A.K., 2006. Two-dimensional depth-averaged circulation model CMS-M2D: Version 3.0, Report 2, sediment transport and morphology change. Engineer Research and Development Center Vicksburg MS Coastal and Hydraulics Lab.
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). 2024a. Drainage Manual. Tallahassee, FL.
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). 2024b. FDOT Design Manual, Design Criteria. Tallahassee, FL.
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). 2022. Bridge Scour Manual. Tallahassee, FL.
- Holthuijsen, L. H., Herman, A., & Booij, N. (2003). *Phase-decoupled refraction–diffraction for spectral wave models*. Coastal Engineering, 49(4), 291-305.
- INTERA Inc. 2019. Bridge Hydraulics Report (BHR) for SR 679 (Manatee Bayway) Structure E Intracoastal Waterway Manatee County, Florida
- IPCC. 2022. "Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; Pörtner, H." O., Roberts, DC, Tignor, M., Poloczanska, ES, Mintenbeck, K., Alegría, A., Craig, M., Langsdorf, S., Löschke, S., Möller, V., et al., Eds.
- Lagasse, P. F., Zevenbergen, L.W., Spitz, W.J., and Arneson, L.A. 2012. *Stream Stability at Highway Structures*. Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 20, FHWA-HIF-12-004. Washington, DC.
- Lagasse, P. F., Clopper, P. E., Pagan-Ortiz, J. E., Zeverbergen, L. W., Arneson, L. A., Schall, J. D., & Girard, L.
 G. 2009. *Bridge Scour and Stream Stability Countermeasures (Vols. 1 and 2), HEC-23*. FHWA-NHI-09-111, Federal Highway Administration, US Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2019 "Continuously Updated Digital Elevation Model (CUDEM) - Ninth Arc-Second Resolution Bathymetric-Topographic Tiles files" NOAA. Accessed January 6, 2023. https://coast.noaa.gov/htdata/raster2/elevation/NCEI_ninth_Topobathy_2014_8483/AL_nwFL/ ncei19_n30X00_w084X50_2019v1.tif.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2020. "2020 NOAA NGS Topobathy Lidar DEM: Hurricane Michael (NW Florida) files." NOAA. Accessed January 6, 2023.

https://chs.coast.noaa.gov/htdata/raster5/elevation/NGS_NW_Florida_Topobathy_DEM_2020_ 9708/.

- Sánchez, A., Wu, W., Li, H., Brown, M. E., Reed, C. W., Rosati, J. D., & Demirbilek, Z. 2014. Coastal Modeling System: Mathematical formulations and numerical methods.
- Sheppard, D.M., and Miller, W. 2003. *Design Storm Surge Hydrographs for the Florida Coast*. Department of Civil and Coastal Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Sweet, W. V., B. D. Hamlington, R. E. Kopp, C. P. Weaver, P. L. Barnard, D. Bekaert, W. Brooks, M. Craghan, G. Dusek, T. Frederikse, G. Garner, A. S. Genz, J. P. Krasting, E. Larour, D. Marcy, J. J. Marra, J. Obeysekera, M. Osler, M. Pendleton, D. Roman, L. Schmied, W. Veatch, K. D. White, and C. Zuzak. 2022. *Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States: Updated Mean Projections and Extreme Water Level Probabilities Along U.S. Coastlines*. 111. NOAA Technical Report NOS 01. Silver Spring: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Service.
- US Army Corps of Engineers. 1995. Design of Coastal Revetments, Seawalls, and Bulkheads. EM_1110-2-1614. Washington D.C.

Appendix A: Bridge Plans



^{7/31/2024 9:19:24} AM Default

jessi.schafer

No.

K:\TAM_Roadway\148400 -Manatee County\148400101 - Ft Hamer\45285215201\struct\B1PlanElev01.dgn







K:\TAM_Roadway\148400 -Manatee County\148400101 - Ft Hamer\45285215201\struct\B1PlanElev03.dgn





K:\TAM_Roadway\148400 -Manatee County\148400101 - Ft Hamer\45285215201\struct\B1PlanElev04.dgn







K:\TAM_Roadway\148400 -Manatee County\148400101 - Ft Hamer\45285215201\struct\B1PlanElev06.dgn