FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY

VOLUME 1 OF 8

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS
(ALL JURISDICTIONS)



COMMUNITY NAME	COMMUNITY NUMBER
ACTON, TOWN OF	250176
ARLINGTON, TOWN OF	250177
ASHBY, TOWN OF	250178
ASHLAND, TOWN OF	250179
AYER, TOWN OF	250180
BEDFORD, TOWN OF	255209
BELMONT, TOWN OF	250182
BILLERICA, TOWN OF	250183
BOXBOROUGH, TOWN OF	250184
BURLINGTON, TOWN OF	250185
CAMBRIDGE, CITY OF	250186
CARLISLE, TOWN OF	250187
CHELMSFORD, TOWN OF	250188
CONCORD, TOWN OF	250189
DRACUT, TOWN OF	250190
DUNSTABLE, TOWN OF	250191
EVERETT, CITY OF	250192
FRAMINGHAM, TOWN OF	250193
GROTON, TOWN OF	250194
HOLLISTON, TOWN OF	250195
HOPKINTON, TOWN OF	250196
HUDSON, TOWN OF	250197
LEXINGTON, TOWN OF	250198
LINCOLN, TOWN OF	250199
LITTLETON, TOWN OF	250200
LOWELL, CITY OF	250201
MALDEN, CITY OF	250202
MARLBOROUGH, CITY OF	250203
MAYNARD, TOWN OF	250204
MEDFORD, CITY OF	250205
MELROSE, CITY OF	250206
NATICK, TOWN OF	250207
NEWTON, CITY OF	250208
NORTH READING, TOWN OF	250209
PEPPERELL, TOWN OF	250210
READING, TOWN OF	250211
SHERBORN, TOWN OF	250212
SHIRLEY, TOWN OF	250213
SOMERVILLE, CITY OF	250214
STONEHAM, TOWN OF	250215
STOW, TOWN OF	250216
SUDBURY, TOWN OF	250217
TEWKSBURY, TOWN OF	250218
TOWNSEND, TOWN OF	250219
TYNGSBOROUGH, TOWN OF	250220
WAKEFIELD, TOWN OF	250221
WALTHAM, CITY OF	250222
WATERTOWN, TOWN OF	250223
WAYLAND, TOWN OF	250224
WESTFORD, TOWN OF	250225
WESTON, TOWN OF	250226
WILMINGTON, TOWN OF	250227
WINCHESTER, TOWN OF	250228
WOBURN, CITY OF	250229

Map Revised: July 7, 2014

Federal Emergency Management Agency

FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY NUMBER
25017CV001B

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 (FIS) may not contain all data available within the repository. It is advisable to contact the community repository for any additional data.

Part or all of this FIS may be revised and republished at any time. In addition, part of this FIS may be revised by the Letter of Map Revision process, which does not involve republication or redistribution of the FIS. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the user to consult with community officials and to check the community repository to obtain the most current FIS components.

Initial Countywide FIS Effective Date: June 4, 2010

Revised Countywide FIS Date: July 7, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 1- July 7, 2014

		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Purpose of Study	1
	1.2 Authority and Acknowledgments	2
	1.3 Coordination	12
2.0	AREA STUDIED	14
	2.1 Scope of Study	14
	2.2 Community Description	22
	2.3 Principal Flood Problems	23
	2.4 Flood Protection Measures	27
3.0	ENGINEERING METHODS	33
	3.1 Hydrologic Analyses	34
	3.2 Hydraulic Analyses	93
	3.3 Vertical Datum	104
4.0	FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT APPLICATIONS	105
	4.1 Floodplain Boundaries	105
	4.2 Floodways	107
5.0	INSURANCE APPLICATIONS	109
6.0	FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP	109
7.0	OTHER STUDIES	116
8.0	LOCATION OF DATA	116
9.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 1 – continued

FIGURES

Page

Figure 1 – Floodway Schematic 108

TABLES

Table 1 – Initial and Final CCO Meetings 13-14

Table 2 – Scope of Revision 15

Table 3 – Letters of Map Change 16

Table 4 – Flooding Sources Studied by Detailed Methods 17-18

Table 5 – Areas Studied by Detailed Methods for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses 19-20

Table 6 – Areas Studied by Redelineation for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses 21

Table 7 – Areas Studied by Approximate Methods for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses 21-22

Table 8 – Summary of Discharges 51-84

Table 9 – Summary of Stillwater Elevations 85-86

Table 10 – Manning's "n" Values 99-103

Table 11 – Community Map History 111-115

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 2 - July 7, 2014

TABLES – continued

Table 12 – Floodway Data 1-140

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 3 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles

Aberjona River	Panels 01P – 08P
Aberjona River North Spur	Panels 09P – 10P
Alewife Brook (Little River)	Panels 11P – 13P
Angelica Brook	Panels 14P – 15P
Assabet Branch No. 3	Panels 16P – 17P
Assabet Branch No. 4	Panel 18P
Assabet River	Panels 19P – 38P
Baddacook Brook	Panels 39P – 40P
Baiting Brook	Panels 41P – 43P
Bear Meadow Brook	Panel 44P
Beaver Brook 1	Panels 45P – 49P
Beaver Brook 2	Panels 50P – 54P
Beaver Brook 2 - Split 1	Panel 55P
Beaver Brook 2 - Split 2	Panel 56P
Beaver Brook 2 - Split 3	Panel 57P
Beaver Brook 3	Panels 58P – 61P
Beaver Brook 4	Panels 62P – 71P
Beaver Brook 5	Panels 72P – 73P
Beaver Dam Brook	Panels 74P – 82P
Bennetts Brook	Panels 83P – 87P
Birch Meadow Brook	Panel 88P
Black Brook	Panel 89P
Bogastow Brook - Jar Brook	Panels 90P – 95P
Bogle Brook 1	Panels 96P – 97P
Bogle Brook 2	Panels 98P – 103P
Boons Pond Branch	Panel 104P
Boutwell Brook	Panels 105P – 106P
Bow Brook	Panels 107P – 108P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 4 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Branch of Assabet River	Panels 109P – 110P
Branch of Elizabeth Brook 1	Panel 111P
Broad Meadow Brook	Panels 112P – 113P
Brook A of Shawsheen River	Panel 114P
Brook from Waushakum Pond	Panels 115P – 116P
Butter Brook	Panels 117P – 119P
Catacoonamug Brook	Panels 120P – 121P
Charles River	Panels 122P – 133P
Cheese Cake Brook	Panel 134P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 4 – continued

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Cherry Brook	Panels 135P – 137P
Chester Brook	Panels 138P – 141P
Chicken Brook	Panels 142P – 145P
Cochituate Brook	Panel 146P
Cold Brook	Panel 147P
Cold Spring Brook	Panels 148P – 151P
Cole's Brook	Panel 152P
Collins Brook	Panel 153P
Conant Brook	Panels 154P – 157P
Concord River	Panels 158P – 164P
Content Brook - Middlesex Canal	Panels 165P – 167P
Course Brook	Panel 168P
Cow Pond Brook	Panels 169P – 171P
Cranberry Brook	Panels 172P – 173P
Cummings Brook	Panels 174P – 175P
Dakins Brook	Panel 176P
Danforth Brook	Panels 177P – 180P
Darby Brook	Panels 181P – 182P
Davis Brook	Panels 183P – 184P
Dirty Meadow Brook	Panel 185P
Dopping Brook	Panels 186P – 187P
Dudley Brook / Tributary A to Dudley Brook	Panels 188P – 191P
East Outlet	Panels 192P – 193P
Elizabeth Brook 1	Panels 194P – 197P
Elizabeth Brook 2	Panels 198P – 203P
Elm Brook	Panels 204P – 206P
Farley Brook	Panels 207P – 208P
Farley Brook Split 1	Panel 209P
Farrar Pond Brook	Panels 210P – 211P
Fort Meadow Brook	Panels 212P – 217P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 5 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Fort Pond Brook	Panels 218P – 225P
Fort Pond Brook Branch 1	Panel 226P
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2	Panel 227P
Grassy Pond Brook	Panels 228P – 229P
Graves Pond Brook	Panel 230P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 5 – continued

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Great Road Tributary	Panel 231P
Greens Brook	Panels 232P – 233P
Guggins Brook	Panels 234P – 236P
Gumpas Pond Brook	Panel 237P
Hales Brook	Panels 238P – 239P
Halls Brook	Panels 240P – 242P
Hayward Brook	Panels 243P – 244P
Heath Brook	Panels 245P – 246P
Heath Hen Meadow Brook	Panels 271P – 248P
Heath Hen Meadow Brook Split	Panel 249P
Hobbs Brook 1	Panels 250P – 251P
Hobbs Brook 2	Panels 252P – 253P
Hog Brook	Panels 254P – 255P
Hop Brook	Panels 256P – 260P
Horn Pond Brook / Fowle Brook	Panels 261P – 263P
Inch Brook	Panel 264P
Ipswich River	Panels 265P – 270P
James Brook	Panels 271P – 278P
Jenny Dugan Brook	Panels 279P – 280P
Jones Brook	Panels 281P – 282P
Kiln Brook	Panels 283P – 284P
King Street Tributary	Panels 285P – 286P
Landham - Allowance Brook	Panels 287P – 291P
Lawrence Brook	Panels 292P – 294P
Little Brook	Panel 295P
Locke Brook	Panels 296P – 297P
Lower Spot Pond Brook	Panel 298P
Lubbers Brook	Panels 299P – 304P
Malden River	Panels 305P – 307P
Maple Meadow Brook	Panels 308P – 310P
Marginal Brook	Panel 311P
Marshall Brook	Panels 312P – 314P
Martins Brook	Panels 315P – 317P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 6 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Martins Pond Brook	Panels 318P – 319P
Mascuppic Brook	Panels 320P – 321P
Mason Brook	Panels 322P – 325P
Meadow Brook	Panels 326P – 327P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 6 – continued

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Meadow River Branch	Panels 328P – 329P
Merrimack River	Panels 330P – 332P
Mill Brook 1	Panels 333P – 335P
Mill Brook 2	Panels 336P – 337P
Mill Brook 3	Panels 338P – 341P
Mill Pond Tributary	Panels 342P – 343P
Mill River	Panels 344P – 346P
Mineway Brook	Panels 347P – 352P
Mongo Brook	Panels 353P – 354P
Morse Brook	Panel 355P
Mowry Brook	Panels 356P – 357P
Mud Pond Brook	Panel 358P
Muddy Brook	Panel 359P
Mulpus Brook	Panels 360P – 368P
Munroe Brook	Panels 369P – 371P
Mystic River	Panels 372P – 374P
Nagog Brook	Panels 375P – 377P
Nashoba Brook	Panels 378P – 381P
Nashua River	Panels 382P – 389P
Nissitissit River	Panels 390P – 392P
Nonacoicus Brook 1	Panels 393P – 394P
Nonacoicus Brook 2	Panel 395P
North Lexington Brook	Panels 396P – 398P
Pages Brook	Panels 399P – 401P
Pages Brook Branch	Panel 402P
Pantry Brook	Panels 403P – 405P
Pearl Hill Brook	Panels 406P – 409P
Peppermint Brook	Panel 410P
Pine Brook	Panel 411P
Pole Brook	Panels 412P – 415P
Pratts Brook	Panels 416P
Putnam Brook	Panels 417P
Reedy Meadow Brook	Panels 418P – 420P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 7 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Reservoir No. 1 - North Branch and Reservoir No. 3	Panels 421P – 422P
Richardson Brook	Panels 423P – 425P
River Meadow Brook	Panels 426P – 430P
Run Brook	Panels 431P – 433P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 7

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Salmon Brook	Panels 434P – 436P
Sandy Brook	Panels 437P – 438P
Saugus River	Panels 439P – 443P
Saunders Brook	Panel 444P
Sawmill Brook 1	Panels 445P – 446P
Sawmill Brook 2	Panel 447P
Schneider Brook	Panels 448P – 449P
Shakers Glen Brook	Panel 450P
Shawsheen River	Panels 451P – 457P
Skug River	Panels 458P – 459P
Snake Brook	Panels 460P – 461P
South Meadow Brook - Paul Brook	Panels 462P – 463P
Spencer Brook	Panel 464P – 467P
Spring Brook	Panels 468P – 470P
Squannacook River	Panels 471P – 477P
Stony Brook	Panels 478P – 479P
Stony Brook 1	Panels 480P – 494P
Stony Brook 2	Panels 495P – 501P
Strong Water Brook	Panels 502P – 503P
Sudbury River	Panels 504P – 513P
Sutton Brook	Panels 514P – 515P
Sweetwater Brook	Panel 516P
Tadmuck Brook	Panels 517P – 518P
Tadmuck Swamp Brook	Panel 519P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 8 - July 7, 2014

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Taylor Brook	Panel 520P
Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook	Panel 521P
Tributary 1 to Sudbury River	Panel 522P
Tributary 2 to Assabet River	Panel 523P
Tributary 2 to Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook	Panel 524P
Tributary 3 to Bogle Brook 2	Panel 525P
Tributary 4 to Bogle Brook 2	Panel 526P
Tributary A to Cold Brook	Panels 527P – 529P
Tributary A to Course Brook	Panel 530P
Tributary A to Hop Brook	Panels 531P – 532P
Tributary A to Pantry Brook	Panels 533P – 534P
Tributary A to Squannacook River	Panels 535P – 536P
Tributary B to Hop Brook	Panel 537P

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Volume 8 – continued

EXHIBITS – continued

Exhibit 1 - Flood Profiles – continued

Tributary B to Squannacook River	Panels 538P – 539P
Tributary B to Vine Brook	Panels 540P – 541P
Tributary C to Vine Brook	Panels 542P – 543P
Tributary to Beaver Brook 3	Panel 544P
Tributary to Cold Spring Brook	Panels 545P – 546P
Tributary to Indian Brook	Panel 547P
Tributary to Martins Brook	Panel 548P
Tributary to Mill Brook	Panels 549P – 552P
Tributary to Nonacoicus Brook 1/Long Pond Brook	Panels 553P – 557P
Tributary to Waushakum Pond	Panels 558P – 559P
Trout Brook	Panels 560P – 561P
Trout Brook 1	Panel 562P
Trout Brook 2	Panels 563P – 565P
Trull Brook	Panels 566P – 571P
Trull Brook Tributary	Panels 572P – 573P
Unkety Brook	Panels 574P – 576P
Valley Pond	Panel 577P
Varnum Brook	Panels 578P – 581P
Vine Brook	Panels 582P – 588P
Walker Brook 1	Panels 589P – 591P
Walker Brook 2	Panels 592P – 595P
Walker Brook 3	Panels 596P – 598P
Walkers Brook	Panels 599P – 602P
Wellington Brook	Panel 603P
West Chester Brook	Panels 604P – 606P
Whitehall Brook	Panels 607P – 609P
Willard Brook	Panels 610P – 611P
Winthrop Canal	Panels 612P – 613P
Witch Brook	Panels 614P – 615P

Exhibit 2 - Flood Insurance Rate Map Index
Flood Insurance Rate Map

FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY
MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS (ALL JURISDICTIONS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Study

This revised countywide Flood Insurance Study (FIS) investigates the existence and severity of flood hazards in, or revises and updates previous FISs/Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the geographic area of Middlesex County, including: the Cities of Cambridge, Everett, Lowell, Malden, Marlborough, Medford, Melrose, Newton, Somerville, Waltham, and Woburn; the Towns of Acton, Arlington, Ashby, Ashland, Ayer, Bedford, Belmont, Billerica, Boxborough, Burlington, Carlisle, Chelmsford, Concord, Dracut, Dunstable, Framingham, Groton, Holliston, Hopkinton, Hudson, Lexington, Lincoln, Littleton, Maynard, Natick, North Reading, Pepperell, Reading, Sherborn, Shirley, Stoneham, Stow, Sudbury, Tewksbury, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Wakefield, Watertown, Wayland, Westford, Weston, Wilmington, and Winchester (hereinafter referred to collectively as Middlesex County).

This FIS aids in the administration of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973. This FIS has developed flood risk data for various areas of the county that will be used to establish actuarial flood insurance rates. This information will also be used by Middlesex County to update existing floodplain regulations as part of the Regular Phase of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), and will also be used by local and regional planners to further promote sound land use and floodplain development. Minimum floodplain management requirements for participation in the NFIP are set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations at 44 CFR, 60.3.

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 Commonwealth (or other jurisdictional agency) will be able to explain them.

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

1.2 Authority and Acknowledgments

The sources of authority for the Middlesex County countywide FIS are the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973.

Information on the authority and acknowledgments for each jurisdiction included in this countywide FIS, as compiled from their previously printed FIS reports, is shown below.

Acton, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses in the FIS report dated January 6, 1988, were prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. The work was completed in December 1985. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the original FIS report were also prepared by Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA. That work was completed in December 1976.
Arlington, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1982, were performed by Camp, Dresser, and McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-3861. That work, which was completed in May 1978, covered all significant flooding sources affecting the Town of Arlington.
Ashland, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 16, 1981, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen, and Bergendoff for the Federal Insurance Administration (FIA), under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979.
Ayer, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 19, 1982, were performed by Howard, Needles, Tammen, and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in January 1978.
Bedford, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated July 4, 1988, were prepared by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA under Contract No. EMW-C-0280. That work was completed in January 1984. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses in the FIS report represent a revision of the original analyses prepared by the

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for FEMA under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-8-71. An updated version was prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc. for FEMA under Contract No. H-4523. That work was completed in April 1979.

Belmont, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 15, 1981, were prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work, which was completed in February 1978, covered all significant flooding sources in the Town of Belmont.

Billerica, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated February 5, 1985, were performed by the Schoenfeld Associates, Inc. for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-C-0280. That work was completed in July 1983. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated May 1980 were performed by Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc. for FEMA under Contract No. H-3861. That work was completed in January 1978.

Boxborough, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated September 8, 1999, were prepared by the Green International Affiliates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMB-96-CO-0403 (Task #4). That work was completed in August 1997. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated March 1978 was prepared by Harris-Toups Associates for the FIA under Contract No. H-4024, That work was completed in April 1977.

Burlington, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1984, were prepared by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4794. That work was completed in March 1981.

Cambridge, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1982, were performed by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work, which was completed in April 1978, covered all significant flooding sources affecting the City of Cambridge. Preliminary findings for Alewife Brook (Little River) were revised using a later study done by Research Analysis, Inc.

Carlisle, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated May 17, 1988, were prepared by the Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-C-0280. That work was completed in 1984. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated October 15, 1980, were prepared by Harris-Toups Associates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work was completed in April 1978.
Chelmsford, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 16, 2004, for River Meadow Brook, were prepared by Roald Haestad, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMB-1999-CO-0564. That work was completed in October 2001. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the original December 1979 FIS and June 4, 1980, FIRM (hereinafter referred to as the 1980 FIS), were prepared by Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-3861. That work was completed in March 1978.
Concord, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 3, 1988, were prepared by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc. for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-C-0280. That work was completed in February 1984. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses in the June 15, 1979, FIS report were prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA under Contract No. H-3861. That work was completed in April 1977.
Dracut, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 5, 1989, were prepared by the New England Division of the USACE for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. EMW-E-0941. This work was completed in July 1986. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 2, 1980, were prepared by the New England Division of the USACE for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-7-76, Project Order No. 24, and Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-10-77, Project Order No. 2. That work was completed in May 1978.
Dunstable, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1982, were prepared by

Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4794. That work was completed in February 1980.

Everett, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 3, 1986, were prepared by Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in January 1985.

Framingham, Town of: For the FIS report dated March 16, 1992, Dewberry & Davis prepared updated hydraulic and hydrologic analyses. The data used in these analyses were provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The work was completed in July 1989. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the original FIS report, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff, for the FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979. In the first revision, updated topographic data were provided by Dewberry & Davis, for FEMA, using contour maps provided by MacCarthy & Sullivan Engineering, Inc. In the second revision, updated zone designations were prepared by Dewberry & Davis for FEMA.

Groton, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1982, were prepared by Howard, Needle, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in January 1978.

Holliston, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated March 1980 were prepared by the C-E Maguire, Inc., for FIA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work was completed in December 1978.

Hopkinton, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1982, were prepared by Howard, Needle, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979.

Hudson, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 1979 were prepared by Harris-Toupes Association, for the FIA, under Contract

No. H-4024. That work was completed in December 1977.

Lexington, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1977 were performed by Harris-Toups Associates for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work, which was completed in April 1977, covered all significant flooding sources affecting the Town of Lexington.

Lincoln, Town of: The hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 17, 1986, were performed by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-C-0280. They were limited to recalculating the flood profiles of Stony Brook and recalculating all floodways based upon the availability of more recent information. In addition, the floodplains and floodways of all streams studied in detail in Lincoln were delineated on topographic maps obtained from the Town of Lincoln (American Air Surveys, Inc., 1968). This work was completed in March 1983. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1977 were prepared by Harris-Toups Associates for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work was completed in May 1977.

Littleton, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 15, 1982, were prepared by Schoenfeld Associates Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4794. That work was completed in October 1980.

Lowell, City of: The hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated September 30, 1992, were prepared by Roald Haestad, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-90-C-3126. That work was completed in March 1991. The original analyses were prepared by the USACE, New England Division, for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. H-2-73, Project Order No. 1. In the first revision, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by the USACE for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. EMW-E-0941. That work was completed in August 1986.

Malden, City of: The topographic information for Town Line Brook and Linden Brook for the FIS report dated

August 20, 2002, was prepared by Roald Haestad, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMB-1999-CO-0564, Modification No. 5. That work was completed in November 2000. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the original FIS report dated May 19, 1987, were prepared by Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in October 1985.

Marlborough, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated July 6, 1981, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979.

Maynard, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1978 were prepared by Harris-Toups Associates for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work was completed in July 1977.

Medford, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 3, 1986, were prepared by Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in January 1985.

Melrose, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated August 5, 1986, were prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in March 1985.

Natick, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated August 1979 were prepared by Harris-Toups Associates, for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work was completed in May 1978.

Newton, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated June 4, 1990, represent a revision of the original analyses by the USACE for FEMA, under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-2-72, Project Order No. 4. The updated version was prepared by Schoenfeld Associates, Inc., for FEMA under Contract No. H-4794. This work was completed in November 1981. The FIS report was revised on July 17, 1986, for FEMA, to adjust the

profiles for the Charles River. A further revision was completed in July 1988 by Dewberry & Davis, for FEMA, to reflect more accurate culvert data on South Meadow Brook.

North Reading, Town of: For the June 16, 2004, revision, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for Martins Brook, Martins Pond, and Skug River were prepared by Green International Affiliates, Inc., for the Town of North Reading under FEMA's Cooperating Technical Communities Program, Agreement No. EMB-2000-CA-0594. That work was completed in November 2001. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for Bear Meadow Brook were taken from the FIS for the Town of Reading. For the April 3, 1989, FIS, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for an updated study of a portion of Martins Brook were prepared by Dewberry & Davis LLC, under agreement with FEMA. That work was completed in January 1987. For the July 6, 1982, FIS, and the January 6, 1983, FIRM (hereinafter referred to as the 1983 FIS), the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by the New England Division of the USACE for FEMA under Inter-Agency Agreement No. IAA-H-10-77, Project Order No. 29. That work was completed in May 1979.

Pepperell, Town of: For the FIS report dated June 2, 1993, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by Green International Affiliates, Inc., under Contract No. EMW-89-C-2820, for FEMA. This work was completed in December 1989. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses in the FIS report dated July 2, 1981, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. Raytheon Autometrics, under subcontract to the study contractor, provided supplemental topographic mapping for areas along the Nashua River, the Nissitissit River, and Reedy Meadow Brook. Schofield Brothers, Incorporated, also under subcontract to the study contractor, provided field survey data and aerial photogrammetric mapping along portions of the Nissitissit River and Reedy Meadow Brook. The aerial photogrammetric mapping was provided by Teledyne Geotronics. That work was completed in January 1978.

Reading, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 2, 1981, were performed by Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4524. That study was completed in August 1978.
Sherborn, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1979 were prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work was completed in July 1978.
Shirley, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 5, 1983, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in January 1978.
Somerville, City of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated July 17, 1986, were prepared by Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in January 1985.
Stoneham, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated July 3, 1986, were prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-84-C-1601. That work was completed in March 1985.
Stow, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated February 1979 were prepared by Harris-Toups Associates for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4024. That work was completed in December 1977.
Sudbury, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated November 20, 1998, were prepared by Green International Affiliates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMW-94-C-4406. That work was completed in February 1996. The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1, 1981, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979.
Tewksbury, Town of:	The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 2, 1981, represent a revision of

the original analyses by Anderson-Nichols and Company, for the FIA under Contract No. H-3707. That work was completed in December 1978.

Townsend, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated February 2, 1982, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in January 1978.

Tyngsborough, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated March 2, 1982, were prepared by Cullinan Engineering Co., Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4797. That work was completed in January 1981.

Wakefield, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated April 1978 were prepared by Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc., Environmental Engineers for the FIA, under Contract No. H-3861. That work was completed in December 1976.

Waltham, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated July 5, 1984, represent a revision of the original analyses prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4523. The original work was completed in April 1978. The updated version was completed in August 1983 from information supplied by C. E. Maguire, Inc., reflecting changes as of December 1981.

Watertown, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated August 1980 were prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work was completed in August 1978.

Wayland, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated February 19, 1986, were prepared by Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4004. That work was completed in November 1979. The revised hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for Hayward Brook were performed by Dewberry & Davis, under agreement with FEMA. That work was completed in April 1985.

Westford, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 15, 1982, were prepared by

Cullinan Engineering Co., Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4797. That work was completed in January 1981.

Weston, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 1980 were prepared by C. E. Maguire, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4523. That work was completed in May 1978.

Wilmington, Town of: For the June 2, 1999, revision, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for Lubbers Brook, from Glen Road to the upstream corporate limits, were prepared by Green International Affiliates, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. EMB-96-CO-0403 (Task No. 3). That work was completed in April 1997. For the January 18, 1989, revision, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared for Martins Brook and Tributary to Martins Brook by Dewberry & Davis, under contract to FEMA. The work for the updated study was completed in November 1986. For the original June 15, 1982, FIS, the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc., for FEMA, under Contract No. H-4524; approximate flood boundaries were prepared by Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. That work was completed in August 1978.

Winchester, Town of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated December 1979 were performed by Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4524. That study, which was completed in July 1978, covered all significant flooding sources in the Town of Winchester.

Woburn, City of: The hydrologic and hydraulic analyses for the FIS report dated January 1980 were performed by Anderson-Nichols & Company, Inc., for the FIA, under Contract No. H-4524. That study was completed in July 1978.

The authority and acknowledgments for the Town of Ashby is not available because no FIS report was ever published for this community.

For the June 4, 2010 countywide study, hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared by ENSR, under subcontract to CR Environmental, Green International Affiliates, under Contract No. EMB-2001-CO-0670. Revised hydrologic and hydraulic analyses were prepared and completed in June 2005. The following

streams were restudied: Aberjona River, Aberjona River North Spur, Alewife Brook (Little River), Cummings Brook, Halls Brook, Horn Pond Brook/Fowle Brook, Little Brook, Mill Brook 3, Mystic River, Schneider Brook, Shakers Glen Brook, Sweetwater Brook, and Wellington Brook.

Floodplain boundaries were delineated using the Office of Geographic and Environmental Information (MassGIS), Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, 2002 LiDAR topography for the study area, at a scale of 1:5,000, suitable for 2-foot contour generation.

The digital base map information was provided by MassGIS. This information was derived from digital orthophotos produced at a scale of 1:5,000 from aerial photography dated April 2005.

For this revised countywide FIS, the DFIRM database and mapping were prepared for FEMA by STARR, (a joint venture between Atkins, Greenhorne & O'Mara, Inc., Stantec, and Camp, Dresser, and McKee (CDM), under Joint Venture Contract No. EMP-2003-CO-2606, Task Order No. HSFE01-10-J-0006. This revision includes detailed hydraulic analyses, redelineation, digitizing of effective flood hazard information and new approximate analyses for the Concord Watershed which includes parts of both Middlesex and Worchester Counties. This FIS only covers work done in Middlesex County. This work was completed in October 2012.

A 10 foot by 10 foot horizontal grid digital elevation model (DEM) was derived from Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data, provided by Photo Science Geospatial Solutions, a STARR subconsultant. This DEM was constructed to cover all drainage areas for streams within the Concord River Watershed, and was the only DEM used during hydraulic modeling, including floodplain delineation. The vertical precision of the DEM is 0.03 feet. Stream centerlines developed during the scoping process were compared to orthophotos and United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) flow lines and revised as required to ensure that the stream channels were in the correct locations. Two foot contour intervals were created from the DEM to use as a reference when adjusting overbank, centerline, and cross section geometry. Using an Optech Gemini LiDAR system, a total 111 flightlines of highest density (Nominal pulse Spacing of 1.0m) were collected over the Concord Watershed area. A total of 405 square miles was collected. A total of 12 missions were flown between December 2 and December 12, 2010.

1.3 Coordination

Consultation Coordination Officer's (CCO) meetings may be held for each jurisdiction in this countywide FIS. An initial CCO meeting is held typically with representatives of FEMA, the community, and the study contractor to explain the nature and purpose of a FIS, and to identify the streams to be studied by detailed

methods. A final CCO meeting is held typically with representatives of FEMA, the community, and the study contractor to review the results of the study.

Prior to the countywide FIS, the dates of the initial and final CCO meetings held for all jurisdictions within Middlesex County from the historic FIS reports are shown in Table 1, "Initial and Final CCO Meetings."

TABLE 1 - INITIAL AND FINAL CCO MEETINGS

Community	Initial CCO Date	Final CCO Date
Acton, Town of	April, 1984	August 19, 1986
Arlington, Town of	August 21, 1975	June 11, 1981
Ashby, Town of	*	*
Ashland, Town of	April 14, 1976	August 21, 1980
Ayer, Town of	April 21, 1976	April 16, 1981
Bedford, Town of	August 30, 1979	December 16, 1986
Belmont, Town of	May 3, 1977	July 27, 1981
Billerica, Town of	August 27, 1979	July 26, 1984
Boxborough, Town of	September 12, 1996	September 8, 1999
Burlington, Town of	May, 1978	April 5, 1982
Cambridge, City of	May 3, 1977	February 25, 1981
Carlisle, Town of	August 23, 1979	December 16, 1986
Chelmsford, Town of	November 29, 2000	August 19, 2002
Concord, Town of	August 30, 1979	December 17, 1986
Dracut, Town of	August 3, 1983	May 4, 1988
Dunstable, Town of	May, 1978	March 30, 1981
Everett, City, of	April, 1984	July 11, 1985
Framingham, Town of	April 9, 1976	March 5, 1981
Groton, Town of	April 12, 1976	May 26, 1981
Holliston, Town of	May 24, 1977	July 24, 1979
Hopkinton, Town of	April 15, 1976	November 4, 1981
Hudson, Town of	April 29, 1976	September 12, 1978
Lexington, Town of	April 13, 1976	June 23, 1977
Lincoln, Town of	August 30, 1979	April 24, 1984
Littleton, Town of	April, 1978	January 26, 1982
Lowell, City of	November 13, 1990	*
Malden, City of	February 23, 2000	*
Marlborough, City of	April 15, 1976	September 15, 1980
Maynard, Town of	April 29, 1976	March 22, 1978
Medford, City of	April, 1984	July 11, 1985
Melrose, City of	April, 1984	September 12, 1985
Natick, Town of	April 9, 1976	November 8, 1978
Newton, City of	May, 1978	December 9, 1982
North Reading, Town of	*	March 31, 2003

*Data Not Available

TABLE 1 - INITIAL AND FINAL CCO MEETINGS -continued

Community	Initial CCO Date	Final CCO Date
Pepperell, Town of	April 30, 1976	November 7, 1991
Reading, Town of	May, 1977	May 30, 1979
Sherborn, Town of	May 24, 1977	March 13, 1979
Shirley, Town of	October 18, 1976	November 4, 1981
Somerville, City of	April, 1984	August 29, 1985
Stow, Town of	May 12, 1976	August 8, 1978
Sudbury, Town of	August 4, 1993	December 10, 1997
Tewksbury, Town of	January 6, 1975	August 28, 1979

For the June 4, 2010 countywide study, which includes a restudy of the Mystic River basin, an initial CCO meeting was held on November 1, 2001, and was attended by representatives of FEMA Region I, ENSR International, Dewberry, Green International Affiliates, and the Massachusetts NFIP Coordinator.

Further, all communities in Middlesex County were notified by FEMA in a letter dated February 5, 2003, that FEMA will be preparing a FIS and FIRM for Middlesex County, Massachusetts. The letter stated that the effective FIRMs and Flood Hazard Boundary Maps (FHBMs) of these communities will be digitally converted to a format that conforms to FEMA's Digital FIRM specifications.

For the countywide FIS, final CCO meetings were held on November 5, 7, and 8, 2007, and were attended by representatives of FEMA, Dewberry, ENSR, the Commonwealth, and various communities.

For this revised countywide FIS which includes a restudy of the Concord Watershed, three initial CCO meetings were held. The first meeting was held on January 13, 2011 in the Town of Southborough, Worcester County. The second meeting was held on January 18, 2011 in the Town of Chelmsford, Middlesex County. The third meeting was held on February 7, 2011 in the Town of Concord, Middlesex County. All meeting were attended by representatives of FEMA Region I, STARR, and state and community officials.

2.0 AREA STUDIED

2.1 Scope of Study

Countywide Analyses

This FIS covers the geographic area of Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

As part of the countywide FIS, which includes a restudy of the Mystic River basin, updated analyses were included for the flooding sources shown in Table 2, "Scope of Revision."

TABLE 2 - SCOPE OF REVISION

Stream	Limits of Revised or New Detailed Study
Aberjona River	From its confluence with Mystic River to the confluence of the Aberjona River North Spur
Aberjona River North Spur	From its confluence with Aberjona River to a point approximately 275 feet upstream of Willow Street
Alewife Brook (Little River)	From its confluence with Mystic River to the confluence of Wellington Brook
Cummings Brook	From its confluence with Shakers Glen Brook to a point approximately 130 feet upstream of Winn Street
Halls Brook	From its confluence with Aberjona River to a point approximately 220 feet upstream of Merrimac Street
Horn Pond Brook/Fowle Brook	From its confluence with Aberjona River to the confluence of Shakers Glen Brook
Little Brook	From its confluence with Cummings Brook to a point approximately 400 feet upstream of Bedford Road
Mill Brook 3	From its confluence with Lower Mystic Lake to a point approximately 40 feet upstream of Boston and Maine Railroad
Mystic River	From Amelia Earhart Dam to the outlet of Lower Mystic Lake
Schneider Brook	From its confluence with Aberjona River to a point approximately 800 feet upstream of Forbes Street
Shakers Glen Brook	From its confluence with Fowle Brook to a point approximately 190 feet upstream of Russell Street
Sweetwater Brook	From its confluence with Aberjona River to a point approximately 120 feet upstream of Lindenwood Road
Wellington Brook	From its confluence with Alewife Brook (Little River) to a point approximately 710 feet upstream of Library Private Drive

This FIS also incorporates the determinations of letters issued by FEMA resulting in map changes (Letter of Map Revision [LOMR], Letter of Map Revision - based on Fill [LOMR-F], and Letter of Map Amendment [LOMA], as shown in Table 3, "Letters of Map Change."

TABLE 3 - LETTERS OF MAP CHANGE

Community	Flooding Source(s)/Project Identifier	Effective Date	Type
Bedford, Town of	Concord River – Bedford Meadows Subdivision	May 20, 1996	LOMR
Bedford, Town of	Elm Brook – 135 South Road	March 31, 2009	LOMR
Billerica, Town of	Content Brook – Whipple Road Culvert	August 15, 1999	LOMR
Concord, Town of	Mill Brook 3 – Keyes Road Weir and Footbridge (2nd Submittal)	November 22, 2002	LOMR
Dunstable, Town of	Nashua River- N.R.L.C & Patenaude Gravel Pit	November 8, 1999	LOMR
Framingham, Town of	Baiting Brook – Belport Farms Subdivision	November 11, 1994	LOMR
Lowell, City of	Trull Brook Tributary	October 25, 1998	LOMR
Lowell, City of	River Meadow Brook, Former Wang Towers	January 8, 1996	LOMR
Pepperell, Town of	Nashua River (Data from Nashua, NH LMMP)	July 12, 2001	LOMR
Stow, Town of	Analysis of Zone A area for Elizabeth Brook – Land Realty Trust	November 17, 1989	LOMR
Tewksbury, Town of	Trull Brook Tributary	October 25, 1998	LOMR
Westford, Town of	Wyman's Beach	November 14, 2005	LOMR
Wilmington, Town of	Martins Brook	March 16, 2004	LOMR

The areas studied by detailed methods were selected with priority given to all known flood hazard areas and areas of projected development and proposed

construction. All or portions of the flooding sources listed in Table 4, "Flooding Sources Studied by Detailed Methods," were studied by detailed methods. Limits of detailed study are indicated on the Flood Profiles (Exhibit 1) and on the FIRM (Exhibit 2).

TABLE 4 - FLOODING SOURCES STUDIED BY DETAILED METHODS

Aberjona River
Aberjona River North Spur
Alewife Brook (Little River)
Angelica Brook
Assabet Branch No. 3
Assabet Branch No. 4
Assabet River
Atlantic Ocean
Baddacook Brook
Baiting Brook
Bear Meadow Brook
Beaver Brook 1
Beaver Brook 2
Beaver Brook 3
Beaver Brook 4
Beaver Brook 5
Beaver Dam Brook
Bennetts Brook
Birch Meadow Brook
Black Brook
Bogastow Brook / Jar Brook
Bogle Brook 1
Bogle Brook 2
Boons Pond and Branch
Boutwell Brook
Bow Brook
Branch of Assabet River
Branch of Elizabeth Brook 1
Broad Meadow Brook
Brook A of Shawsheen River
Brook from Waushakum Pond
Butter Brook
Catacoonamug Brook
Charles River
Cheese Cake Brook
Cherry Brook
Chester Brook
Chicken Brook
Cochituate Brook
Cold Brook
Cold Spring Brook
Cole's Brook
Collins Brook
Conant Brook
Concord River
Content Brook - Middlesex Canal
Course Brook
Cow Pond Brook
Cummings Brook
Dakins Brook
Danforth Brook
Darby Brook
Davis Brook
Dirty Meadow Brook
Dopping Brook
Dudley Brook/Tributary A to Dudley Brook
East Outlet
Elizabeth Brook 1
Elizabeth Brook 2
Ell Pond
Elm Brook
Farrar Pond Brook
Fort Meadow Brook
Fort Pond Brook
Fort Pond Brook Branch 1
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2
Grassy Pond Brook
Graves Pond Brook
Great Road Tributary
Greens Brook
Guggins Brook
Gumpas Pond Brook
Hales Brook
Halls Brook
Hayward Brook
Heath Brook
Hobbs Brook 1
Hobbs Brook 2
Hog Brook
Hop Brook
Horn Pond Brook / Fowle Brook
Indian Brook
Ipswich River
James Brook
Jones Brook
Kiln Brook
King Street Tributary
Landham - Allowance Brook
Lake Quannapowitt
Lawrence Brook
Linden Brook
Little Brook
Locke Brook
Lower Spot Pond Brook
Lower Mystic Lake
Lubbers Brook
Malden River
Maple Meadow Brook
Marginal Brook
Marshall Brook
Martins Brook
Martins Pond Brook
Mascuppic Brook
Massapoag Pond
Mason Brook
Meadow Brook
Meadow River Branch
Merrimack River
Mill Brook 1
Mill Brook 2
Mill Brook 3
Mill Pond Tributary
Mill River
Mineway Brook

TABLE 4 - FLOODING SOURCES STUDIED BY DETAILED METHODS - continued

Mongo Brook
Morse Brook
Mowry Brook
Mud Pond Brook
Mulpus Brook
Munroe Brook
Mystic River
Nagog Brook
Nagog Pond
Nashoba Brook
Nashua River
Nissitissit River
Nonacoicus Brook 1
Nonacoicus Brook 2
North Lexington Brook
Pages Brook
Pages Brook Branch
Pantry Brook
Pearl Hill Brook
Peppermint Brook
Pine Brook
Pole Brook
Pratts Brook
Putnam Brook
Reedy Meadow Brook
Reservoir No. 1 – North Branch and Reservoir No. 3
Richardson Brook
River Meadow Brook
Run Brook
Salmon Brook
Sandy Brook
Saugus River
Saunders Brook
Sawmill Brook 1
Sawmill Brook 2
Schneider Brook
Shakers Glen Brook
Shawsheen River
Skug River
Snake Brook
South Meadow Brook/ Paul Brook
Spencer Brook
Spring Brook
Squannacook River
Stony Brook 1
Stony Brook 2
Sudbury River
Sutton Brook
Sweetwater Brook
Tadmuck Brook
Tadmuck Swamp Brook
Taylor Brook
Town Line Brook
Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook
Tributary 1 to Sudbury River
Tributary 2 to Assabet River
Tributary 2 to Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook
Tributary 3 to Bogle Brook 2
Tributary 4 to Bogle Brook 2
Tributary A to Cold Brook
Tributary A to Course Brook
Tributary A to Hop Brook
Tributary A to Pantry Brook
Tributary A to Squannacook River
Tributary B to Hop Brook
Tributary B to Squannacook River
Tributary B to Vine Brook
Tributary C to Hop Brook
Tributary C to Vine Brook
Tributary D to Hop Brook
Tributary to Beaver Brook 3
Tributary to Cold Spring Brook
Tributary to Indian Brook
Tributary to Martins Brook
Tributary to Mill Brook
Tributary to Nonacoicus Brook 1/Long Pond Brook
Tributary to Waushakum Pond
Trout Brook 1
Trout Brook 2
Trull Brook
Trull Brook Tributary
Unkety Brook
Upper Mystic Lake
Valley Brook
Varnum Brook
Vine Brook
Walkers Brook
Walker Brook 1
Walker Brook 2
Walker Brook 3
Waushakum Pond
Wellington Brook
West Chester Brook
Whitehall Brook
Willard Brook
Winthrop Canal
Witch Brook

Revised Countywide Analyses

As part of this revised countywide FIS, updated analyses is included for the flooding sources shown in Table 5, "Areas Studied by Detailed Methods for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses," lists the streams that were newly studied by detailed methods.

TABLE 5 - AREAS STUDIED BY DETAILED MEHTODS FOR CONCORD WATERSHED REVISED COUNTYWIDE ANALYSES

Stream	Limits of Revised Detailed Study
Assabet River	From its confluence with Sudbury River to approximately 370 feet upstream of Robin Hill Street
Beaver Brook 2	From its confluence with River Meadow Brook to Littleton Road/State Route 110
Beaver Brook 2 – Split1	From its confluence with Beaver Brook 2 to approximately 1,740 feet upstream of the confluence with Beaver Brook 2
Beaver Brook 2 – Split 2	From its confluence with Beaver Brook 2 to approximately 370 feet upstream of the confluence with Beaver Brook 2
Beaver Brook 2 – Split 3	From its confluence with Beaver Brook 2 to approximately 1,260 feet upstream of the confluence with Beaver Brook 2
Cold Spring Brook	From its confluence with Sudbury River to approximately 1,500 feet upstream of Main Street
Concord River	From its confluence with Merrimack River to approximately 600 feet upstream of Lowell Road
Course Brook	From approximately 500 feet downstream of Pond Street to approximately 250 feet upstream of Merchant Road
Elizabeth Brook 1	From approximately 7,200 feet above the confluence with Assabet River to Delany Street
Elizabeth Brook 2	From approximately 895 feet below Hoffman Dam to Middlesex/Worcester county boundary
Farley Brook	From its confluence with River Meadow Brook to approximately 1,800 feet upstream of Sierra Drive
Fort Pond Brook Branch 1	From approximately 180 feet downstream of Conant Street to approximately 2,700 feet upstream of Rockland Avenue
Heath Hen Meadow Brook	From its confluence with Fort Pond Brook to approximately 3,900 feet downstream of Action Road
Heath Hen Meadow Brook Split 1	From its confluence with Heath Hen Meadow Brook to approximately 3,140 feet upstream of the confluence with Heath Hen Meadow Brook

TABLE 5 - AREAS STUDIED BY DETAILED MEHTODS FOR CONCORD WATERSHED REVISED COUNTYWIDE ANALYSES - continued

Stream	Limits of Revised Detailed Study
Jenny Dugan Brook	From its confluence with Sudbury River to approximately 3,200 feet upstream of Williams Road
Muddy Brook	From its confluence with Heath Hen Meadow Brook to approximately 1,400 feet upstream of Willow Street
Pratts Brook	From its confluence with Fort Pond Brook to approximately 180 feet downstream of Conant Street
Putnam Brook	From its confluence with River Meadow Brook to approximately 750 feet upstream of Hall Road
Spencer Brook	From approximately 960 feet upstream of Barretts Mill Road to approximately 1,600 feet upstream of Russell Street
Stony Brook	From its confluence with Sudbury River to approximately 200 feet upstream of Deerfoot Road
Sudbury River	From approximately 600 feet upstream of Lowell Road to approximately 220 feet upstream of Interstate 495
Sudbury River – Split1	From its confluence with Sudbury River to approximately 580 feet upstream of confluence with Sudbury River
Tributary A to Course Brook	From its confluence with Course Brook to approximately 2,100 feet upstream of the confluence with Course Brook

Table 6 "Areas Studied by Redelineation for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses" were areas that were redelineated in partial or full for this revised countywide analyses;

TABLE 6 - AREAS STUDIED BY REDELINEATION FOR CONCORD WATERSHED REVISED COUNTYWIDE ANALYSES

Angelica Brook
Assabet River Branch 3
Baiting Brook
Beaver Dam Brook
Birch Meadow Brook
Boons Pond and Branch
Branch of Assabet River
Branch of Elizabeth Brook 1
Broad Meadow Brook
Brook Waushakum Pond
Butter Brook
Cold Brook
Cold Spring Brook
Coles Brook
Conant Brook
Cranberry Brook
Dakins Brook
Danford Brook
Tributary A to Dudley Brook
East Outlet
Elizabeth Brook 1
Farrar Pond Brook
Fort Meadow Brook
Fort Pond Brook
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2
Grassy Pond Brook
Guggins Brook
Hales Brook
Haywood Brook
Hog Brook
Hop Brook
Landham-Allowance Brook
Marginal Brook
Meadow River Branch
Mill Brook 1
Mill Brook 2
Mineway Brook
Mowry Brook
Nagog Brook
Nashoba Brook
Pages Brook
Pages Brook Branch
Pantry Brook
Pine Brook
Pole Brook
River Meadow Brook
Run Brook
Sawmill Brook 2
Snake Brook
Spencer Brook
Tadmuck Swamp Brook
Tributary 1 to Coles Brook
Tributary 1 to Sudbury River
Tributary 2 to Tributary 1 to Coles Brook
Tributary A to Hop Brook
Tributary A to Cold Brook
Tributary A to Pantry Brook
Tributary B to Hop Brook
Tributary to Cold Spring Brook
Tributary to Mill Brook
Tributary 1 to Stony Brook
Tributary to Waushakum Pond
Tributary 2 to Assabet River
Trout Brook
Walker Brook 3

All or portions of numerous flooding sources in the county were studied by approximate methods. Approximate analyses were used to study those areas having a low development potential or minimal flood hazards. The scope and methods of the study were proposed to, and agreed upon, by FEMA and Middlesex County. Table 7 "Areas Studied by Approximate Methods for Concord Watershed Revised Countywide Analyses" lists the streams studied in partial or full for this revised countywide analyses;

TABLE 7- AREAS STUDIED BY APPROXIMATE METHODS FOR CONCORD WATERSHED REVISED COUNTYWIDE ANALYSES

Angelica Brook
Assabet Branch 4
Assabet Branch Tributary 5,5.1
Beaver Brook 2 Tributaries 1-3
Beaver Brook 2 (East)
Beaver Brook 2 (West)
Birch Meadow Brook
Butter Brook
Cathy Road Tributary
Cathy Road Tributary to Tributary 1
Cochituate Brook
Cold Spring Brook (East)
Cold Spring Brook (West)
Cold Spring Brook Tributary 3
Coles Brook
Coles Brook Tributary 1
Cranberry Brook
Cranberry Brook Tributary 1
Crooked Brook
Dolly Brook
Elizabeth Brook 1
Fort Meadow Brook Tributary 1
Fort Pond Brook
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2 to Tributary 1
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2 to Tributary 2
Fort Pond Brook Tributaries 1-4
Grassy Pond Brook
Grassy Pond Brook Tributary 1
Grassy Pond Brook Tributary 2
Guggins Brook Tributary 1
Hales Brook

TABLE 7- AREAS STUDIED BY APPROXIMATE METHODS FOR CONCORD WATERSHED REVISED COUNTYWIDE ANALYSES - continued

Hazel Brook	Pages Brook Branch	Stony Brook Tributary 1
Heath Hen Meadow Brook	Pantry Brook Tributary 1	Sudbury River Tributary 1
Heath Hen Meadow Brook Tributaries 1-5	Pine Brook	Sudbury River Tributary 2
Hog Brook	Ponds 10, 11,14,15,16	Sudbury River Tributary 7
Inch Brook	Pond Brook	Sudbury River Tributary 10
Indian Brook	Pond Brooks Tributaries 1-2	Sudbury River Tributary 11
Indian Brook Tributary 1	Pratts Brook Tributaries 1-3	Sudbury River Tributary 12
Indian Brook Tributary 4	River Meadow Brook	North Tributary 1
Long Pond Brook	Road Brook Tributary 2	Tributary to Cold Spring Brook
Meadow River Branch	Road Brook Tributary 2.1	Trout Brook
Mill Brook	Road Brook Tributary 2.2	Vine Brook
Nashoba Brook	Russell Millpond Brook	Vine Brook Tributaries 1-4
Nashoba Brook Tributary 3	Second Division Brook	Waushakum Pond
Nonsex Brook	South Brook	Whitehall Brook Tributary 3
	South Street Brook	

This revision incorporates LOMR 10-01-2135P dated October 8, 2010 affecting Jar Brook within the Town of Ashland and the Town of Holliston.

2.2 Community Description

Middlesex County is located in eastern Massachusetts. In Middlesex County, there are 54 communities. The Towns of Ashby, Ayer, Groton, Pepperell, Shirley, and Townsend are located in the northwestern section of the county. The Towns of Carlisle, Chelmsford, Dunstable, Tyngsborough, and Westford are located in the northern section of the county. In the northeastern part of the county, lie the City of Lowell and the Towns of Billerica, Burlington, Dracut, North Reading, Tewksbury, and Wilmington. In the eastern part of the county are the City of Boston suburbs including the Cities of Cambridge, Everett, Malden, Medford, Melrose, Somerville, and Woburn, and the Towns of Arlington, Belmont, Reading, Stoneham, Wakefield, and Winchester. The City of Boston suburbs also spill into the southeastern part of the county to include the Cities of Newton and Waltham and the Towns of Watertown and Weston. In the central part of Middlesex County lie the Towns of Bedford, Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln. In the far southern portion of the county are the Towns of Ashland, Framingham, Holliston, Hopkinton, Natick, and Sherborn. Southwestern Middlesex County contains the City of Marlborough and the Towns of Hudson, Maynard, Sudbury, and Wayland. The Towns of Acton, Boxborough, Littleton, and Stow are located in the western part of Middlesex County.

Middlesex County is bordered to the north by communities of Hillsboro County, New Hampshire: the Cities of Nashua and Manchester and the Towns of Antrim, East Merrimack, Hillsborough, Milford, and Peterborough. To the east, the county is bordered by communities of Essex County: the Cities of Lawrence and Peabody and the Towns of Andover, Lynnfield, Methuen, Middleton, and Saugus. It is bordered to the southeast by the City of Boston located in Suffolk County. Middlesex County is bordered to the south by communities of Norfolk County: the

Towns of Dover, Medfield, Medway, Millis, Needham, and Wellesley. To the west, the county is bordered by the communities of Worcester County: the Cities of Fitchburg and Leominster and the Towns of Ashburnham, Berlin, Bolton, Harvard, Lancaster, Lunenburg, Milford, Northborough, Southborough, Upton and Westborough.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the estimated population of Middlesex County was 1,503,085 in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

The topography of the county is flat coastal plains to the east with elevations near 10 feet in parts of Cambridge, gently rolling hills to the south and center of the county with elevations ranging from 200 feet to 800 feet, and more hilly terrains to the west and northwest with elevations from 800 feet to over 1,400 feet in Ashby and Townsend. Soils are generally made up of sediment in lower elevations and are quite rocky in the western and northwestern part of the county. The development in Middlesex County is primarily residential and commercial.

The climate of the county can be classified as modified continental courtesy of the Atlantic Ocean. The average high temperature in January is near 36 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) with average January lows near 21°F. Average July high temperatures are near 83°F with average low temperatures in July near 65°F. Low temperatures during winter infrequently drop below 0°F and high temperatures rarely rise above 100°F in summer (National Weather Service, Boston, 2006). Average annual precipitation for Middlesex County ranges from 42 inches in the east to near 50 inches in the higher hills of the northwest (Oregon State University, 2006).

2.3 Principal Flood Problems

Historically, excessive rainfall along, or in combination with, snowmelt runoff have produced flooding in low-lying areas of Middlesex County. Severe flooding occurred during August 1955. The flood of August 1955 resulted from two hurricanes that arrived almost concurrently-Hurricane Connie, occurring between August 11 and 15; and Hurricane Diane occurring between August 17 and 20. As a result of these two storms, roads and bridges were overtopped, and residences and businesses were flooded. Further, significant recorded floods were those occurring in May 1850, December 1878, July 1891, July 1897, February and March 1900, November 1927, March 1936, July and September 1938, October 1942, October 1955, April 1960, March 1968, and January 1979.

Flooding in Middlesex County may be caused by a number of factors: inadequate and deteriorated river channels, constricting culverts and bridges, heavy precipitation in combination with frozen ground conditions, summer and fall hurricanes, winter northeasters, inadequate storm drain discharge, increased development, topographic conditions, and undersized culverts.

Chapter 131, Section 40 (310 CMR 10.00) of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (revised, April 1, 1983) is commonly referred to as the Wetlands Protection Act. The law gives the responsibility for issuing permits to remove, fill, dredge, or alter wetlands to the local conservation

commission. The commission has to determine if an area on which a permit is requested "is significant to public or private water supply, to flood control, to storm damage prevention, to prevention of pollution, to protection of land containing shellfish, or to the protection of fisheries." After a public hearing, the commission can impose such conditions as will contribute to the protection of these interests. The Department of Environmental Quality Engineering (DEQE) may also make a determination after a review of the commission's order. Conditions imposed by the DEQE supersede conditions imposed by the commission. Detailed rules and regulations concerning the administration of this act have been promulgated by the DEQE.

Section 40 now requires a conservation commission, if requested, to make a determination of whether a particular parcel of land is a wetland and governed by the Wetlands Protection Act. It also contains definitions of terms to aid this determination.

Chapter 131, Section 40A of the Acts of 1968, as amended by Chapter 782 of the Acts of 1972, gives the commissioner of the Department of Environmental Management the authority to protect inland wetlands and floodplains by establishing encroachment lines "for the purpose of preserving and promoting the public safety, private property, wildlife, fisheries, water resources, floodplain areas, and agriculture." The commissioner may adopt orders regulating, restricting, or prohibiting the altering or polluting of inland wetlands by designating lines with which no obstruction or encroachment would be permitted without prior approval. These restrictions require notifications to each land owner affected, public hearings, and approval by the town. Section 40A was further amended by Chapter 818 by defining "inland wetlands" to include the definition of "freshwater wetlands" as set forth in Section 40 as "that portion of any bank that touches any inland waters or any freshwater wetland, and any freshwater wetland subject to flooding."

The Damondale Dam in West Concord and the old High Street Dam (Powder Mill Dam) in Acton affect flood elevations on the Assabet River. Warners Pond Dam in West Concord affects flooding in Warners Pond and the lower portions of Fort Pond Brook and Nashoba Brook. The Merriam, Cement, and Erikson Dams affect flooding on Fort Pond Brook. The Concord Road and Wheeler Lane Dams affect flooding on Nashoba Brook. The Amelia Earhart Dam in Arlington affects flood elevations on the Mystic River, Lower Mystic Lake, and Alewife Brook (Little River). The Cooke's Hollow Dam affects flooding on Mill Brook 3. The Charles River Dam at Warren Avenue in Boston controls the level of the Charles River within the City of Cambridge. This dam was designed to maintain the basin at a level of 4.35 feet during the 1-percent-annual-chance flood. It is estimated that damage to properties along the basin will not occur until the basin level reaches an elevation of 4.6 feet. With water being pumped at a rate of 8,400 cubic feet per second (cfs) at the dam, a basin level of 4.6 feet can be expected to be exceeded approximately once in 175 years. The Talbot Mills Dam in Billerica affects flooding on the Concord and Sudbury Rivers. The Newton Lower Falls Dam, the Cordingly Dam, and the Metropolitan Dam affect flood elevations on the lower Charles River. The Cochrane Dam, which is located in Needham and

Dover, affects flood elevations on the upper Charles River. The significance of the combination of the upstream control structures and natural valley storage can be explained when analyzing the March 1968 flood. Runoff within the lower basin crested at the old Charles River Dam within hours. The upper basin peak flow took four days to reach the dam. All storm runoff was drained from the watershed in about a month's time.

The following tabulation, taken from a USACE Flood Plain Information report, presents the relative flood heights at the Carlisle Road bridge (State Route 225) from Bedford to Carlisle for the 10 major floods in the Concord River basin in order of magnitude.

Date of Crest[1]	Estimated Elevation (feet NAVD88)	Peak Discharge at Lowell[2] (cfs)
August 23, 1955	118.6	4,540
January 26, 1979	118.5	5,400
March 20, 1936	118.4	6,000
March 27, 1968	117.9	4,900
July 29, 1938	117.3	3,790
September 15, 1954	116.7	3,340
September 24, 1938	116.5	3,210
March 24, 1948	116.5	3,200
January 30, 1958	116.4	3,120
April 18, 1956	116.2	2,970

[1] The Carlisle Road bridge is located one mile upstream of the Bedford/ Billerica/Carlisle corporate limits.

[2] The Lowell gage is located 9.15 miles downstream of the Bedford/Billerica/Carlisle corporate limits.

Velocities of water during a 1-percent-annual-chance flood on the Concord River would be approximately 2.0 feet per second (fps) in the main channel and approximately 0.4 fps over the floodplain. For the Shawsheen River, velocities would be somewhat greater than 4 fps in the main channel and approximately 0.5 fps over the bank. During the 1936 and 1955 floods, it was estimated that velocities in the channel of the Concord River ranged up to 1.9 fps. Overbank velocities ranged up to 0.3 fps. These flood velocities are not considered hazardous.

The duration of flooding for most of the Concord River is generally sustained due to the large drainage area, shallow channel slopes, and wide meadow flood-storage areas. Records indicate that the 1936 flood remained higher than an elevation of 117.2 feet North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88) at the Carlisle Road bridge for more than 11 days. Hurricane Diane occurred on August 19 and 20, 1955, but the Concord River did not crest until late on August 22 with water levels remaining above an elevation of 117.2 feet NAVD88 for over 3 days. The Shawsheen River, on the other hand, rises fairly rapidly and crests within 36 to 48 hours after the time of maximum precipitation over the watershed.

Flooding along the coastline of the Town of Everett (downstream of Amelia Earhart Dam) is greatly influenced by storm surge elevations from Boston Harbor. The flood of record occurred in February 1978. A flood elevation of 10.25 feet was recorded at the U.S.S. Constitution in the nearby Charlestown section of Boston.

The flooding history of the Merrimack River includes information of floods dating back to 1785, although little factual information on these early floods exists. The dates and peak discharges of the five largest floods recorded at the USGS gage on the Merrimack River, below the mouth of the Concord River gage (No. 01100000), are shown in the following tabulation:

Date	Peak Discharge (cfs)
March 20, 1936	173,000
September 23, 1938	121,000
April 23, 1852	108,000[1]
April 7, 1987	84,700
April 6, 1960	79,000[2]
November 5, 1927	76,800[1]

[1] Based on data furnished by Proprietors of Locks and Canals
[2] Modified by Franklin Falls, and the Blackwater and MacDowell Reservoirs.

The USGS has maintained continuous discharge records on the Concord River in Lowell since 1937. Based on the flow records of this gage, the greatest flood was recorded in March 1968 with a peak flow of 4,800 cfs. Flood records indicate that prior to the establishment of the gage, a water-surface elevation of approximately 77.2 feet NAVD88 was experienced in March 1936 in the vicinity of the gage site.

In March 1968, 5 inches of rain coupled with melting snow produced flood conditions in Natick. This storm was comparable to a 2-percent-annual-chance event, according to the USGS gage record on the Charles River at Charles River Village (No. 01103500).

High-water marks gathered after the 1936 and 1968 floods on the Ipswich River are as follows:

Location	1936 Flood Height Elevation (feet NAVD88)	1968 Flood Height Elevation (feet NAVD88)
Main Street (upstream side)	69.5	70.1
200 feet downstream of Mill Street	N/A	70.6
Mill Street (upstream side)	N/A	70.7
State Route 93 (downstream side in Wilmington)	N/A	74.1

On the Aberjona River, high water marks gathered after the March 1936 flood are presented below:

Location	Elevation (feet NAVD88)
Willow Street and Summer Avenue culvert	81.0
Boston & Maine Railroad	85.8
Lowell and Intervale Streets	88.4

The Massachusetts Geodetic Survey gathered high water mark data for the 1936 flood on the Merrimack River. Representative crest elevations for the Merrimack River are shown in the following tabulation:

Location	Elevation (feet NAVD88)
At bridge to Tyngs Island	111.0
At country club at north end of Tyngs Island	111.3
State Route 113 at Butterfield Road	112.8
At Tyngsborough Bridge east abutment	114.0
At Tyngsborough Bridge west abutment	114.7
At Tyngsborough- Nashua, New Hampshire corporate limits	118.1

Two features, one man-made and one natural, affect flooding in Sudbury along the Sudbury River. The man-made feature is the Talbot Mill Dam on the Concord River in Billerica which creates a backwater effect from Billerica to Framingham. The crest of the Talbot Mill Dam is approximately 108.2 feet NAVD88, while the bottom of the Sudbury River at the downstream corporate limits is approximately 102.2 feet NAVD88. The natural feature is the low undefined banks of the Sudbury River which are adjacent to bordering vegetated wetlands. These two features make parts of Sudbury (as well as parts of Wayland, Concord, and Lincoln) a natural detention area for floodwaters.

2.4 Flood Protection Measures

Various measures have been taken in Middlesex County for flood protection. Among them: the adoption of local floodplain zoning ordinances (which are intended to regulate construction, excavation, filling, and grading of any land situated below specified elevations); construction of dams to control flooding (for example, along the Assabet River and its major tributaries); zoning by-laws (which may, for example, allow development within the floodplain only by special permit); stormwater drainage programs; dredging of channels; replacement of inadequate culverts; preserving natural runoff and flow patterns of streams and floodwater storage areas; wetland identification; flood retention structures; formation of Floodplain Conservancy Districts; The Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938; flood protection dikes and walls; holding pond storage;

natural storage that exists in the many swamps and ponds; and establishing wetlands protection districts.

Ten dams have been constructed within the Upper Assabet River basin to control flooding and provide recreation. These dams are in Berlin, Bolton, Stow, Marlborough, Westborough, Northborough, and Shrewsbury, and they were designed to reduce the peak water-surface elevations of the 1-percent-annual-chance flood by 2.3 feet at the Maynard USGS gaging station.

Originally a Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) water-supply reservoir and presently a recreation area, the Ashland Reservoir serves to moderate the flood flows of the lower portion of Cold Spring Brook.

An extensive portion of the Concord and Sudbury Rivers floodplain is further protected from development by being designated as part of the Great Meadows National Wildlife Refuge.

A dam is located on Sawmill Brook at the end of Sawmill Road approximately 10 feet from the Burlington-Wilmington corporate limits. The dam, locally known as the Noah Clapp Dam, controls a drainage area of approximately 960 acres, is approximately 80 feet long and ranges in height from 7 to 14 feet.

There are five flood control dams located upstream in New Hampshire that are operated in conjunction with each other to reduce flooding on the Merrimack River and its upstream tributaries. Flood discharges along the Merrimack River have been significantly reduced as a result of these projects. These structures are the Franklin Falls Dam on the Pemigewasset River, the Edward McDowell Dam on Nubanusit Brook, the Blackwater Dam on the Blackwater River (flood control); and the Everett Dam on the Piscataquog River and the Hopkinton Dam on the Contoocook River that control Hopkinton Lake. In addition to the upstream reservoirs, the USACE has also completed five local protection projects.

There are 14 non-Federal reservoir or lake systems existing in the Merrimack River basin with usable storage in excess of 4,000 acre-feet. These reservoirs have no storage specifically allocated for flood control; however, they are drawn down during the winter months and are capable of storing significant amounts of runoff during the spring snowmelt period.

Massapoag Pond Dam, located on Salmon Brook, provides storage in Massapoag Pond during periods of heavy runoff, provided storage capacity is available.

Chapter 131, Section 40 of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (amended by Chapter 65 of the Acts of 1978) is commonly referred to as the Wetlands Protection Act. The law gives the responsibility for issuing permits to remove, fill, dredge, or alter wetlands to the town conservation commissions.

The USACE has constructed flood protection dikes and walls along a portion of the Sudbury River and the project eliminates flooding in much of the area of

Saxonville. The levee along the Sudbury River in Framingham currently meet accreditation criteria by the USACE and are designated as provisionally accredited levees following FEMA's Revised Procedure Memorandum No. 43. As such, the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain has been extended to the landward topographic extent of the base flood elevation for the Sudbury River.

The NRCS has constructed a flood control project for the Baiting Brook watershed that reduces the severity of flooding along major portions of Baiting Brook and Birch Meadow Brook. The project includes a dry dam on Baiting Brook and culvert and channel modifications to the east outlet diversion channel.

Of the five dams in Holliston, three are used to create impoundments for industrial purposes. These dams are the Linden Pond Dam, located on the Winthrop Canal; the Houghton Pond Dam, located on Jar Brook; and the Factory Pond Dam, located on Bogastow Brook. The Waseeka Dam on Chicken Brook is used to create a wildlife habitat. The Winthrop Lake Dam is used to keep a minimum water-surface elevation in Winthrop Lake, because of the recreation area located along this lake.

In the Town of Hopkinton, the Sudbury River watershed contains large amounts of natural storage upstream of the study area. The storage available in Cedar Swamp in Westborough and Hopkinton significantly reduces flooding on the Sudbury River. Whitehall Reservoir also provides storage capacity which reduces flooding along the Sudbury River and Whitehall Brook.

In the Town of Hudson, since the occurrence of the 1955 and the 1968 floods, flood retarding structures have been installed by the NRCS and are in operation. These structures are located on the Upper Assabet River tributaries, outside of the Hudson corporate limits. The overall effect of the structures would be to lower flood peaks, making a recurrence of floods of the magnitude of the 1955 or 1968 floods less likely.

Arlington Reservoir on Munroe Brook is for the control of floods downstream on Mill Brook 3 in Arlington.

An overflow spillway is located on Mill Pond approximately 35 feet upstream of Interstate Route 495. This structure causes flood flows to backup, increasing the level of Mill Pond.

Additional existing flood control measures within Lowell are a series of dikes and walls along the north bank of Beaver Brook 3 and the Merrimack River to Bridge Street. These structures, however, would not control a 1-percent-annual-chance flood and currently lack accreditation by the USACE. As such, the 1-percent-annual-chance floodplain has been extended to the landward topographic extent of the base flood elevation from Beaver Brook 3 and the Merrimack River as if there were no dikes or walls.

In the City of Malden, channel improvements were made to Lower Spot Pond Brook from the outlet of Spot Pond Brook Branch and Ell Pond Brook Branch

near Wyoming Station in Melrose to the Melrose-Malden border. The existing streambed was deepened, widened, and lined with concrete in 1960. A 12.5-foot diameter tunnel built at the downstream end of Lower Spot Pond Brook in Malden provided the capacity to contain a 4-percent-annual-chance flood discharge safely within the channel's banks. This tunnel was built to circumvent the construction of a surface drainage structure through the center of Malden, where the old stream channel flowed to its confluence with the Malden River. The tunnel outlet structure directs discharge into the Malden River near Charles Street and is the source of the Malden River flows. At the time the tunnel was constructed, the Malden River water-surface elevations were affected by tidal surge.

The Amelia Earhart Dam, under the jurisdiction of the DCR, is a multipurpose structure used for flood control and recreation. The dam was built across the confluence of the Malden and Mystic Rivers in the early 1970s to maintain the upstream water surface at constant elevations. The dam, however, has minor influences on elevations of Lower Spot Pond Brook during normal conditions. During high intensity, long duration storms, the elevation of the Malden River may affect water-surface elevations at the tunnel intake and points further upstream along Lower Spot Pond Brook.

In the City of Marlborough, the NRCS has constructed a system of flood control reservoirs to reduce the severity of flooding along the Assabet River. There are no such man-made flood protection systems for the brooks in Marlborough. A limited amount of natural storage area, which aids in reducing peak flows, is available in the city's wetlands. Marlborough has adopted measures to protect its floodplain and wetland areas from development.

In the Town of Maynard, at the present time, nine flood-retarding structures under the supervision of the NRCS are in operation and one is under construction. These structures are located on the upper Assabet River tributaries, outside of the Maynard corporate limits. The overall effect of the structures would be to significantly lower flood peaks, reducing the chance of recurrence of floods of the magnitude of the 1955 or 1968 floods.

In the Cities of Medford and Somerville, the Amelia Earhart Dam is located at the confluence of the Mystic and Malden Rivers. The dam, which eliminated the tidal influence upstream, can pump 4,000 cfs of flow from the Mystic and Malden Rivers against high tide into Boston Harbor.

Along portions of the Mystic River, open parklands operated by the DCR prevent floodplain encroachment, provide floodplain storage, and provide a buffer between the streams and the developed areas.

A number of flood control projects have been constructed in the City of Melrose. Spot Pond Brook Branch and Ell Pond Brook Branch were enclosed in a piecemeal manner that improved floodwater drainage. Further channel improvements were made to Lower Spot Pond Brook from the outlet of Spot Pond Brook Branch and Ell Pond Brook Branch near Wyoming Station to the

Melrose-Malden border. The existing streambed was deepened, widened, and lined with concrete in 1960. A 12.5-foot diameter tunnel built at the downstream end of Lower Spot Pond Brook in Malden provided the capacity to contain a 25-year flood discharge safely within the new channel's banks. This tunnel was built to circumvent the construction of a surface drainage structure through the center of Malden, where the old stream channel ran down to its confluence with the Malden River. The tunnel outlet structure directs discharge into the Malden River near Charles Street in Malden and is the source of the Malden River flows. At the time the tunnel was constructed, the Malden River water-surface elevations were affected by tidal surge. Amelia Earhart Dam was built across the confluence of the Malden and Mystic Rivers in the early 1970s to maintain the upstream water surface at constant elevations. The dam, however, has minor influence on Lower Spot Pond Brook elevations during normal conditions. During high intensity storms of long duration, the elevation of the Malden River may affect water-surface elevations at the tunnel intake and points further upstream along Lower Spot Pond Brook.

In the City of Newton, a multi-purpose regulating dam and pumping station completed by the USACE in 1978 was designed to significantly reduce future flood stages in the Charles River basin. The facility replaced a structure built in 1910 which had become obsolete. The dam and pumping station were designed to reduce the elevation of a flood of the same magnitude as the August 1955 flood, from 6.9 feet to 4.0 feet. The facility has no effect on flood stages upstream of the Watertown Dam. The city has established regulations governing the use of its floodplains and watershed areas. The provisions of Section 30-20 of the zoning ordinances give the Board of Aldermen control over these areas in all matters pertaining to construction, maintenance of bridges, recreational areas, and agriculture. These regulations are considered to be more restrictive than the minimum regulations as required for a community's eligibility in the NFIP.

Another USACE flood control measure, in accordance with Public Law 93-351 (Water Resources Development Act of 1974), is the acquisition of flowage rights in 8,442 acres of 17 natural valley storage areas in the upper and middle Charles River basins. In order to justify the federal expenditure for this program, the Congressional authorization in Public Law 93-351 required a commitment from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that floodplain and wetlands protection zoning will be adopted and enforced in the Charles River watershed.

Following the major flood of August 1955, the DCR initiated channel improvements on the middle Charles River in Newton Upper Falls, from the Silk Mill Dam to the Nahanton Street Bridge. The improvements included the installation of a hydraulically operated bascule gate at the dam and extensive channel excavation from the dam to Nahanton Street, a distance of approximately 2 miles. The gate has a 4.5-foot range in elevation from a lowered position of 80 feet to a raised position of 84.5 feet.

Flood protection is also generated by following the USACE recommendation concerning the operation of the Silk Mill Dam and Mother Brook Control Dam in Dedham in advance of and during storms.

There are no flood protection measures for the rivers and streams in the Town of Pepperell. The two dams which do exist, the Pepperell Pond Dam on the Nashua River and a dam on the Nissitissit River, do not offer flood protection. However, the town has sought to limit floodplain development by designating parts of the undeveloped floodplain as conservation land.

In the Town of Stoneham, open parklands operated by the DCR surround Spot Pond Reservoir, Doleful Pond, Fells Reservoir, North Reservoir, and South Reservoir in Stoneham. This prevents floodplain encroachment, provides floodplain storage, and provides a buffer between the ponds and reservoirs and the developed areas.

In the Town of Stow, on the upper Assabet River basin, nine flood control structures have been completed and one is under construction by the NRCS. One such structure, the Delaney Dam, is located on Elizabeth Brook in Stow. These structures are designed to lower flood peaks on the Assabet River and on their respective tributaries such as Elizabeth Brook. Several floodplain management measures have been undertaken by town officials, including zoning controls to protect fringe areas along the Assabet River from encroachment, ongoing land management, and maintenance programs by the town conservation commission.

In the Towns of Sudbury and Wayland, Cedar Swamp provides a natural storage area for the Sudbury River. The storage area helps to mitigate peak flows and the severity of flooding along the Sudbury River as it passes through the towns. The Sudbury Reservoir and the Framingham Reservoir system, which are an integral part of the DCR water-supply system, also provide significant storage volume which reduces peak flood flows on the Sudbury River.

In the Town of Tewksbury, above the study area there are five dams designed for flood control on the Merrimack River. They were constructed and are operated by the New England Division of the USACE. These structures are the Franklin Falls Dam on the Pemigewasset River, the Edward McDowell Dam on Nubanusit Brook, the Blackwater Dam on the Blackwater River (flood control), and two dams, the Everett Dam on the Piscataguog River and the Hopkinton Dam on the Contoocook River that control Hopkinton Lake. These reservoirs have the capacity to reduce flood stages on the Merrimack River in the Tewksbury area about 8 feet for a recurrence interval of the March 1936 event.

In the Town of Watertown, natural storage that exists in the many swamps and ponds in the upper Charles River is an important factor in dampening the potentially hazardous effects of the floodwaters. A program is presently underway to acquire extensive natural valley storage areas in the upper watershed in order to ensure preservation of these areas and allow for natural storage of floodwaters. This program is being administered by the USACE.

The reach of the Charles River downstream of the Watertown Dam is called the Charles River basin. The flood elevations in this area are controlled by the Charles River Dam located approximately eight miles downstream from Watertown.

Natural storage that exists in the many swamps and ponds throughout the Town of Weston is an important factor in dampening the potentially hazardous effects of the floodwaters. A program is presently underway to acquire extensive natural valley storage areas in the upper Charles River watershed in order to ensure preservation of these areas and allow for the natural storage of floodwaters. This program is being administered by the USACE.

In the Town of Winchester, two 30-inch pipes with gates at the base of the Main Street Falls are opened when a major storm is anticipated, dropping the water level in the Mill Pond approximately 12 inches. For normal and low flow conditions, this structure controls the water level of the Aberjona River upstream. During flood flow conditions, however, the falls do not significantly influence the water level of the Aberjona River.

A floodgate structure also exists at the mouth of Wedge Pond. The removal of flashboards when a major storm is anticipated drops the water level in Wedge Pond approximately 12 inches also.

Flooding Source and Location	Gage Number	Period of Record	Drainage Area (sq. mi.)	Datum (NAVD88)
Aberjona River at Winchester	01102500	April 1939 to 1980	24.8, excludes 0.6 drained by Winchester North Reservoir	"sea level", assumed 0

3.0 ENGINEERING METHODS

For the flooding sources studied in detail in the county, standard hydrologic and hydraulic study methods were used to determine the flood hazard data required for this FIS. Flood events of a magnitude which are expected to be equaled or exceeded once on the average during any 10-, 50-, 100-, or 500-year period (recurrence interval) have been selected as having special significance for floodplain management and for flood insurance rates. These events, commonly termed the 10-, 50-, 100-, and 500-year floods, have a 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent chance, respectively, of being equaled or exceeded during any year. Although the recurrence interval represents the long term average period between floods of a specific magnitude, rare floods could occur at short intervals or even within the same year. The risk of experiencing a rare flood increases when periods greater than 1 year are considered. For example, the risk of having a flood which equals or exceeds the 100-year flood (1-percent chance of annual exceedence) in any 50-year period is approximately 40 percent (4 in 10), and, for any 90-year period, the risk increases to approximately 60 percent (6 in 10). The analyses reported herein reflect flooding potentials based on conditions existing in the county at the time of completion of this FIS. Maps and flood elevations will be amended periodically to reflect future changes.

3.1 Hydrologic Analyses

Hydrologic analyses were carried out to establish the peak discharge-frequency relationships for the flooding sources studied in detail affecting the county.

Pre-countywide Analyses

For each community within Middlesex County that has a previously printed FIS report, the hydrologic analyses described in those reports have been compiled and are summarized below.

Discharge-frequency data for the flooding sources studied by detailed methods were determined from equations based on multiple-regression analyses of data from USGS gaged sites in Massachusetts and adjacent areas of bordering states (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1978). The equations contain the independent variables basin drainage area, main-channel slope, and a precipitation intensity index.

Flooding on the Assabet River is presently controlled by flood storage reservoirs constructed by the NRCS in the upper Assabet River basin (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975). Hydrographs of peak flows on the Assabet River for 10- and 1-percent-annual-chance recurrence interval floods were prepared by the NRCS at Maynard, Stow and Hudson, without consideration of the flood control structures (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1970). The USGS has maintained a gage at Maynard for approximately 65 years (USGS, prior to 1950-1975). A log-Pearson Type III statistical analysis on uncontrolled records (U.S. Water Resources, 1976) yields results comparable to the 10- and 1-percent-annual-chance peak flows for the hydrographs developed without structural control by the NRCS. Therefore, the hydrograph analysis can be assumed to be valid. However, the unmodified flow record is no longer valid; therefore, the modified hydrograph at Maynard was employed to establish peak discharge-frequency estimates at that point. In the Town of Hudson, the NRCS then modified its hydrographs to reflect the effects of the flood control structures located upstream. At Acton and Concord, these flows were modified by the use of regression equations to reflect the change in intervening drainage area and the total flood control reservoir storage area at each point. Frequency curves on the 10- and 1-percent-annual-chance floods at each point were then extended on log-probability paper to establish the 2- and 0.2-percent-annual-chance flows.

Discharge-frequency estimates for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods for Branch of Assabet River were computed by the USGS regional formula (U.S. Geological Survey, 1974). Peak discharge estimates for the 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood were determined by the extension of the frequency curve for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods on log-probability paper.

Discharge-frequency-drainage area relationships and discharge-frequency relationships for Cole's Brook, Conant Brook, Dakins Brook, Fort Pond Brook, Grassy Pond Brook, Mill Brook 2, Nashoba Brook, Pratt's Brook, Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook, Tributary 2 to Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook, Tributary 1 to Sudbury River, Tributary 2 to Assabet River, and the portion of Spencer Brook in Concord

were developed using the hydrologic methods developed by the NRCS and the USGS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). These methodologies base flood flows on basin characteristics such as drainage area, basin slope, soil type, land use, and precipitation duration and intensity. The methodology used to establish the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharge-frequency relationships for the restudied portions of Fort Pond Brook, Grassy Pond Brook, Inch Brook, and Nagog Brook is outlined in USGS Water-Supply paper No. 2214, Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1983). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was calculated from regression analyses of the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharges. In the Town of Boxborough, discharge-frequency relationships for Fort Pond Brook were obtained by computations from a USGS regional study (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was computed based on a log-Pearson Type III distribution for the three lower floods, using regional skew coefficients (Water Resources Council, 1976). Discharge-frequency estimates were compared with downstream discharges computed for the Acton FIS (FEMA, 1988). These results were plotted with the results of the log-Pearson Type III analysis on Heath Hen Meadow gage, on frequency-discharge-drainage area curves. Discharges were found to vary with drainage area to the 0.90 exponential power. In the Town of Maynard, peak discharge-frequency estimates for Taylor Brook for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods were determined by a USGS regional formula (USGS, 1974). This formula accounts for the parameters of drainage area, slope, and mean annual precipitation. The precipitation data were obtained from the U.S. Weather Bureau (U.S. Weather Bureau, 1961). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was determined by extrapolation of a log-probability graph of flood discharges computed for frequencies of up to 100 years. For Nashoba Brook, the 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was calculated from regression analyses of the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharges.

Discharge-frequency data for the outflow of Nagog Brook at its outlet with Nagog Pond were determined using the USACE HEC-1 computer program (USACE, 1981). The outlet flow was used as starting flow at the upstream end of Nagog Brook.

In the Town of Acton, the methodology used to establish the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharge-frequency relationships for the restudied portions of Butter Brook is outlined in USGS Water-Supply paper No. 2214, Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1983). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was calculated from regression analyses of the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharges. In Westford, peak discharge-frequency relationships for Boutwell Brook, Butter Brook, Swamp Brook, Tadmuck Brook, and Tadmuck were developed using procedures described by the USGS in Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods for Natural-Flow Streams in Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The results were reconciled and verified with statistically analyzed data from nearby stream gages with similar watershed characteristics and the drainage area relationships described above.

In the Town of Acton, the methodology used to establish the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharge-frequency relationships for the restudied portions of Guggins Brook is outlined in USGS Water-Supply paper No. 2214, Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts. (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1983) The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was calculated from regression analyses of the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharges. In Boxborough, discharge-frequency relationships were obtained by computations from a USGS regional study (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974.) The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was based on a log-Pearson Type III distribution for the three lower floods, using regional skew coefficients (Water Resources Council, 1976.) The discharge-frequency estimates were plotted on frequency-discharge-drainage area curves and checked with the log-Pearson Type III analysis on the nearby Heath Hen Meadow Brook gage. Flows at the gage were slightly lower than Guggins Brook flows for comparable drainage area, due to a large amount of storage area within the Heath Hen Meadow Brook drainage basin. Guggins Brook discharges were found to vary with drainage area to the 0.88 exponential power.

Angelica Brook, Assabet Branch 3, Assabet Branch 4, Beaver Dam Brook, Bennetts Brook, Bow Brook, Broad Meadow Brook, Catacoonamug Brook, Cold Spring Brook, Davis Brook, Dudley Brook, Hayward Brook, Hop Brook, Indian Brook Tributary, James Brook, Landham-Allowance Brook, Locke Brook, Martins Pine Brook, Pond Brook, Mason Brook, Mill Brook 3Morse Brook, Mowry Brook, Pantry Brook, Pearl Hill Brook, Reedy Meadow Brook, Snake Brook, Tributary to Cold Spring Brook, Tributary to, the Nissitissit River, Tributaries A and B to Squannacook River, Run Brook, Trout Brook 2, Unkety Brook, Walker Brook 1, Walker Brook 2 Walker Brook 3, Waushakum Pond, Willard Brook, Witch Brook, and Brook from Waushakum Pond discharge-frequency data was defined using regional equations (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). These equations, which relate basin characteristics to stream flow, provided the method for which the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance peak discharges were obtained. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge was obtained graphically using the data obtained by the regional discharge-frequency equations. This data was compared with previously published data where such data was available and applicable. The result of a mathematical model developed by the NRCS was the source of the 10-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges for the Cold Spring Brook between the Ashland Reservoir to Reservoir No.2 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973). The peak discharges for the 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood was obtained graphically using Soil Conservation Service data. In Natick, the 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge estimates for Beaver Dam Brook and Davis Brook were determined by linear extrapolation of a log-Pearson Type III probability distribution on the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods (U.S. Water Resources Council, 1976). The revised hydrologic analysis for Hayward Brook was performed using USGS regional equations for small rural streams in Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1982). Gage data taken at the U.S. Route 20 culvert at Hayward Brook was used in the regression analysis to develop the regional equations for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance discharges.

Gaging stations on the Nashua River in East Pepperell and on the North Nashua River in Leominster were the principal sources of data utilized for defining discharge-frequency relationships for the Nashua River (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1964; U.S. Department of the Interior, 1976). These gages have been in operation since 1936. Values for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharges at each gage were obtained from a log-Pearson Type III statistical analysis of annual peak flow data. In order to define discharge-frequency relationships for the Nashua River, a method of analysis in the NRCS National Engineering Handbook was utilized (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). This method provides for the hydrologic routing of flows. This method, which relates the discharge, in cfs per square mile, between any two points in the drainage basin by a ratio of the respective drainage areas, was used to account for the large floodplain storage available along the Nashua River.

In the Towns of Bedford, Billerica, and Wilmington, flood discharges for the Shawsheen River were computed using a log-Pearson Type III analyses of the USGS gage (No. 01100600) at Wilmington, and high-water marks recorded during the January 1979 flood. Using these developed flows and the frequency curve developed for the Shawsheen River at the Bedford/Billerica corporate limits, flows were calculated at this point. Using the NRCS area discharge relationship, these flows were transferred upstream (FEMA, 1983.) In Tewksbury peak discharges were developed based on data obtained from the USACE and the FIA (USACE, 1972; FEMA, unpublished).

In the Town of Bedford, the hydrologic data for Bogastow Brook, Chicken Brook, Dirty Meadow Brook, Dopping Brook, Elm Brook, Jar Brook, Mongo Brook, Spring Brook, Tributary to Mill Brook**,** Tributary A, Vine Brook, and the Winthrop Canal were developed using the regional frequency method (U.S. Department on the Interior, 1977). Due to the inherent possibility of a large standard error in the regional frequency method, comparative computations of discharges by the rainfall-runoff technique based on a synthetic triangular unit hydrograph and NRCS methodology were utilized for assisting in the adoption of discharges for various frequencies into a smooth curve (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). In Burlington, the hydrologic analysis for Vine Brook was obtained from the Burlington storm water management report (Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., 1978). Methods for developing hydrographs used in the preparation of this report were the NRCS Technical Release (TR)-20 and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Storm Water Management Model (SWMM) reports (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1971). The TR-20 method was used for the upstream portions of Vine Brook. In Lexington, discharge-frequency estimates for Vine Brook for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance storms were based on the USGS gage record on Beaver Brook. The gage is located in Belmont, downstream of Lexington, near the confluence of Beaver Brook and the Charles River. To insure a reasonable estimate of peak discharges, the 10-year gaging record on Beaver Brook was extended by correlation with the 44-year record of the USGS gaging station on the Charles River at Waltham. The correlation was carried out in accordance with statistical methods established in Water Resources Bulletin No. 17 (USGS, 1974). A log-Pearson type III analyses was run on both the 10-year record and on the

extended record using a regionalized skew coefficient in both cases. The drainage areas contributing to peak discharges on Vine Brook have characteristics of runoff similar to those on Beaver Brook. Due to the similarity of watersheds, the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods for Kiln Brook, Mill Brook 1, Munroe Brook, North Lexington Brook, and Vine Brook were determine by applying the Beaver Brook coefficients to discharges computed by the USGS regional formula. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was determined by straight line extrapolations of a log-probability graph of discharges computed above. Discharges at other points were determined by applying the discharge computed from the regional formula to a discharge-drainage area formula.

The hydrology for Wellington Brook was calculated using the unit hydrograph theory. This technique was selected because the watershed is ungaged, has natural storage flow regulation and high urbanization. Synthetic triangular unit hydrographs were developed to represent each watershed, utilizing available data and making adjustments for slopes and local inflows (USACE, 1976).

A method developed by the NRCS for ungaged watersheds was used to obtain the hydrologic analyses for Content Brook in Billerica (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975; U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). This method is based on soil types, type of land cover, and surface roughness. The soil cover-land use complex is given a curve number from which storm runoff and peak flow can be determined. In the Town of Tewksbury, peak discharges for Content Brook, Sutton Brook, Collins Brook, and Heath Brook were developed from regional relationships published for southeastern New England (USACE, 1972). The peak discharges obtained for Content Brook were used to calculate the frequency discharges for Brook A, Mud Pond Brook, and Saunders Brook using the discharge-drainage area ratio formula.

Discharge-frequency relationship data for Beaver Brook No. 1 in the Town of Littleton and Westford was developed using the procedures described by the USGS in Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods for Natural-flow Streams in Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The technique was developed using multiple regression analyses to estimate flood peaks in ungaged, natural-flow streams in Massachusetts by relating peak discharges to basin and climatic parameters. The resulting peak discharges were used to develop corresponding peak discharges at the inlet of Forge Pond using a multiplications factor equal to the ratio of the drainage areas to the 0.75 power. In Boxborough, discharge-frequency relationships were obtained by computations from a USGS regional study (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge was computed based on a log-Pearson Type III distribution for the three lower floods, using regional skew coefficients (Water Resources Council, 1976). The discharges computed were compared with a downstream study by the USACE (USACE, 1975). These two results were plotted on a frequency-discharge-drainage area curve. The Shawsheen River was assumed, in the Littleton report, to have similar basin characteristics to Beaver Brook. The gaging record on the Shawsheen River gage (No. 01100600, 11 years of record) at Wilmington was extended by correlation with the Ipswich River gage (No. 01102000, 45 years of record) at Ipswich and a log-Pearson Type III

analysis was run on the extended record (Water Resources Council, 1976). The gage discharges were also plotted on the curves and found to check well with the derived relationship that discharge varies with drainage area to the 0.73 exponential power.

Because most of the watercourses in the Town of Chelmsford are ungaged, it was necessary to investigate several hydrologically similar gaged streams. Requisite parameters needed for this investigation included the following: drainage area, main channel length, main channel slope, hydrologically similar gaged streams were located, flow-frequency statistical analysis based on yearly maximum flows at the gages for their period of record through 1974. Discharge-frequency relationships for Stony Brook were developed using this method and used information from the USGS gage on the Parker River at Byfield gage (No. 01101000). Hydrologically similar watersheds could not be found for Hales Brook, and Putnam Brook. Flow-frequency relationships for Hales Brook and Putnam Brooks were developed using regression analysis methods of the USGS (USGS, 1974). Flood-frequency discharges were adjusted to reflect differences in the sizes of the drainage areas contributing to the stream flows.

Beaver Brook 3 discharges were developed by statistical analysis of available flow data in the region and by the use of empirical regression equations developed for Massachusetts by the USGS (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). There are no stream flow gaging stations on Beaver Brook. Two representative gaging stations within the region were used. Statistical analyses were performed using a log-Pearson Type III distribution on the Assabet River at Maynard and on the Ipswich River at Ipswich. Discharge frequencies were then transferred from each gage to Beaver Brook by ratio of respective drainage areas to the 0.7 exponential power. Also, discharge frequencies were developed by use of the referenced USGS regression equations. These equations were applied using physical characteristics of the Beaver Brook 3 watershed. It was determined that the discharge frequencies developed by the two methods were comparable and agreed with the discharges used in previous FISs in Dracut; therefore, the discharge frequencies in the original Dracut study were adopted in this study (FEMA, 1980).

For Beaver Brook 4 in Lexington, discharge-frequency estimates for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance storms were based on the USGS gage record on Beaver Brook. The gage is located in Belmont, downstream of Lexington, near the confluence of Beaver Brook and the Charles River. To ensure a reasonable estimate of peak discharges, the 10-year gaging record on Beaver Brook was extended by correlation with the 44-year record of the USGS gaging station on the Charles River at Waltham. The correlation was carried out in accordance with statistical methods established in Water Resources Bulletin No. 17 (USGS, 1974). A log Pearson type III analyses was run on both the 10-year record and on the extended record using a regionalized skew coefficient in both cases. Peak discharges at the Beaver Brook gages for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods were then computed based on the USGS regional formula (USGS, 1974). At the gage, these discharges were found to be low in comparison to the discharges computed by log-Pearson type III analysis on the gage record by

a factor of 2.2 for the 10-percent-annual-chance flood, 2.9 for the 50-year flood and 3.2 for the 1-percent-annual-chance flood. Peak discharge estimates on Beaver Brook No. 4 in Lexington for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods were computed using the USGS regional formula. The resultant discharges were modified by applying the above-mentioned coefficients established at the Belmont gage. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge estimate was determined by straight line extrapolation of a log-probability graph of discharges computed for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods. Discharges on Beaver Brook No. 4 at two other locations in Lexington were determined using a peak discharge-drainage area formula. Hydrologic data for Beaver Brook No. 4 in Waltham were calculated using unit hydrograph theory. This technique was selected because the watersheds are ungaged, have natural storage flow regulation and have high urbanization. Synthetic triangular unit hydrographs were developed by representing each watershed, utilizing data available in USGS Water Resources Investigation 77-39, and making appropriate adjustments for slopes and local inflows (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The results of these studies were compared to results obtained by using the peak discharge equations found in the USGS publication (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977).

Discharge-frequency estimates for Elizabeth Brook and Branch of Elizabeth Brook 1 were developed by the NRCS in their study on Elizabeth Brook (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975). These discharges were developed using the NRCS computer program for project formulation, Hydrology, TR-20 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975). The program computes surface runoff, taking into account conditions having an effect on runoff and routes the flow through stream channels and reservoirs. It combined the routed hydrograph with those from other tributaries and computes the peak discharges, the time to peak, and the water-surface elevation at selected cross sections. It takes into account the retarding effect of storage areas, such as the Delaney Reservoir, in decreasing discharges. Discharges were developed by the NRCS for floods of 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance frequency. The frequency curve on these three floods was extended on log-probability paper to determine the 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge. In Boxborough, peak discharges for Elizabeth Brook were calculated using the USGS Regional Regression Equations for Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1993).

In Concord, discharge-frequency-drainage area relationships and discharge-frequency relationships for Sawmill Brook were developed using the hydrologic methods developed by the NRCS and the USGS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). These methodologies base flood flows on basin characteristics such as drainage area, basin slope, soil type, land use, and precipitation duration and intensity. In Burlington, the hydrologic analysis was obtained from the Burlington stormwater management report (Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., 1978). Methods for developing hydrographs used in the preparation of this report were the NRCS TR-20 and the EPA SWMM reports (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1971). Flows along Sawmill Brook were developed using the NRCS TR-55 model (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975).

Discharge-frequency-drainage area relationships were calculated for Darby Brook, Marshall Brook, Meadow Brook, Meadow River Branch, Pages Brook, Pages Brook Branch, and Trull Brook as well as the portion of Spencer Brook in Carlisle using the USGS regional method (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977).

Peak flood discharges for River Meadow Brook in Chelmsford were calculated for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance periods (recurrence interval) using regression equations. The regression equations used in the analysis are published in the USGS Water-Supply Paper 2214 (USGS, 1983). A regression equation was not available for the 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood; therefore, the flood peaks were extrapolated from the 2- to 1-percent-annual-chance data. The rural peak discharges calculated with the regression equations were not adjusted for urbanization because there is storage potential within the watershed. No urbanization adjustment would also be consistent with the methodology used in the downstream contiguous community of Lowell. In Lowell, the discharges were developed by statistical analysis of available flow data in the region and by use of empirical regression equations developed by the USGS for Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). Since stream flow gaging information was not available for River Meadow Brook, two representative gaging stations in the region were used; Aberjona River at Winchester and Nashoba Brook near Acton. The drainage areas of the two streams at the gage sites are 24.2 square miles and 12.7 square miles, respectively. Statistical analyses were performed using a log-Pearson Type III distribution. Discharge frequencies were then transferred from each gage to River Meadow Brook by ratio of respective drainage areas to the 0.7 exponential power. Also, discharge frequencies were developed by used of the reference USGS regression equations. The equations were applied to River Meadow Brook at its mouth using the physical parameters of drainage area (25.7 square miles) and main channel slope (5.5 feet/mile). The equations were also applied at the upstream end of the study limit where the drainage area was 22 square miles and the main channel slope was 5 feet/mile. It was determined that the discharge frequencies developed by the two methods were comparable and the results using the regression equations were adopted.

The 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharges for the Merrimack River in Dracut, Lowell, and Tewksbury were developed by statistical analysis of recorded flow data in the region. The USGS gaging station located on the Merrimack River below the Concord River gage (No. 01100000) within the City of Lowell was used in the analysis. Statistical analysis was performed at the gaging station by using annual peak flows in a log-Pearson Type III distribution (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1981). The computed discharge frequency curve was adjusted for the modifying effects due to upstream USACE flood control reservoirs. In Tyngsborough and Chelmsford, flows developed for the Merrimack River by the USACE were reviewed and adopted (USACE, 1972). A discharge-frequency relationship was developed using a log-Pearson Type III statistical analysis of the discharges for the USGS Goffs Falls gage in Manchester, New Hampshire. The period of record for the gage extends from October 1936 to September 1977 (Water Resources Council, 1976). The discharges were then adjusted to reflect reductions caused by the flood control

reservoirs between Manchester and Tyngsborough, as well as the additional runoff from the intervening drainage area.

Discharge frequencies for Richardson Brook were determined using a 13-year record of peak flows on the stream as measured by the USGS. A discharge frequency curve was developed using the log-Pearson Type III procedure with a computed standard deviation of 0.202, a mean of 2.06, and an adopted regional skew of 0.5. The discharges for Trout Brook No. 1 were developed by using available flow data from Richardson Brook. Richardson Brook has similar basin characteristics to that of Trout Brook No. 1. Discharges were developed by statistical analysis of the Richardson Brook gage data using empirical regression equations developed for Massachusetts by the USGS (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977).

The Mystic River Comprehensive Hydrology Study was completed in September 1981 to determine the flood potential upstream of the Amelia Earhart Dam (Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., 1981). This study uses the techniques and results obtained from the DCR Comprehensive Hydrology Study for the analysis of the Malden River. Hydrologic analyses were carried out to establish inflow storm hydrographs. The hydrologic analyses technique used for the Malden River was computer simulation of the rainfall-runoff processes as they affect the lands within the entire basin. Rainfall events were simulated using the M.I.T. Catchment (MITCAT) rainfall-runoff model (Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., 1980). Storm hydrographs from the rainfall events were generated and later used as input to the hydraulic model of the Mystic-Malden River Systems.

Because of both the Amelia Earhart Dam and the large amounts of storage found along the stream lengths, the Mystic-Malden River system behaves more like a series of reservoirs than as free flowing streams. Peak stages are not the result of peak discharges and generally do not occur at the time of peak discharge. They are not caused by the peak discharge but by the runoff volume and basin storage relationships. The relationship between inflows, outflows, and the resultant change in storage dominate the system. The discharges for Amelia Earhart Dam represent the pumping capacity at the damn during periods of high tide. The discharge through the dam can be greater when tidal conditions are lower than water levels above the dam, in which case water from upstream of the dam is allowed to pass through the lock gates. Elevations for Lower Mystic Lake and Upper Mystic Lake were determined using the MITCAT model described above.

Stillwater elevations for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods for Ell Pond were obtained from the Mystic River Comprehensive Hydrology Study (Camp, Dresser and McKee, Inc., 1981). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood elevation for Ell Pond was not calculated in that study. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharge splits between the Ell Pond Conduit and a broad-crested weir formed along the northeastern corner of Emerson Street and Main Street. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance elevation was determined considering flow through the conduit and over the roadway.

A gaging station on the Squannacook River located 2.7 miles northwest of West Groton was the principal source of data utilized for defining discharge-frequency relationships for the river (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1964; U.S. Department of the Interior, 1976). The gage has been in operation since 1949. Values for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharges at the West Groton gage were obtained from a log-Pearson Type III analysis of annual peak flow data. In order to define discharge-frequency relationships for the Squannacook River at sections upstream and downstream of the gaging station, the NRCS method for the hydrologic routing of flows was used (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). It relates the discharge in cubic feet per second per square mile between any two points in the drainage basin by a ratio of the respective drainage areas.

In Weston and Waltham, the hydrology for Chester Brook, Hobbs Brook, Stony Brook, and West Chester Brook was calculated using unit hydrograph theory. This technique was selected because the watershed is ungaged and has natural storage flow regulation. Synthetic triangular unit hydrographs were developed representing the watershed, utilizing the data available in USGS Water Resources Investigation 77-39 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977), and making appropriate adjustments for slopes and local inflows. The results of this study was compared to results obtained by using the peak discharge equations found in Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods on Natural Flow Stream in Massachusetts (USGS, 1977). In Lincoln, peak discharge frequency estimates for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods on Farrar Pond Brook, Hobbs Brook, Pole Brook, Stony Brook, and Valley Pond were determined using the USGS regional method (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). The 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge estimates for these streams were determined by using a straight line extrapolation of plotted flood discharges for frequencies up to 100-years on log-probability paper. In Westford, peak discharge-frequency relationships for the upstream portions of Stony Brook required the use of another USGS publication (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1962). The technique is similar to that used on the other portions of the brook, but permits an adjustment in consideration of the Forge Pond/Beaver Brook No. 1 wetland storage areas. Increases in the peak discharges at various locations along Stony Brook were calculated using a series of discharge-drainage area curves developed from the previously mentioned data and the peak discharges for Stony Brook used in the FIS for the Town of Chelmsford (FEMA, 1979).

Peak discharges for Greens Brook, Lower Spot Pond Brook, Town Line Brook, and Varnum Brook were developed using the standardized techniques presented in the USGS Water-Supply Papers Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts and in Flood Characteristics of Urban Watersheds in the United States (Wandle, Jr., 1983; Sauer, et al., 1983). The two publications are complimentary, where a rural watershed discharge was computed and used as input for computing an urban watershed discharge. The urban discharge also depended on drainage areas but, in addition, the resulting discharges. The first publication provides a method for calculating discharges based on regional storm data. It is designed for ungaged streams and uses drainage basin area as the variable for determining discharge. Equations found in the latter publication

adjust the regional rural discharge values to an urban condition by incorporating a basin development factor. The only portion of the Lower Spot Pond Brook watershed contributing flow through the Melrose-Malden corporate limits that is not fully developed is the area in the Fellsway Reservation. The rest of the basin has little attenuation of runoff.

Computer modeling techniques developed by the NRCS determined the discharge-frequency data for Mulpus Brook and Graves Pond Brook (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). In this method, runoff was calculated and the resulting quantity of flow was routed through stream reaches and control structures. The 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges were determined by applying the appropriate total rainfall depth associated with a particular frequency. This methodology takes into account excessive storage areas between Townsend Road Bridge and the confluence of Mulpus Brook with the Nashua River. The storage areas cause discharges on Mulpus Brook to increase going upstream.

In Weston, the hydrology for Bogle Brook, Tributary 3 to Bogle Brook 2, Tributary 4 to Bogle Brook 2, Cherry Brook and Stony Brook was calculated using unit hydrograph theory. This technique was selected because the watershed is ungaged and has natural storage flow regulation. Synthetic triangular unit hydrographs were developed representing the watershed, utilizing the data available in USGS Water Resources Investigation 77-39 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977), and making appropriate adjustments for slopes and local inflows. The results of this study was compared to results obtained by using the peak discharge equations found in Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods on Natural Flow Stream in Massachusetts (USGS, 1977). In Natick, discharge-frequency data for Bogle Brook and Stony Brook were defined using regional equations (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). These equations, which relate basin characteristics to stream flow, provided the method for which the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance peak discharges were obtained. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharge estimates were determined by linear extrapolation of a log-Pearson Type III probability distribution on the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods (U.S. Water Resources Council, 1976).

Peak discharge-frequency estimates for the Charles River were developed by the USACE using the log-Pearson Type III method (U.S. Water Resources Council, 1976), from records of the USGS gaging stations on the Charles River at the Village of Charles River and at Waltham (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). The gage on the Charles River (no. 01103500) has been in effect since October 1937, and the gage at Waltham (no. 01104500) has been in effect since October 1909. A discharge-frequency-drainage area relationship was developed from this data. Watertown is located downstream of the gages. Approximately one-third of the Charles River flow is diverted from the basin via Mother Brook in Dedham, which is located midway between the two gaging stations.

For the Ipswich River in Reading and North Reading, flood-flow frequency data were based on statistical analyses of stage-discharge records covering a 35-year period at the South Middleton gage operated by the USGS. This analysis

followed the standard log-Pearson Type III method as outlined by the Water Resources Council (Water Resources Council, 1967). Based on a previous study of the Ipswich River basin, a skew coefficient of 0.5 was adopted (USGS, 1971). Discharges at various locations on the Ipswich River were derived by multiplying the given discharge by a factor equal to the ratio of the drainage areas to the 0.7 exponential power.

Peak discharges for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floods on Lubbers Brook and Ipswich River in Wilmington were initially determined using the regional frequency-discharge formulas in Water Resources Investigation 77-39 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The formulas used drainage area, main channel slope, and storage to develop the calculated discharges. The percentage of impervious land in each drainage basin was considered in determining the regional discharge values.

Hydrologic routings using the Muskingum Method were carried out to take into account the moderating influence of storage in the extensive swamplands along the Ipswich River, Maple Meadow Brook, and Lubbers Brook (R.K. Linsley and J.B. Franzini, 1972). Calculations were made to determine inflow and outflow hydrographs and storage curves. From these working curves, discharges for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floods at the downstream limit of the routed reaches were determined.

Two reaches of the Ipswich River were routed. The section from the Kelly Road area to a point just upstream of the confluence of Maple Meadow Brook was first routed and then, using the altered outflows, the section from a point downstream of the confluence of Maple Meadow Brook was routed to a point midway between Wildwood and Federal Streets. The local inflows along each reach were added to the routed outflows to calculate the peak flows just downstream of the routed sections. The discharges at the corporate limits were matched exactly to the North Reading FIS (FEMA, 1996).

One reach was routed on Maple Meadow Brook and one on Lubbers Brook. For Maple Meadow Brook, the regional peak flows were routed from the upstream limit of detailed study to the confluence of an unnamed tributary. USGS stream gaging station no. 01101300 on Maple Meadow Brook is a partial record station with only 11 years of record (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). The discharges calculated by the regional equation and routing analysis were coordinated with the gage record. The peak flows determined from the regional equation for Lubbers Brook were routed from the Boston & Maine Railroad bridge to Middlesex Avenue. The local inflows along the reach were added to the routed outflows to calculate peak flows at the downstream limit of the reach.

In Wilmington, peak discharges on Lubbers Brook upstream of Glen Road were computed using the USACE HEC-1 Computer Program (USACE, 1990).

Peak discharges and hydrographs for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood events for Martins Brook, Martins Pond, and Skug River were developed using the USACE HEC-1 computer program (USACE, 1990). Flood

storage effects in Martins Brook upstream of Salem Street (Route 62) in the Town of Wilmington and in Martin Pond, upstream of Burrough Road, were considered. Stage-storage and stage-discharge rating curves for both location were developed during the study. Runoff curve numbers were computed for all drainage subareas in the watershed area for Martins Brook, Martins Pond, and Skug River and were used to develop NRCS unit hydrographs in HEC-1. Rainfall depths were taken from U.S. Weather Bureau's Technical Paper (TP)-40. Stage-frequency relationships used for Martins Pond were obtained from the elevations computed for Martins Brook at the outlet of the pond. In Wilmington, peak discharges for Martins Brook upstream of Salem Street and Tributary to Martins Brook were determined using regional equations developed by the USGS in Open-File Report 80-676 (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1982).

Elevations for Massapoag Pond were developed in the HEC-2 step-backwater analysis of Salmon Brook in the Flood Insurance Study for the Town of Dunstable (FEMA, unpublished).

Flooding of Alewife Brook (Little River) and the Lower Mystic Lake is caused by the elevated water-surface of the Mystic River. This backwater condition causes higher water-surface elevations than the natural drainage from the tributary area.

Discharge-frequency data for Baddacook Brook, Cow Pond Brook, Long Pond Brook, Nonacoicus Brook 1, Nonacoicus Brook 2, and Tributary to Nonacoicus Brook were obtained using computer modeling techniques developed by the NRCS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). In this method, a precipitation event is simulated over a basin, runoff is calculated, and the resulting quantity of flow routed through stream reaches and control structures. The 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges were determined by applying the appropriate total rainfall depth associated with a particular frequency.

Peak discharge frequencies for Peppermint Brook and Tributary to Beaver Brook 3 were derived using procedures presented in the USGS report developed for Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The resulting flow values were also compared with statistically analyzed gaged stream records in the region and were found to be in general agreement.

Discharges for Gumpas Pond Brook were obtained from the FIS for the Town of Pelham, New Hampshire (FEMA, 1980). In that study, the discharges were determined by averaging the results of the regional equation by Johnson and Tasker and an area-weighted transposition with an adjusted log-Pearson Type III frequency analysis of the gages at Hop Brook (No. 01147000 with 27 years of record), Bungay Brook (No. 01112300 with 11 years of record), and East Meadow Brook (No. 01100700 with 11 years of record) (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974; U.S. Department of the Interior 1981). The regional equations by Johnson and Tasker consist of parameters that include drainage area, ground slope, and average rainfall per year. Bungay Brook, East Meadow Brook, and Hop Brook have drainage areas with similar hydrologic characteristics as those of this study. Discharges for Gumpas Pond Brook were modified to include some storage effects. This modification utilizes a numerical reservoir routing technique

known as the Unit Hydrograph Method, which developed an inflow hydrograph (Viessman, Harbough, and Knapp, 1972).

Discharges for Bear Meadow Brook, Great Road Tributary, King Street Tributary, Mill Pond Tributary, Salmon Brook, and Walkers Brook were determined using the Wandle method developed by the USGS specifically for Massachusetts. This methodology takes into consideration channel slope and drainage area in its evaluation of a stream (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). The USGS derived the equations used in the Wandle method by applying multiple regression techniques to flow data and physical characteristics of 113 stream gaging stations in or near Massachusetts. The regional equation flows were adjusted for Bear Meadow Brook, and Walkers Brook to account for impervious land surface area resulting from urbanization. Flows on the upstream portion of Great Pond were determined using the transposition of drainage area methods established by the Water Resources Council (Water Resources Council, 1977).

Storm surge elevations for the Atlantic Ocean affecting the Island End River and the Mystic River were determined by FEMA. The storm surge elevations were obtained from the FIS for the City of Chelsea (FEMA, 1982).

The results of a mathematical model developed by the NRCS were the source of the 10-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges for Reservoir No.2 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973). For Cochituate Brook, Reservoir No 1, Reservoir No.1 North Branch, and Reservoir No. 3, discharge-frequency data were obtained using computer modeling techniques developed by the NRCS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1972). In this method, a precipitation event is simulated over a basin, runoff is calculated, and the quantity of flow is routed through stream reaches and control structures. The 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges were determined by applying the appropriate total rainfall depth associated with a particular event. Most of the watershed was analyzed in this way except for certain diversion areas where manual hand-routing procedures were used.

Originally, 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance discharges for Baiting Brook were obtained from previous hydrologic analyses conducted by the NRCS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1957). Discharges for Baiting Brook, and for East Outlet and Birch Meadow Brook, were determined using the NRCS TR-20 hydrologic computer program (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1965).

The result of a mathematical model developed by the NRCS was the source of the 10-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance peak discharges for Whitehall Brook (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973). The peak discharges for the 2-percent-annual-chance flood was obtained graphically using NRCS data.

Discharges for Black Brook and Marginal Brook were developed by statistical analysis of available flow data in the region and by use of the regression equations developed by the USGS for Massachusetts (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). As there are no stream flow gaging stations on either Black Brook or

Marginal Brook, the following four representative gaging stations within the region were used:

Station	Drainage Area (square miles)	Years of Record
Aberjona River At Winchester gage (No. 01102500)	24.2	43
Nashoba River At Acton gage (No. 01097300)	12.7	19
Stony Brook At Temple, New Hampshire gage (No. 01093800)	3.6	19
Richardson Brook Near Lowell gage (No. 01100100)	4.2	21

Statistical analyses were performed using a log-Pearson Type III distribution (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1981). Discharge frequencies were then transferred from each gage to Black Brook and Marginal Brook by ratio of respective drainage areas to the 0.7 exponential power. Also, discharge frequencies were developed using the reference USGS regression equations. In applying the equations to Black Brook, the following physical parameters were used: drainage area = 3.0 square miles and main channel slope = 10 feet/mile. For Marginal Brook, the parameters were: drainage area = 1.2 square miles and main channel slope = 20 feet/mile. It was determined that the statistical analyses and regression analyses were comparable and the results using the regression equations were adopted for both Black Brook and Marginal Brook.

Discharge-frequencies for Trull Brook Tributary were obtained from the FIS for the Town of Tewksbury (FEMA, 1981). The published discharges agreed with results using the reference regression equations (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). Therefore, discharges along the tributary were considered proportional to those on Trull Brook Tributary by ratio of respective drainage area to the 0.7 exponential power.

Discharges for South Meadow Brook/Paul Brook, and Cheese Cake Brook were determined using a method developed by the NRCS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1974). The method takes into consideration the type of storm, antecedent moisture conditions, hydrologic soil groups, and topographic characteristics.

No hydrologic routings were performed on lakes in Reading. In Woburn, the Aberjona River enters the Aberjona Holding Pond in the Woburn Industrial Park. A hydrologic reservoir routing of this pond was performed to establish the water-surface elevations during the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floods on the Aberjona River upstream.

Discharge-frequency estimates for the 10-, 2-, and 1-percent-annual-chance floods on Boons Pond and Branch were derived by computations using the NRCS formulation for runoff determination of small watershed (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975). This formula takes into account drainage area, watershed land

use, 24-hour rainfall, hydraulic length of watershed, land slope, and amount of ponded areas. Peak discharge estimates for the 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood were determined by extending the frequency curve of the three other floods on log-probability paper.

For Tributary A to Dudley Brook, Mineway Brook, Tributary A to Cold Brook, Tributary A to Pantry Brook, and Tributaries A, B, C, and D to Hop Brook, peak discharges were developed using USGS regression equations for the region (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1993).

Frequency-discharge data for Strong Water Brook were developed by a discharge-drainage area ratio formula, where Q_1 and Q_2 are the discharges at Strong Water Brook and the Shawsheen River, A_1 and A_2 are the drainage areas of the brook and river, respectively and n is an exponent varying from 0.5 to 0.8 (Johnstone and Cross, 1949).

$$Q_{1/} Q_2 = [A_{1/}A_2]^n$$

Peak discharge-frequency relationships for Lawrence Brook and Mascuppic Brook were developed using procedures described by the USGS in Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods for Natural-Flow Streams in Massachusetts. (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977). This technique was developed using multiple regression analyses to estimate flood peaks on ungaged, natural-flow streams in Massachusetts by relating peak discharges to basin and climatic parameters. The resulting peak discharges were verified and/or reconciled with statistically analyzed data from nearby stream gages with similar watershed characteristics by using a multiplication factor equal to the ratio of the drainage areas to the 0.75 exponential power. They were found to be in general agreement. A numerical integration reservoir routing of triangular inflow hydrographs was used in conjunction with the previously mentioned procedures for Mascuppic Brook (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1977; Viessman, Jr., 1972). The routing process was incorporated to take into account the effects of storage in Mascuppic Lake, upstream of Mascuppic Brook.

The Saugus River watershed is a complex hydrologic system, containing three major storage areas: Lake Quannapowitt, a large swampy area in Reading; the large swamp north of Route 128 on the Wakefield-Lynnfield line by the Wakefield Industrial Park; and two major tributary streams, the Reading Drainage Canal and Beaver Dam Brook.

Because there are no hydrologically similar gaged streams in the area, runoff and flows tributary to Lake Quannapowitt were calculated by methods developed by the NRCS. The NRCS TP-149 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973) and TR-55 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1975) are methods of estimating volume and rates of runoff on watersheds. Rainfall data were obtained from the U.S. Weather Bureau TR-40 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1963). The discharges determined by these NRCS methods can then be routed through the lake (Fair and Geyer, 1954). Because of the storage capacity of Lake Quannapowitt, flood flows could be significantly reduced. By calculating a stage-discharge curve for the

outlet weir, a stage-discharge-frequency curve was developed for outflows from Lake Quannapowitt. The outflow hydrograph for Lake Quannapowitt, developed for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance recurrence intervals, was hydrographically combined with flood flows developed for the Reading Drainage Canal. These flows were routed and again hydrographically combined with flows developed for Beaver Dam Brook and the Pilling Pond outflow. Flows through the swamp were then reduced to take into account the effect of storage provided by the swamp and to obtain outflows over the Saugus River Dam (Lynn Diversion works). Flows over the dam were then combined with flows developed from the incremental drainage area between Water Street and the dam.

Flows were developed for the Mill River, upstream of its confluence with the Saugus River for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance recurrence intervals by methods used by the NRCS. In studying the Mill River watershed, it was found that overflows from Crystal Lake are tributary to the Mill River via storm drain pipes. Analysis showed that overflows from the lake reaching Mill River are very infrequent and generally occur long after peak flows on the river; therefore, they would not affect peak flow discharges.

Water-surface elevations of selected recurrence intervals for Forge Pond were computed using a set of empirical equations in conjunction with a set of stage-discharge curves for the multiple outlets of the pond (during periods of significant flooding) (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1962).

The 1-percent-annual-chance discharges for streams studied by approximate methods in Ashland, Ayer, Framingham, Groton, Hopkinton, Lexington, Marlborough, Townsend, were calculated using regional discharge frequency equations (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974).

Although Todd Pond Brook was not studied in detail, the 1-percent-annual-chance peak discharge was calculated using the USGS regional method (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1974). The drainage area at the outlet of Todd Pond is approximately 0.8 square mile, and the 1-percent-annual-chance peak discharge is approximately 68 cfs.

A summary of the drainage area-peak discharge relationships for the streams studied by detailed methods is shown in Table 8, “Summary of Discharges.”

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
ABERJONA RIVER					
Upstream of confluence with Mill Brook 3	28.0	700	1,370	1,820	3,910
At Mid Lake Dam	27.7	700	1,380	1,930	3,710
At USGS gaging station	24.8	730	1,380	1,830	3,510
Downstream of confluence of Horn Pond Brook	24.3	710	1,350	1,800	3,560
Upstream of confluence of Horn Pond Brook	14.5	600	930	1,190	2,410
At Washington Street	12.5	560	900	1,150	2,160
Downstream of confluence of Sweetwater Brook	11.5	520	870	1,080	1,970
Upstream of confluence of Sweetwater Brook	9.0	400	640	820	1,560
Downstream of confluence of Schneider Brook	8.4	380	610	790	1,260
Upstream of confluence of Schneider Brook	7.0	330	520	670	1,030
Downstream of confluence of Halls Brook	5.5	270	460	550	810
Upstream of confluence of Halls Brook	2.5	200	370	480	640
Downstream of confluence of Aberjona River North Spur	2.0	110	190	200	250
Upstream of confluence of Aberjona River North Spur	1.4	40	100	110	120
At West Street/Willow Street culvert	0.9	20	50	80	130
ABERJONA RIVER NORTH SPUR					
At Holding Pond at Woburn Industrial Park	1.9	20	30	38	140
ALEWIFE BROOK (LITTLE RIVER)					
At Cambridge/Somerville corporate limits	8.3	230	360	460	410
ANGELICA BROOK					
At confluence with Reservoir No. 3	1.6	90	140	160	220

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
ASSABET BRANCH NO. 3					
At confluence with Assabet River	1.1	60	72	99	134
ABERJONA RIVER					
ASSABET BRANCH NO. 4					
At confluence with Assabet River	1.0	72	104	118	159
ASSABET RIVER					
At the confluence with Concord River/Sudbury River	177.5	2,990	4,560	5,330	6,460
At the confluence with Dakins Brook	176.8	2,980	4,550	5,310	6,450
At the confluence with Spencer Brook 1	169.0	2,890	4,400	5,140	6,320
About 2,000 feet downstream of Concord Turnpike	168.0	2,880	4,380	5,120	6,310
At the confluence with Nashoba Brook	120.5	2,310	3,500	4,070	5,540
At the confluence with Tributary 2 to Assabet River	120.3	2,310	3,500	4,060	5,540
About 240 feet downstream of Main Street	117.8	2,280	3,450	4,010	5,460
About 800 feet downstream of Powdermill Road	116.7	2,260	3,430	3,980	5,430
About 0.8 mile downstream of Acton Street	116.0	2,250	3,410	3,960	5,400
About 10 feet downstream of Acton Street	115.2	2,240	3,400	3,950	5,380
About 1,400 feet upstream of Florida Road	114.6	2,240	3,380	3,930	5,360
About 190 feet downstream of Great Road	114.2	2,230	3,380	3,930	5,350
About 1,300 feet upstream of Great Road	109.5	2,170	3,290	3,820	5,200
About 1,400 feet upstream of White Pond Road	90.1	1,910	2,890	3,360	4,570
About 2,400 feet downstream of Sudbury Road	88.7	1,890	2,860	3,320	4,530
At the confluence with Boons Pond	86.6	1,860	2,810	3,270	4,460
At the confluence with Fort Meadow Brook	79.5	1,760	2,660	3,090	4,210
About 0.9 mile downstream of Gleansondale Road	78.8	1,750	2,640	3,070	4,190

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
ASSABET RIVER (continued)					
At the confluence with Branch of Assabet River	75.6	1,700	2,570	2,990	4,080
About 1.0 mile downstream of Cox Street	75.1	1,690	2,560	2,980	4,060
At the confluence with Assabet River Branch No. 3	74.0	1,670	2,540	2,950	4,020
About 1,800 feet upstream of Main Street	72.9	1660	2,510	2,920	3,980
At the confluence with Mill Brook	64.5	1580	2,320	2,740	3,600
At the confluence with Hog Brook	61.5	1580	2,310	2,730	3,570
About 800 feet upstream of Chapin Road	60.1	1460	2,140	2,530	3,320
About 400 feet downstream of Interstate 495	59.0	1370	2,020	2,380	3,130
About 250 feet downstream of Bridge Road	57.4	1350	1,990	2,350	3,080
At the confluence with North Brook	40.2	380	560	660	870
About 100 feet downstream of Interstate 290	40.1	350	520	620	810
About 375 feet upstream of Robin Hill Street	39.5	1650	2,420	2,860	3,760
About 900 feet downstream of Boundary Street	35.3	1500	2,210	2,610	3,440
About 400 feet upstream of Boundary Street	35.2	1500	2,210	2,610	3,430
About 2,500 feet upstream of Boundary Street	30.3	1320	1,950	2,310	3,040
About 2,550 feet upstream of Boundary Street	29.9	1260	1,870	2,210	2,920
BADDACOOK BROOK					
At confluence of Whitney Pond	2.1	190	520	590	1,080
BAITING BROOK					
At confluence with Sudbury River	3.6	288	425	488	625
At Constance M. Fiske Dam	1.9	68	77	80	87

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
BEAR MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with Ipswich River	4.7	160	270	330	500
BEAR MEADOW BROOK (continued)					
Approximately 1,200 feet downstream of Haverhill Street	4.0	140	230	280	430
Approximately 680 feet upstream of Haverhill Street	2.3	100	160	190	290
Approximately 2,700 feet upstream of Haverhill Street	1.4	57	96	120	180
BEAVER BROOK 1					
At confluence with Charles River	11.5	1,020	1,370	1,800	2,450
Upstream of confluence of Chester Brook	7.8	670	900	1,180	1,600
Upstream of Beaver Street Bridge	6.9	570	760	1,000	1,375
Upstream of Beaver Street Bridge	5.9	570	760	1,000	1,375
Approximately 15 feet downstream of Linden Street/ State Route 60	1.8	129	234	289	477
BEAVER BROOK 2					
At the confluence with River Meadow Brook	5.7	470	700	830	1090
About 1,200 feet downstream of High Street	3.4	320	480	570	760
About 970 feet downstream of Hunt Road	2.6	270	410	490	640
About 330 feet upstream of Garrison Road	2.1	220	340	400	530
BEAVER BROOK 3					
At Dracut/Lowell corporate limits	96.5	1,850	3,500	4,200	6,650
Upstream of confluence of Peppermint Brook	93.7	1,800	3,400	4,050	6,450
Upstream of Lakeview Avenue	87.4	1,710	3,220	3,830	6,090
Upstream of confluence of Gumpas Pond Brook	83.7	1,690	3,190	3,790	6,080

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
BEAVER BROOK 4					
At inlet to Forge Pond	13.6	420	690	845	1,280
Downstream of Westford/ Littleton corporate limits	11.8	380	620	760	1,150
Approximately 200 feet upstream of King Street	9.8	339	563	686	1,045
Upstream of Mill Pond	7.9	296	494	601	920
At State Route 2	5.8	241	403	493	756
At Boxborough/Littleton corporate limits	4.3	145	215	250	330
Approximately 7,280 feet upstream of Captain Isaac Davis Highway/State Route 2	3.0	92	140	160	220
Approximately 3,260 feet downstream of West Whitcomb Road	1.9	66	100	120	150
At Interstate Route 495	1.4	55	84	98	120
BEAVER BROOK 5					
At State Route 2	2.1	147	269	334	554
At Cross Section H	1.8	129	234	289	477
BEAVER DAM BROOK					
At River Mile 0.0	5.6	221	369	450	690
At River Mile 1.733	3.5	183	309	378	586
At the Framingham/Natick corporate limits	5.5	180	310	380	590
At the Ashland/Framingham corporate limits	1.0	180	310	380	590
BENNETTS BROOK					
At the Ayer/Littleton corporate limits	4.9	180	280	330	440
Approximately 1,500 feet downstream of Shaker Mille Pond	2.8	120	180	210	280
BIRCH MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with East Outlet	1.0	50	80	99	149
BLACK BROOK					
At confluence with Merrimack River	3.0	120	200	250	380
BOGASTOW BROOK-JAR BROOK					
At county boundary	12.4	690	1,000	1,400	2,200
Upstream of confluence of Dirty Meadow Brook	9.7	540	770	1,050	1,600

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
BOGASTOW BROOK-JAR BROOK (continued)					
Upstream of confluence of Dopping Brook	6.7	450	610	800	1,170
Upstream of Factory Pond	2.9	270	420	540	800
Upstream of Houghton Pond	2.5	250	400	500	750
At Meadowbrook Lane	0.4	50	80	100	150
BOGLE BROOK 1					
At the county boundary	1.9	50	82	99	151
At State Route 9	1.0	32	54	65	101
BOGLE BROOK 2					
At county boundary	3.6	325	490	630	1,000
Upstream of confluence of Tributary 4 to Bogle Brook 2	3.1	325	490	630	930
At Nonesuch Pond Outlet	2.8	300	460	600	890
At Nonesuch Pond Inlet	2.4	280	430	560	840
Upstream of confluence of Tributary 3 to Bogle Brook 2	1.4	200	260	350	510
At Pine Street	1.1	150	200	270	400
BOONS POND AND BRANCH					
At Barton Road	2.3	120	285	350	667
BOUTWELL BROOK					
At confluence with Stony Brook 2	1.3	90	150	180	280
BOW BROOK					
At confluence with Catacoonamug Brook	2.4	110	180	200	280
BRANCH OF ASSABET RIVER					
Approximately 1,380 feet downstream of Hudson Road/Walcott-Randall Road	4.2	186	294	347	505
At Hudson Road/Walcott-Randall Road	1.5	78	118	135	188
At Goshen Lane	1.1	60	91	104	145
At Athens Street	1.0	57	78	98	136
BRANCH OF ELIZABETH BROOK 1					
At confluence of Ministers Pond	1.1	84	113	125	175

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
BROAD MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with Sudbury Reservoir	1.1	70	100	110	150
BROOK A OF SHAWSHEEN RIVER					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	0.7	65	120	150	255
BROOK FROM WAUSHAKUM POND					
At confluence with Beaver Dam Brook	2.9	30	40	50	60
BUTTER BROOK					
At confluence with Nashoba Brook	3.1	105	180	225	440
At Acton/Westford corporate limits	1.4	65	110	140	275
At Concord Road	1.0	60	120	160	270
At Griffin Road	0.4	30	50	70	110
CATACOONAMUG BROOK					
At confluence with the Nashua River	20.3	670	1,150	1,400	2,080
CHARLES RIVER					
At the Waltham/Newton/ Watertown corporate limits	250.6	2,200	3,200	3,700	5,200
At Moody Street Dam	250.6	2,200	3,200	3,700	5,200
At Waltham Gaging Station	227.0	2,200	2,900	3,500	4,500
At diversion from Mother Brook	200.0	1,780	2,480	3,200	4,270
At confluence of Mother Brook	200.0	2,650	3,610	4,680	6,210
At the Charles River Village/ Dover Gage (No. 01103500)	184.0	2,500	3,500	4,500	6,000
At Natick/Sherborn corporate limits	176.0	2,500	3,500	4,500	6,000
At Medfield	156.0	2,450	3,430	4,410	5,925
CHEESE CAKE BROOK					
At Eddy Street	2.0	410	680	800	1,080
CHERRY BROOK					
At confluence with Stony Brook 1	3.2	400	500	700	1,080
At Concord Road	2.0	310	350	550	800

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
CHESTER BROOK					
At its confluence with Beaver Brook 1	3.7	300	460	600	850
At the confluence of West Chester Brook	1.7	200	300	400	450
At the lower end of the Lexington Street culvert	0.5	100	150	200	300
CHICKEN BROOK					
At county boundary	2.9	150	250	300	450
Upstream of Waseeka Wildlife Dam	0.2	40	50	60	80
COCHITUATE BROOK					
At confluence with Sudbury River	18.2	420	690	800	1,100
COLD BROOK					
At confluence of Pantry Brook	2.1	120	190	230	345
Above confluence of Tributary A to Cold Brook	0.4	40	65	80	125
COLD SPRING BROOK					
At the confluence with Merrimack River	400.7	4,120	5,490	6,060	7,340
About 40 feet downstream of Rogers Street	400.5	4,120	5,490	6,050	7,340
At the confluence with River Meadow Brook	372.6	3,930	5,240	5,770	7,000
About 130 feet upstream of Lawrence Street	372.5	3,930	5,240	5,770	6,990
At the confluence with Marginal Brook	371.0	3,920	5,220	5,760	6,970
About 115 feet downstream of Interstate 495	370.8	3,920	5,220	5,760	6,970
About 0.8 miles upstream of Interstate 495	369.8	3,910	5,210	5,740	6,960
About 1,900 feet downstream of Faulkner Street	368.8	3,900	5,200	5,730	6,950
About 870 feet upstream of Pollard Street	368.3	3,900	5,200	5,730	6,940
About 700 downstream of Boston Road	367.2	3,890	5,190	5,720	6,930

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
COLD SPRING BROOK (continued)					
About 1,900 feet upstream of Boston Road	366.7	3,890	5,180	5,710	6,920
About 3,600 feet downstream of River Street	365.9	3,880	5,170	5,700	6,910
About 1,600 feet upstream of River Street	365.1	3,880	5,170	5,700	6,900
About 1,000 feet downstream of US 3	362.5	3,860	5,140	5,670	6,870
About 10 feet downstream of US 3	362.4	3,860	5,140	5,670	6,870
About 1,400 feet downstream of Nashua Road	361.6	3,850	5,130	5,660	6,860
At the confluence with Pages Brook	357.2	3,820	5,090	5,610	6,800
About 1.0 mile downstream of Bedford Road	356.2	3,820	5,080	5,600	6,790
About 0.9 mile downstream of Bedford Road	353.3	3,800	5,050	5,570	6,750
About 0.5 mile downstream of Bedford Road	351.4	3,780	5,040	5,550	6,730
About 0.2 mile downstream of Bedford Road	351.1	3,780	5,030	5,550	6,730
About 1,250 feet upstream of Bedford Road	350.3	3,770	5,030	5,540	6,720
About 2,500 feet upstream of Bedford Road	350.3	3,770	5,030	5,540	6,710
About 3,600 feet upstream of Bedford Road	349.6	3,770	5,020	5,540	6,710
About 1.0 mile upstream of Bedford Road	349.0	3,770	5,010	5,530	6,700
About 1.2 miles upstream of Bedford Road	348.7	3,760	5,010	5,530	6,690
About 1.8 miles downstream of Monument Street	347.3	3,750	5,000	5,510	6,680
At the confluence with Sawmill Brook 2	345.5	3,740	4,980	5,490	6,650
About 1,800 feet downstream of Monument Street	344.8	3,740	4,970	5,480	6,650
About 1,050 feet downstream of Lowell Road	340.6	3,710	4,930	5,440	6,590
COLE'S BROOK					
At School Street	1.8	275	455	530	655
At Brucewood Road	1.5	275	455	530	655
At confluence of Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook	1.1	225	370	430	530

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
COLLINS BROOK					
At confluence with Sutton Brook	0.5	55	100	130	220
At Pringle Street	0.2	40	65	85	145
CONANT BROOK					
At confluence with Nashoba Brook	2.2	290	490	550	630
At Nagog Hill Road	1.2	200	330	370	430
CONCORD RIVER					
At the Billerica/Tewksbury corporate limits	373.0	3,100	4,900	6,000	8,900
At Talbot Mill Dam	370.0	2,940	4,660	5,675	8,395
At U.S. Route 3 Bridge, In Billerica	363.0	2,885	4,577	5,575	8,245
At the Billerica/Carlisle corporate limits	360.0	2,885	4,577	5,575	8,245
At Concord/Carlisle corporate limits	352.0	2,950	4,680	5,700	8,430
CONTENT BROOK – MIDDLESEX CANAL					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	3.3	145	260	330	560
At Billerica/Tewksbury corporate limits	5.8	205	370	455	585
At Gray Street	4.9	180	330	400	520
Just upstream of confluence of Content Brook and Middlesex Canal	2.2	95	175	210	275
COURSE BROOK					
About 1,400 feet downstream of Pond Street	3.3	190	310	380	510
About 1,450 feet downstream of Coolidge Street	2.8	170	280	340	460
At the confluence with Tributary A to Course Brook	1.9	130	220	260	360
About 190 feet upstream of Merchant Road	1.2	100	170	200	280
COW POND BROOK					
At the abandon railroad	9.3	210	510	570	980
At the outlet from Whitney Pond	7.3	50	100	110	195
At the outlet from Lost Lake	4.8	30	50	50	70

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
CRANBERRY BROOK					
At confluence with Hop Brook	1.8	105	170	205	310
CUMMINGS BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Shakers Glen Brook	3.4	120	230	330	690
Downstream of confluence of Little Brook	2.8	90	190	260	600
Upstream of confluence of Little Brook	1.5	40	110	140	320
At Winn Street	1.2	30	70	90	170
DAKINS BROOK					
At Lowell Road	0.5	120	215	250	275
DANFORTH BROOK					
At confluence with Assabet River	6.4	236	379	450	664
At county boundary	4.9	176	274	320	458
DARBY BROOK					
At confluence with Marshall Brook	0.6	35	70	90	145
DAVIS BROOK					
At confluence with Charles River	1.9	109	185	227	353
DIRTY MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with Bogastow Brook	2.5	140	230	340	570
DOPPING BROOK					
At confluence with Bogastow Brook	2.1	130	180	240	350
DUDLEY BROOK/TRIBUTARY TO DUDLEY BROOK					
At confluence with Hope Brook	2.3	110	160	190	250
Approximately 1,000 feet downstream of Bent Road	1.1	75	125	150	225
At U.S. Route 20	0.3	30	50	60	100

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
EAST OUTLET					
At confluence with Sudbury River	2.2	121	192	237	356
ELIZABETH BROOK 1					
Approximately 1,500 feet downstream of Box Mill Road	18.3	473	803	967	1,390
At Fletcher Road	17.9	462	787	949	1,367
At Gleasondale Road	17.8	446	760	918	1,324
At Wheeler Dam	16.8	367	632	768	1,113
At Great Road	15.9	289	487	588	844
At Hiley Brook Road	15.4	244	397	478	759
At Delaney Road	14.9	200	308	371	674
ELIZABETH BROOK 2					
At county boundary	1.6	100	160	190	290
Approximately 140 feet downstream of Rushwood Road	1.1	80	130	155	235
Approximately 470 feet downstream of Massachusetts Avenue/State Route 111	0.7	60	100	120	180
ELM BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	4.6	200	270	355	527
FARLEY BROOK					
At the confluence with River Meadow Brook	1.1	140	220	260	340
About 775 feet downstream of Smokerise Drive	0.3	60	90	110	150
FARRAR POND/ POLE BROOK					
At Sudbury River	2.2	100	147	169	237
At confluence with Farrar Pond/ Pole Brook confluence	1.0	54	80	92	129
At Concord Road	0.5	38	57	65	91
FARRAR POND BROOK					
At confluence with Farrar Pond	1.1	51	75	85	110
FORT MEADOW BROOK					
At Chestnut Street	4.6	245	385	450	649
At Fort Meadow Reservoir	3.3	169	252	289	399

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
FORT POND BROOK					
At confluence with Nashoba Brook	24.6	570	850	975	1,250
At Laws Brook Road	24.7	570	850	980	1,250
At Merriam Dam	24.3	565	850	975	1,245
At Erikson Dam	20.5	555	840	965	1,235
At confluence of Heath Hen Meadow Brook	19.8	545	835	955	1,220
At Boston & Main Railroad near Elm Street	10.1	375	650	790	1,210
Upstream of confluence of Inch Brook	4.4	130	230	285	520
At Boxborough/Acton corporate limits	2.8	97	148	175	235
Approximately 990 feet upstream of Littlefield Road	2.6	90	138	165	220
FORT POND BROOK BRANCH 1					
About 500 feet upstream of High Street	1.2	160	240	280	370
About 280 feet upstream of Main Street	0.5	90	140	160	210
FORT POND BROOK BRANCH 2					
At confluence with Fort Pond Brook	4.3	143	215	260	350
At Boston and Maine Railroad, Southern Crossing	4.2	140	213	255	340
At Sargent Road	3.0	103	165	190	255
GRASSY POND BROOK					
At confluence with Fort Pond Brook	1.6	70	120	150	290
GRAVES POND BROOK					
At the outlet of Graves Pond	1.5	90	150	170	240
GREAT ROAD TRIBUTARY					
At the confluence with Beaver Brook 4	0.4	46	81	100	159
At Great Road	0.1	17	30	37	58
Approximately 290 feet upstream of Interstate Route 495	0.1	9	16	20	32

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
GREENS BROOK					
At confluence with Varnum Brook	0.5	50	80	100	155
GUGGINS BROOK					
At confluence with Inch Brook	4.6	140	240	295	540
At Boxborough/Acton corporate limits	2.2	77	118	143	190
Approximately 3,340 feet downstream of Liberty Square Road	2.1	74	115	135	185
At Liberty Square Road	1.8	64	98	120	160
At eastern crossing of Massachusetts Avenue	1.5	59	84	100	135
Approximately 560 feet upstream of Massachusetts Avenue	1.0	39	60	73	98
GUMPAS POND BROOK					
At Dracut/Pelham corporate limits	3.7	200	345	425	715
HALES BROOK					
At confluence with River Meadow Brook	1.8	65	90	102	130
HALLS BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Aberjona River	3.0	70	90	80	170
Downstream of Boston and Maine Railroad	2.6	100	180	240	370
Upstream of Boston and Maine Railroad	2.1	70	130	170	270
At Merrimac Street and School Street	0.3	20	40	50	90
HAYWARD BROOK					
At confluence with Pine Brook	3.4	161	260	312	442
At Boston Post Road	2.3	83	140	175	272
At private drive bridge	1.5	62	104	130	202

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
HEATH HEN MEADOW BROOK					
At the confluence with Fort Pond Brook	5.8	280	450	540	730
About 1.7 miles downstream of West Acton Road	5.0	160	290	370	560
HOBBS BROOK 1					
At confluence with Stony Brook 1	24.7	300	400	525	775
At inlet to pond upstream of North Avenue	8.6	280	380	500	730
At Weston/Waltham corporate limits	7.2	150	200	260	390
HOBBS BROOK 2					
At Lexington Road	2.4	97	145	167	221
HOG BROOK					
At confluence with Assabet River	3.5	214	341	400	583
HOP BROOK					
At confluence with Landham-Allowance Brook	15.6	470	770	920	1,300
Above confluence of Dudley Brook	11.7	390	630	750	1,050
Above confluence of Run Brook	9.2	320	530	630	890
At Dutton Road	3.5	160	260	310	440
At the Sudbury/Framingham corporate limits	2.0	180	280	320	440
At the Marlborough/Sudbury corporate limits	1.3	160	260	310	435
HORN POND BROOK/ FOWLE BROOK					
At confluence with Aberjona River	9.8	200	430	610	1,240
At Horn Pond Dam	8.8	180	400	570	1,080
Downstream of confluence of Cummings Brook and Shakers Glen Brook	6.2	170	350	490	910

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
INCH BROOK					
At confluence with Fort Pond Brook	5.7	155	270	335	615
IPSWICH RIVER					
At downstream North Reading/ Reading corporate limits	18.4	360	520	600	830
At Reading/North Reading/ Wilmington corporate limits	14.7	320	480	560	760
Upstream of confluence of Lubbers Brook	8.9	150	250	320	550
Downstream of confluence of Maple Meadow Brook	8.4	280	450	540	820
Upstream of confluence of Maple Meadow Brook	2.7	50	80	110	190
Approximately 1,050 feet downstream of Adams Street Culvert	2.6	130	220	260	390
Downstream of Clark Street	2.0	100	160	200	300
At the Burlington/Wilmington corporate limits	1.1	70	120	140	220
JAMES BROOK					
At confluence with Nashua River	4.9	180	290	340	460
At the Ayer/Groton corporate limits	2.9	130	210	240	340
At Old Ayer Road	2.6	110	170	240	340
At Indian Hill Road	1.7	80	120	140	200
At Ayer Road	1.1	50	80	100	140
JENNY DUGAN BROOK					
At the confluence with Sudbury River	1.7	120	200	250	340
About 1,300 feet downstream of Williams Road	0.9	80	130	160	230
About 3,000 upstream of Williams Road	0.2	30	50	60	80
JONES BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	1.7	215	380	450	540
At Golf Course Culvert	1.6	195	355	425	510
At Baldwin Road	1.3	160	290	345	415

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
KILN BROOK					
Approximately 2,700 feet downstream of Interstate Route 95	1.7	177	350	450	803
At State Route 128/ Interstate Route 95	1.1	125	243	312	550
KING STREET TRIBUTARY					
At confluence with Beaver Brook 4	0.5	49	85	104	166
Approximately 1,500 feet upstream of King Street	0.3	39	68	84	136
LANDHAM-ALLOWANCE BROOK					
At Landham Road	21.0	580	940	1,130	1,590
At the Sudbury/Framingham corporate limits	2.0	180	280	330	450
LAWRENCE BROOK					
At confluence with Merrimack River	3.4	110	170	200	305
Upstream of confluence of Mascuppic Brook	0.7	65	110	135	210
LITTLE BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Cummings Brook	1.4	50	100	140	360
At Bedford Road	1.1	40	80	120	230
LOCKE BROOK					
At confluence with Willard Brook	4.7	340	540	640	890
LOWER SPOT POND BROOK					
At the intake to Winter Street in Malden	6.0	640	900	1,060	1,480
LUBBERS BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Ipswich River	5.5	160	220	270	410
Upstream of Middlesex Avenue	4.5	140	200	240	360
Upstream of Boston & Maine Railroad bridge at Lawrence Street	3.4	180	270	310	450

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
LUBBERS BROOK (continued)					
At Glen Road	3.2	135	215	250	350
At State Route 38 (Main Street)	2.8	80	115	130	180
At State Route 129 (Shawsheen Avenue)	2.0	90	135	150	290
Approximately 2,200 feet upstream of Shawsheen Avenue/ State Route 29	1.5	90	150	180	275
At Billerica/Wilmington corporate limits	1.3	63	106	129	200
At Billerica/Burlington corporate limits	0.7	47	80	98	153
MALDEN RIVER					
At the upstream side of the Amelia Earhart Dam	61.9	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
At Medford/Everett corporate limits	9.2	850	1,200	1,410	1,890
MAPLE MEADOW BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Ipswich River	5.7	230	360	430	620
Upstream of tributary, approximately 525 feet northeast of Paddock Street	5.6	190	290	350	520
Upstream of Main Street bridge	4.1	160	260	310	460
Approximately 1,300 feet upstream of Middlesex Canal	1.5	30	50	60	90
MARGINAL BROOK					
At confluence with Concord River	1.2	70	115	140	220
MARSHALL BROOK					
At confluence with Strong Water Brook	4.0	180	295	350	515
Upstream of confluence of Darby Brook	3.2	150	240	290	425
Upstream of the tributary at station 1.075	2.6	105	170	205	300

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
MARTINS BROOK					
At the Wilmington/North Reading corporate limits	10.9	460	700	830	1,190
Approximately 2,000 feet downstream of State Route 62 (Salem Street)	10.3	370	570	670	980
MARTINS POND BROOK					
At confluence with Lost Lake	2.1	90	130	150	200
MASCUPPIC BROOK					
At confluence with Lawrence Brook	2.4	50	70	80	115
MASON BROOK					
At the confluence with Walker Brook 2	7.4	320	540	660	940
MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with Strong Water Brook	5.1	260	425	510	760
Upstream of tributary at Station 1.145	2.6	145	240	285	425
MEADOW RIVER BRANCH					
At Lowell Street	7.9	266	441	537	819
At Curve Street	4.4	177	296	361	554
MERRIMACK RIVER					
At mouth	4,180.0	54,000	85,000	102,000	145,000
At the Andover/Tewksbury corporate limits	4,635.0	58,000	90,000	111,000	156,000
At Dracut/Methuen corporate limits	4,644.0	58,000	90,000	111,000	156,000
At Nashua, New Hampshire (State Route 111)	3,982.0	53,000	85,000	102,000	148,000
MILL BROOK 1					
At confluence with Pine Brook	5.0	70	90	100	130
At Lexington/Wayland corporate limits	1.3	132	225	322	558
At Fottler Avenue	1.0	107	208	264	461

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
MILL BROOK 2					
At Lang Street	3.8	275	495	570	670
At Cambridge Turnpike (State Route 2A)	2.6	116	188	227	322
At confluence of Crosby Pond	0.8	62	101	123	180
MILL BROOK 3					
At Mystic Valley Parkway	5.5	210	370	480	900
At Mill Street	5.0	150	310	450	730
At Brattle Street	4.3	120	210	260	820
At Park Avenue	3.6	80	150	200	390
MILL POND TRIBUTARY					
At confluence with Beaver Brook 4	0.9	37	62	76	117
Upstream of Boston & Maine Railroad	0.5	18	29	36	55
MILL RIVER					
At confluence with Saugus River	3.6	150	260	300	350
At Water Street bridge above Crystal Lake Storm Drain	0.8	75	130	145	170
At Salem Street bridge	0.4	34	58	66	78
MINEWAY BROOK					
At confluence with Pantry Brook	1.5	100	160	190	285
Approximately 1,500 feet upstream of confluence with Pantry Brook	1.3	85	140	165	250
Approximately 1,500 feet upstream of Morse Road	0.9	70	115	140	210
Approximately 3,100 feet upstream of Morse Road	0.7	60	100	120	180
At Abandon Railroad line	0.4	40	65	80	125
At Concord Road and Candy Hill Road Intersection	0.3	30	50	60	95
MONGO BROOK					
At confluence with Elm Brook	0.6	26	41	50	63
MORSE BROOK					
At confluence with the Nashua River	1.0	50	70	80	100

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
MOWRY BROOK					
At confluence with the Sudbury Reservoir	1.6	50	70	80	110
MUD POND BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	0.3	45	80	100	175
MUDDY BROOK					
At the confluence with Heath Hen Meadow Brook	0.5	90	140	170	220
MULPUS BROOK					
At confluence with the Nashua River	15.9	720	1,740	1,950	3,440
At Townsend Road Culvert	14.0	810	1,920	2,140	3,820
MUNROE BROOK					
At Lexington/Arlington corporate limits	2.2	179	345	434	754
At Lilian Road	2.0	165	313	399	665
At Trail	1.5	130	242	302	511
At Bryant Road	1.0	100	188	238	359
MYSTIC RIVER					
At confluence with Maiden River	62.9	1,150	2,130	2,530	3,700
Downstream of confluence of Alewife Brook (Little River)	43.7	990	1,840	2,110	3,520
Upstream of confluence of Alewife Brook (Little River)	34.8	800	1,560	2,040	4,250
NAGOG BROOK					
At confluence with Nashoba Brook	2.4	70	120	155	310
At Nagog Pond outlet	1.2	12	16	18	27
NASHOBA BROOK					
At confluence of Fort Pond Brook	20.3	450	710	845	1,140
At State Route 27	11.8	410	695	840	1,340
Upstream of confluence of Butter Brook	8.7	340	590	715	1,130

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
NASHUA RIVER					
At the Massachusetts/New Hampshire State Line	396.0	8,300	14,300	17,800	28,300
At the Dunstable/Groton corporate limits	390.0	8,400	15,400	19,800	33,900
At confluence of Nissitissit River	352.0	7,055	11,945	14,651	22,829
At Fitch Bridge Road	312.6	6,950	11,700	14,400	22,600
At confluence of Squannacook River	220.5	5,850	9,900	12,500	19,200
At confluence of Mulpus Brook	204.5	5,650	9,600	12,200	18,600
At confluences of Walker Brook 1 and Nonacoicus Brook 1	183.9	5,400	9,100	11,600	18,000
At confluence of Catacoonamug Brook	161.0	5,100	8,600	11,800	17,000
NISSITISSIT RIVER					
At confluence with the Nashua River	59.8	1,497	2,642	3,642	5,000
NONACOICUS BROOK 1					
At confluence with Nashua River	18.4	840	2,120	2,370	4,160
At Main Street	160.7	400	670	720	1,070
NONACOICUS BROOK 2					
At confluence with Nonacoicus Brook 1	11.0	370	980	1,120	2,230
NORTH LEXINGTON BROOK					
At Bedford/Lexington corporate limits	4.9	396	817	1,072	1,986
At Hartwell Avenue	3.2	273	548	708	1,217
Approximately 1,260 feet downstream of Interstate 95 Interchange	1.7	168	330	421	746
At Interstate 95 Interchange	1.0	100	183	235	395
PAGES BROOK					
At confluence with Concord River	4.0	171	286	349	538
At Maple Street	1.8	95	162	199	309

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
PAGES BROOK BRANCH					
At Brook Street	1.4	265	350	384	472
At East Street	0.8	230	300	334	410
PANTRY BROOK					
At confluence with the Sudbury River	6.0	240	380	450	670
Above confluence of Mineway Brook	1.1	75	125	150	225
Above confluence of Tributary A to Pantry Brook	0.3	35	55	70	105
PEARL HILL BROOK					
At confluence with Walker Brook 2	7.0	280	460	550	790
PEPPERMINT BROOK					
At confluence with Beaver Brook 3	2.4	140	240	300	460
At Pleasant Street	2.3	130	230	290	440
At Hildreth Street	2.0	120	200	250	380
PINE BROOK					
At confluence of Mill Brook 1	5.8	220	340	440	540
At confluence of Hayward Brook	4.0	160	251	294	400
PRATTS BROOK					
At the confluence with Fort Pond Brook	1.9	210	320	380	500
PUTNAM BROOK					
At the confluence with River Meadow Brook	0.9	120	190	220	300
REEDY MEADOW BROOK					
At confluence with the Nashua River	2.7	124	190	220	299
At the Groton/Pepperell corporate limits	2.0	120	190	220	300
RESERVOIR NO. 1 - NORTH BRANCH AND RESERVOIR NO. 3					
At Salem End Road	27.7	1,220	2,130	5,130	3,420
At the outlet of Reservoir No. 3	27.7	1,220	2,130	2,490	3,420
At the county boundary	22.3	1,170	2,020	2,360	3,200

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
RICHARDSON BROOK					
At confluence with Merrimack River	4.5	210	330	390	570
Upstream of confluence of Trout Brook 1	1.7	90	150	180	260
RIVER MEADOW BROOK					
At Chelmsford/Lowell corporate limits	22.0	555	870	1,030	1,450
At confluence of Beaver Brook 2	13.2	400	625	740	1,015
At confluence of Putnam Brook	12.4	380	600	715	980
At confluence of Farley Brook	11.1	355	560	665	910
RUN BROOK					
At the confluence of Hop Brook	0.6	50	80	100	150
Downstream of Hudson Road	0.4	40	70	85	130
Downstream of Fairbank Road	0.1	20	35	45	70
SALMON BROOK					
At the Dunstable/Nashua, New Hampshire, corporate limits	22.4	550	920	1,120	1,620
Above confluence of Joint Grass Brook	17.7	190	320	390	605
Above confluence of Hauk Brook	13.4	180	300	365	575
SANDY BROOK					
At the Sandy Brook Road	1.0	360	680	900	1,300
At Maude Graham Circle	0.7	215	420	545	790
At Bedford Street	0.5	140	275	365	575
SAUGUS RIVER					
At county boundary	15.7	340	570	655	840
At Water Street bridge	12.1	230	380	435	595
Above confluence of Montrose Avenue Tributary	11.3	115	185	215	340
At State Route 128 upstream crossing	5.4	190	310	330	395
Above confluence of Reading Drainage Canal	1.8	35	50	57	65
SAUNDERS BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	2.7	130	235	300	515
At Wilmington/Burlington corporate limits	1.5	95	175	220	380

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
SAWMILL BROOK 1					
At Wilmington/Tewksbury corporate limits	1.6	354	595	743	1,250
At Mill Street	1.5	350	585	732	1,220
SAWMILL BROOK 2					
At Monument Street	2.5	285	500	550	600
SCHNEIDER BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Aberjona River	1.4	60	110	140	260
At Forbes Street	0.7	30	50	60	110
SHAKERS GLEN BROOK					
Upstream of confluence of Cummings Brook	2.7	60	130	180	340
Upstream of Russell Street culvert	2.5	50	110	160	290
SHAWSHEEN RIVER					
At the northern Andover/ Tewksbury corporate limits	60.1	1,350	2,015	2,340	3,300
At the southern Andover/ Tewksbury corporate limits	58.7	1,325	1,980	2,300	3,240
Downstream of confluence of Strong Water Brook	54.5	1,260	1,875	2,170	3,070
Upstream of confluence of Strong Water Brook	43.9	1,060	1,580	1,840	2,585
Downstream of confluence of Mud Pond Brook	41.1	1,010	1,515	1,765	2,480
Downstream of confluence of Content Brook	37.0	930	1,400	1,610	2,280
At State Road (SR 129)	36.5	1,115	1,825	2,200	3,285
At the Billerica/Tewksbury corporate limits	35.3	1,000	1,350	1,500	1,850
Above confluence of Jones Brook	33.0	1,040	1,710	2,060	3,070
At Boston Road (SR3A)	31.2	1,020	1,650	1,985	2,960
At Bedford/Billerica corporate limits	27.2	1,000	1,500	1,800	2,660
Upstream of confluence of Vine Brook	16.5	885	1,410	1,695	2,500
Upstream of confluence of Spring Brook	13.4	830	1,320	1,590	2,340
Upstream of confluence of Elm Brook	8.1	665	1,056	1,276	1,875
Upstream of confluence of Kiln Brook	2.3	280	440	530	650

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
SKUG RIVER					
At confluence with Martins Pond	6.9	557	991	1,171	1,642
At Central Street	6.2	535	909	1,082	1,525
SNAKE BROOK					
At confluence with Lake Cochituate	2.5	120	180	210	280
SOUTH MEADOW BROOK-PAUL BROOK					
At Tower Road	2.8	605	1,045	1,265	1,620
At Dedham Street	2.0	480	835	1,015	1,315
At Mildred Road	0.9	285	520	615	845
SPENCER BROOK					
About 870 feet upstream of Barrets Mill Road	7.2	320	520	620	840
About 2,000 feet downstream of Lindsay Pond Road	6.3	300	480	570	770
About 1,050 feet upstream of Lindsay Pond Road	5.5	270	440	520	710
About 60 feet downstream of Spencer Brook Road	4.5	240	380	460	630
About 2,400 feet upstream of Westford Road	3.5	200	330	390	540
About 350 feet upstream of Russel Street	2.2	150	240	290	400
SPRING BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	2.7	110	125	130	150
Upstream of Alcott Street	0.6	34	45	60	70
SQUANNACOOK RIVER					
At confluence with the Nashua River	62.8	3,540	6,880	8,840	15,160
At Elm Street	51.5	2,950	5,740	7,380	12,650
At Mason Road	42.3	2,620	5,090	6,550	11,230

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
STONY BROOK					
At the confluence with Angelica Brook	24.0	1,290	1,900	2,250	2,950
About 1,400 feet downstream of Stony Brook Reservoir Dam	22.5	1,240	1,820	2,150	2,830
About 1.0 mile upstream of Stony Brook Reservoir Dam	12.7	760	1,130	1,340	1,770
About 1,900 feet downstream of Boston Road	12.0	750	1,120	1,320	1,750
About 1,600 feet upstream of Boston Road	11.2	720	1,070	1,260	1,670
About 1,200 feet downstream of White Bagley Road	10.5	680	1,020	1,210	1,600
About 470 feet downstream of Cordaville Road	9.7	670	1,000	1,180	1,550
About 830 feet downstream of Parkerville Road	7.9	580	870	1,030	1,360
STONY BROOK 1					
At confluence with the Charles River	24.6	300	400	500	700
At the inlet to Stony Brook Reservoir	22.6	1,140	1,520	2,000	2,950
Upstream of confluence of Hobbs Brook 1	11.4	890	1,200	1,560	2,300
At confluence of Iron Mine Brook	2.3	95	144	167	230
At Tower Road	1.2	54	82	95	131
At Brooks School	1.0	45	68	79	96
STONY BROOK 2					
At confluence with the Merrimack River	43.2	915	1,320	1,490	1,835
STRONG WATER BROOK					
At confluence with the Shawsheen River	10.2	345	515	595	840
SUDBURY RESEVOIR					
About 1.0 mile upstream of Stony Brook Reservoir Dam	8.9	630	940	1,110	1,470
About 2.0 mile upstream of Stony Brook Reservoir Dam	4.8	420	620	740	970
About 0.7 mile downstream of Marlboro Road	0.7	100	160	190	250
About 160 feet downstream of Marlboro Road	0.2	30	50	60	80

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
SUDBURY RIVER					
About 850 feet upstream of Lowell Road	162.9	2,380	4,070	4,250	6,090
About 570 feet upstream of Main Street	162.0	2,370	4,050	4,240	6,070
About 1,400 feet downstream of Massachusetts 2A/Concord Turnpike	161.7	2,370	4,040	4,240	6,060
About 1,550 feet upstream of Massachusetts 2A/Concord Turnpike	159.3	2,340	3,980	4,210	6,000
About 0.5 mile upstream of Sudbury Road	158.4	2,340	3,960	4,190	5,980
About 0.9 mile downstream of Great Road	157.1	2,320	3,930	4,180	5,940
About 260 feet upstream of Great Road	155.8	2,310	3,900	4,160	5,910
At the confluence with Pole Brook	153.3	2,300	3,700	4,130	5,880
At the confluence with Pantry Brook	146.8	2,250	3,440	4,050	5,730
About 0.5 mile downstream of Lincoln Road	145.8	2,230	3,430	4,030	5,700
About 1,100 feet upstream of Sherman Bridge Road / Lincoln Road	143.8	2,210	3,400	4,000	5,650
About 1.1 miles downstream of Old Sudbury Road	142.1	2,200	3,370	3,960	5,610
About 0.6 mile downstream of Old Sudbury Road	140.8	2,180	3,350	3,940	5,570
About 150 feet upstream of of Old Sudbury Road	139.8	2,170	3,330	3,920	5,550
At the confluence with Wash Brook	116.2	1,920	2,950	3,470	4,910
At the confluence with Pine Brook	110.8	1,870	2,860	3,360	4,760
About 0.8 mile upstream of Pelham Island Road	110.4	1,860	2,850	3,360	4,740
About 1.9 miles downstream of Stonebridge Road	110.1	1,860	2,850	3,350	4,740
About 1.8 miles downstream of Stonebridge Road	108.3	1,840	2,820	3,310	4,690
About 200 feet upstream of Stonebridge Road	107.3	1,830	2,800	3,290	4,660
About 1,300 feet upstream of Stonebridge Road	106.5	1,820	2,790	3,280	4,630

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
SUDBURY RIVER (continued)					
About 50 feet downstream of Danforth Street	106.2	1,810	2,780	3,270	4,630
About 500 feet downstream of Concord Street	84.7	1,560	2,390	2,820	3,980
About 250 feet upstream of Central Street Dam	84.5	1,560	2,390	2,810	3,980
About 0.5 mile upstream of Central Street Dam	84.1	1,550	2,380	2,800	3,960
About 220 feet downstream of Interstate 90	83.2	1,540	2,370	2,780	3,940
About 2,200 feet upstream of Interstate 90	81.2	1,520	2,330	2,740	3,870
At the confluence with East Outlet	80.1	1,510	2,310	2,720	3,840
About 850 feet downstream of Union Avenue	79.0	1,490	2,290	2,690	3,810
About 990 feet downstream of Winter Street	77.5	1,470	2,260	2,660	3,760
About 30 feet downstream of Winter Street	74.2	1,430	2,190	2,580	3,650
About 500 feet upstream of Reservoir No. 1 Dam	45.9	1,430	2,130	2,520	3,310
About 0.6 mile upstream of Reservoir No. 2 Dam	45.4	1,990	2,920	3,450	4,530
About 1,400 feet upstream of Fountain Street	44.2	1,960	2,870	3,390	4,440
About 400 feet downstream of Union Street	35.3	1,620	2,390	2,820	3,710
About 100 feet upstream of Myrtle Street	34.2	1,580	2,330	2,760	3,630
About 460 feet downstream of Cordaville Road	33.1	1,550	2,290	2,700	3,550
About 1,800 feet upstream of Cordaville Road	31.5	1,560	2,290	2,700	3,540
About 1,050 feet downstream of Howe Street	23.8	1,290	1,890	2,240	2,940
About 190 feet downstream of Cordaville Street	21.4	1,150	1,700	2,010	2,650
About 750 feet upstream of Fay Court	19.7	1,130	1,670	1,970	2,590
About 140 feet upstream of Fruit Street	18.4	1,080	1,590	1,880	2,470

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
SUTTON BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	2.7	130	235	300	515
At Wilmington/Tewksbury corporate limits	1.5	95	175	220	380
SWEETWATER BROOK					
Upstream of confluence with Aberjona River	2.4	210	400	530	970
At I-93	2.3	200	400	530	960
At Lindenwood Road	1.9	170	350	470	840
TADMUCK BROOK					
At confluence with Stony Brook 2	2.1	120	210	250	400
At Main Street	1.6	90	160	190	300
At Providence Road	1.0	50	90	110	170
TADMUCK SWAMP BROOK					
At Westford/Chelmsford corporate limits	1.8	110	190	230	360
At Interstate Route 495	1.2	90	150	180	290
TAYLOR BROOK					
At confluence with Assabet River	4.6	102	136	152	200
TRIBUTARY 1 TO COLE'S BROOK					
At Arborwood Road	0.1	50	95	115	155
TRIBUTARY 1 TO SUDBURY RIVER					
At Coolidge Road	0.3	65	126	145	175
TRIBUTARY 2 TO ASSABET RIVER					
At Baker Avenue	0.1	45	85	100	120
TRIBUTARY 2 TO TRIBUTARY 1 TO COLE'S BROOK					
At Fernwood Road	0.2	120	180	200	215
TRIBUTARY 3 TO BOGLE BROOK 2					
At confluence with Bogle Brook 2	1.0	120	175	240	380

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
TRIBUTARY 4 TO BOGLE BROOK 2					
At confluence with Bogle Brook 2	0.5	80	120	170	250
TRIBUTARY A TO COLD BROOK					
At confluence with Cold Brook	0.6	55	90	110	165
At Abandon Railroad line	0.3	35	60	75	110
TRIBUTARY A TO COURSE BROOK					
At confluence with Course Brook	0.7	90	140	180	270
TRIBUTARY A TO HOP BROOK					
At confluence with Hop Brook	0.6	50	90	105	160
At Firecut Lane	0.1	20	35	45	70
TRIBUTARY A TO SQUANNACOOK RIVER					
At confluence with the Squannacook River	2.5	130	200	230	310
TRIBUTARY B TO HOP BROOK					
At confluence with Hop Brook	0.4	40	60	75	115
TRIBUTARY B TO SQUANNACOOK RIVER					
At confluence with the Squannacook River	0.4	30	50	50	70
TRIBUTARY B TO VINE BROOK					
At Middlesex Street	0.7	425	590	685	960
At Third Avenue	0.6	100	130	150	195
At US Route 3	0.5	70	85	95	115
TRIBUTARY C TO VINE BROOK					
At Wheeler Road	0.7	195	300	360	560
At Muller Road	0.5	170	340	465	780

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
TRIBUTARY TO BEAVER BROOK 3					
At confluence with Beaver Brook 3	1.2	80	140	175	275
TRIBUTARY TO COLD SPRING BROOK					
At confluence with Cold Spring Brook	1.2	80	110	130	170
TRIBUTARY TO MARTINS BROOK					
At confluence with Martins Brook	1.5	94	153	185	250
TRIBUTARY TO MILL BROOK					
At confluence with Mill Brook	1.1	60	80	105	155
TRIBUTARY TO NONACOICUS BROOK 1/ LONG POND BROOK					
At the confluence with Nonacoicus Brook 1	4.1	120	150	160	240
At Snake Hill Road	2.2	30	60	70	120
TRIBUTARY TO WAUSHAKUM POND					
At the south end of Waushakum Pond	1.5	100	140	150	200
TROUT BROOK					
At confluence with Hop Brook	1.9	110	180	215	325
TROUT BROOK 1					
At confluence with Richardson Brook	2.6	140	220	270	390
TROUT BROOK 2					
At confluence with the Nashua River	0.6	40	50	60	70

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
TRULL BROOK					
At confluence with Merrimack River	4.4	200	300	355	475
Upstream of River Road	4.1	175	250	285	335
Upstream of tributary at Station 1.145	2.3	125	170	200	235
TRULL BROOK TRIBUTARY					
At Nesmith Street	0.6	40	60	70	95
UNKETY BROOK					
At the Groton/Dunstable corporate limits	2.6	110	160	190	250
VALLEY POND					
At Valley Pond Outlet	1.8	77	116	133	185
VARNUM BROOK					
At confluence with the Nashua River	0.9	70	110	135	210
VINE BROOK					
At confluence with Shawsheen River	8.3	495	700	820	1,195
At Wilson Road	8.2	485	690	805	1,175
At Butterfield Pond	2.3	197	379	486	852
At Emerson Road	2.2	188	350	444	758
At Trail	1.8	159	304	383	660
At Brookwood Road	1.7	150	287	360	620
At downstream end of 2,600-foot culvert	1.5	132	249	309	522
WALKER BROOK 1					
At confluence with the Nashua River	1.1	60	90	100	130
WALKER BROOK 2					
At confluence with the Squannacook River	41.8	1,470	2,760	3,520	5,600
Above confluence of Willard Brook	15.1	750	1,410	1,800	2,830
Above confluence of Mason Brook	6.6	310	520	630	910
WALKER BROOK 3					
At confluence with Sudbury Reservoir	1.9	100	160	190	260

TABLE 8 - SUMMARY OF DISCHARGES – continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	DRAINAGE AREA (sq. miles)	PEAK DISCHARGES (cfs) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
WALKERS BROOK					
Downstream Reading corporate limits	2.6	140	230	280	420
Approximately 2,900 feet downstream of John Street	1.7	120	200	240	350
Approximately 900 feet downstream of John Street	1.2	96	150	180	280
WELLINGTON BROOK					
At Boston and Maine Railroad	1.7	70	130	180	320
WEST CHESTER BROOK					
At its confluence with Chester Brook	1.1	120	160	200	290
WHITEHALL BROOK					
At confluence with Sudbury River	7.2	660	990	1,130	1,470
WILLARD BROOK					
At confluence with Walker Brook No. 2	26.9	1,330	2,360	2,920	4,440
WINTHROP CANAL					
Upstream of Linden Pond	2.5	175	235	310	460
Upstream of Arch Street	1.8	60	80	100	150
WITCH BROOK					
At confluence with the Squannacook River	3.5	150	240	280	380

The stillwater elevations have been determined for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floods for the flooding sources studied by detailed methods and are summarized in Table 9, "Summary of Stillwater Elevations."

TABLE 9 - SUMMARY OF STILLWATER ELEVATIONS

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	ELEVATION (feet NAVD88) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
ASSABET RIVER[1]				
At Damondale Dam	127.8	128.8	129.2	130.4
At Powder Mill Dam	140.8	142.2	142.9	145.1
At American Woolen Company Dam	178.2	179.1	179.4	180.2
Dam near Rockbottom Dam	192.9	194.1	194.4	195.2
ATLANTIC OCEAN				
Mystic River downstream of Amelia Earhart Dam	8.3	9.1	9.5	10.3
CONCORD RIVER[1]				
At Talbot Mill Dam	115.0	115.7	115.9	116.5
ELL POND				
Entire shoreline within Melrose	48.2	51.6	53.4	53.9
FORT POND BROOK[1]				
At Merrimack Dam	148.3	149.3	149.8	150.6
At Cement Dam	174.7	175.2	175.3	175.6
At Erikson Dam	192.5	193.3	193.6	194.2
HOP BROOK[1]				
Dam near School Street	438.7	438.8	438.9	439.1
JENNY DUGAN[1]				
At Protected Beaver Dam	135.7	134.9	135.0	135.6
LAKE QUANNAPOWITT				
Entire shoreline within Wakefield	82.5	82.8	83.0	83.1
LINDEN BROOK				
At confluence with Town Line Brook	*	*	8.2	*
At Beach Street	*	*	8.2	*
LOWER MYSTIC LAKE				
Entire shoreline within Arlington and Medford	*	*	7.2	*
MASSAPOAG POND				
Entire shoreline within Groton, Dunstable, and Tyngsborough	166.5	167.3	167.6	168.6
NAGOG POND[1]				
At Dam	225.8	225.9	225.9	226.2

*Data Not Available

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 9 - SUMMARY OF STILLWATER ELEVATIONS - continued

FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION	ELEVATION (feet NAVD88) 10-PERCENT	2-PERCENT	1-PERCENT	0.2-PERCENT
NASHOBA BROOK				
At Concord Road Dam	135.7	136.1	136.3	136.6
At Wheeler Lane Dam	167.5	167.8	168.0	168.4
SPENCER BROOK[1]				
At Gun Club Driveway Dam	133.1	134.0	134.5	134.6
At Westford Road	148.3	149.1	149.2	149.6
STONEY BROOK/SUDBURY RESERVOIR[1]				
At Foss Dam	181.8	182.7	183.1	184.0
At Sudbury Dam [2]	253.9	254.2	254.5	254.9
Dam at Middle Road	257.7	258.7	260.3	261.4
Dam upstream of Deerfoot Road	257.7	258.7	260.3	261.4
SUDBURY RIVER[1]				
Reservoir 1	163.2	163.9	164.3	165.1
Reservoir 2	173.2	174.1	174.4	175.2
At Former Lombard Governor Dam	191.6	192.1	192.4	192.7
TOWN LINE BROOK				
At county boundary	*	*	8.2	*
At Broadway Drive	*	*	8.2	*
UPPER MYSTIC LAKE				
Entire shoreline within Winchester	*	*	12.6	14.0
WAUSHAKUM POND				
Entire shoreline within Ashland and Framingham	158.6	159.2	159.3	160.0

*Data Not Available
[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study
[2]Structure located in Worcester County

Countywide Analyses

The Hydrologic Engineering Center's Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS), version 2.2.2, was used to develop runoff hydrographs for use in the HEC-RAS unsteady flow model. GIS based automation was employed to efficiently develop sub-basin areas and characteristics. The steps that went into building and the hydrologic model were:

- Basin delineation
- NRCS Curve Number determination
- Time of Concentration calculations
- Storage coefficient calculations
- Determination of precipitation extremes

Basin Delineation

GIS-based digital terrain modeling was employed to automate delineation of sub-watersheds within the study area. These techniques were used to identify the contributing watershed to approximately 200 reaches of study area flooding sources. To accomplish this task, the methodology established for processing the National Elevation Dataset (NED) (USGS 2003) for use with the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (USGS 2003) was followed, which included the following steps:

- Establish stream centerline for flooding sources from NHD
- Segment stream centerline at structure locations to generate desired reaches.
- Modification of NED elevations to fill any sinks and enforce previously delineated stream channel locations (centerline) and basin boundaries (those done by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection).
- Calculate flow direction grid based on the modified NED coverage.

Using the flow direction grid, delineate the contributing area to each of the stream reaches. The filling of sinks, calculation of flow direction, and watershed delineation are functions that are built in to the Spatial Analyst product.

NRCS Curve Number Determination

The NRCS Runoff Curve Number method of hydrologic abstractions as implemented in HEC-HMS (USACE, 2000) was selected as the loss rate method for the hydrologic modeling. This methodology depends on a Runoff Curve Number (RCN) that defines the rainfall-runoff relationship for the basin, and a time of concentration defined by the longest hydrologic flow path in the basin. The RCN was determined in accordance with NRCS TR-55 methodology based on the surficial hydrologic soil group and landcover type. GIS analysis was used to automate calculation of RCNs for each of the approximately 200 basins in the study area.

Hydrologic Soils Data

A Digital NRCS Soil Survey is not yet available for Middlesex County, Massachusetts; therefore, for use in GIS analysis this data had to be captured from the existing paper maps.

Landcover Data

IKONOS satellite imagery from 2001 and 2002 at four meters per pixel resolution was acquired, and classified according to a few basic landcover types: Water, Wetland, Grass, Urban Recreation, Residential, Roads/Parking, Industrial/Commercial, Quarry/Landfill, Forest, Scrub/Shrub, Fallow/Bare Earth, and Agriculture.

Composite Curve Number Generation Method

GIS was used to automate the calculation of composite RCNs for each sub-watershed using separate grid coverages of hydrologic soil groups, landcover, and sub-watershed boundaries.

This automated process also calculated the percent directly connected impervious area (DCIA) for each subwatershed. A percent DCIA was assigned to the land-cover categories residential, roads/parking, and Industrial/Commercial, the remaining land-cover categories were assumed to have no DCIA. The table below summarizes the DCIA used to calculate % Impervious for input into the HMS model. Based on the percent DCIA of each sub-watershed, the RCN input into the hydrologic model was reduced by the following expression:

$$(RCN - 98 * (DCIA)) / (1 - DCIA)$$

Percent Directly Connected Impervious Area

Landuse	% DCIA
Residential	25
Roads/Parking	90
Industrial/Commercial	50

Time of Concentration Calculations

Time of concentration was calculated for each of the sub-basins.

Storage Coefficient Calculations

The Clark Unit hydrograph method was used as the transform method in HEC-HMS. The following relationship was developed to relate basin area to storage coefficient for each of the subbasins, with a minimum R of 0.1:

$$R = 20.84 * (Log(Area) + 1) + 0.1$$

Determination of Precipitation Extremes

The precipitation statistics from the Northeast Regional Climate Center (NRCC) were chosen as the basis for the design storm values for the hydrologic modeling in the Mystic River basin study (Wilks & Cember, 1993).

NRCC and TP- 40 Precipitation Extremes

	Rainfall in Inches	
Return Period	**24-hour**	**1-day**
10-percent-annual-chance	4.8	4.3
2-percent-annual-chance	7.1	6.3
1-percent-annual-chance	8.5	7.5
0.2-percent-annual-chance (extrapolated)	12.5	11.1

NRCC gives 1-day values, and a factor of 1.13 to convert to 24-hour

Revised Countywide Analyses

Flood discharges were estimated using the most current regression equations for rural and urban watersheds developed by the USGS for various regions of Massachusetts. Peak flows were computed for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood events. The following USGS reports were used in this study: for rural areas, Water Supply Paper 2214, "Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts, 1983" (USGS 2003); for urban areas, USGS Water Supply Paper 2207, "Flood Characteristics of Urban Watersheds in the United States, 1983" (USGS 2003).

Adjustments to the USGS regression equations to better represent conditions in the watershed. The adjustments were made to account for:

- Reduced discharge downstream of flood storage reservoirs;
- Comparison of stream gage records through 2010 and the gage records used to produce the equations; and
- Comparison of regression discharges to schematic HEC-HMS model.

The hydrologic analysis included a review and update of flood-flow frequency estimates for stream gages within the basin using the most current stream flow records available. The flood-flow frequency data was updated using the methods described in USGS "Bulletin 17B guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency." Adjustments to discharges on streams with gages were applied based on the procedures in USGS Report 2214 (USGS 2003).

$$\mathbf{Qt(u) = (Au/Ag)^{x} Qt(g)}$$

Q t (u) is the peak discharge at ungaged site for exceedance probability
Q t (g) is the gage discharge from log-Pearson type III frequency analysis
Au is the drainage area of ungaged site
Ag is the drainage area of gaged site
x is the exponent for each flood region

Estimates of Flood Discharges Using Regression Equations in Rural Basins

Estimates for flood discharges in rural drainage basins were determined using regression equations as described in USGS Water Supply Paper 2214, "Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts, 1983". The regression equation used is defined below.

$$\mathbf{Q = C\,(DA)^{b}}$$

Q is the discharge (cfs)
C is the regional coefficient
DA is the drainage area (square miles)
b is the regional exponent

	Q10	Q25	Q50	Q100	Q500
Eastern MA Region C	72.12	96.71	118.1	143.1	198.75
Eastern MA Region B	0.66	0.651	0.645	0.638	0.622

The rural regression equations do not provide an equation for the 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood event. Therefore these discharge estimates are based on a regression equation developed from gages in the eastern Massachusetts region.

Estimates of Flood Discharges Using Regression Equations in Urban Basins

Discharges were estimated for selected urban basins based on the USGS Water Supply Paper 2207, "Flood Characteristics of Urban Watersheds in the United States, 1983". The urban equations were used when the impervious area exceeded 10% of the basin area. The regression equation used is defined below.

$$Q = C(DA)^{b}\ (13\text{-}BDF)^{m} RQ^{f}$$

Q is the discharge (cfs)
C is the constant for drainage area
DA is the drainage area (square miles)
b is the exponent for drainage area
BDF is the basin development factor
m is the exponent for the development factor
RQ is the rural discharge
f is the exponent for the rural discharge

	Q10	Q25	Q50	Q100	Q500
C	9.51	8.68	8.04	7.7	7.47
b	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16
m	-0.36	-0.34	-0.32	-0.32	-0.3
f	0.79	0.8	0.81	0.82	0.82

Stream Gage Analysis

Data was reviewed from the USGS stream gages within the Concord River watershed. The gage locations are with a minimum of 10 years of records. The Concord River watershed includes four active gages and four discontinued gages with a period of record of 10-years or more. These gages range in drainage area from 1.6 square miles to 400 square miles and include records ranging from 12 to 73-years in length.

The annual peak flow record for the active gages was obtained from USGS and was used to update the flood-flow frequency data using the methods described in the USGS "Bulletin 17B Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency". The USGS PEAKFQ computer program was used to perform the flood flow frequency computations. The analysis utilized the weighted skew coefficient, except for gages (No. 1097000, No. 1098530, and No. 1099500), which utilized

station skew because these gages are affected by urbanization and by flow regulation. The regression discharges for the 1% frequency vary from 71% to 125% of the gage discharges.

Because the regression equations from the USGS Water Supply Paper 2214 were developed from gage records through 1983, a comparison was made between the 1983 gage discharges and the active gage discharges through 2010 to determine if the regression equations would over-predict or under-predict discharges due to the additional period of record. The comparison indicated that the 1% frequency discharges through 2010 increased an average of 123% above the 1983 discharges. As a result an adjustment factor was applied to the regression equation discharges.

Adjustment of Discharge Downstream of Flood Storage Reservoirs

The regression equation discharges were reduced downstream of flood storage reservoirs identified in the Middlesex and Worcester Counties FIS. The discharges were reduced based on the average reduction of outflow compared to inflow as determined by flood routing computations. Subsequent discharges downstream were added to the reservoir outflow based on the additional downstream drainage area and the regression equations. The flood routing computations were obtained from the NRCS for reservoirs located in the Assabet River watershed. Flood routing computations were prepared with this study for reservoirs located in the Sudbury River watershed. Discharges were reduced at the following reservoirs:

Assabet River Watershed

- Cold Harbor Brook Dam
- Nichols Dam
- Tyler Dam

Sudbury River Watershed

- Ashland Reservoir
- Framingham #1 Reservoir
- Framingham #2 Reservoir
- Framingham #3 Reservoir
- Hopkinton Reservoir
- Lake Cochituate Dam
- Whitehall Reservoir

HEC-HMS Model

A schematic HEC-HMS rainfall runoff model for the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers was prepared to validate and compare the discharges computed using the USGS Water Supply Paper 2214 gage transfer equations. A schematic model was used because it was possible to limit the model to include only the major, large, sub-watersheds within the Assabet, Concord, and Sudbury Rivers. A larger HEC-HMS model was not practical because it would require over 900 sub-watersheds. The schematic model is suitable for comparison and validation of the large sub-watersheds however. Because the model is schematic, discharges from the HEC-HMS model were not intended to be used directly in the hydrologic computations.

The regression equation discharges were adjusted at several locations based on a comparison to the results of the HEC-HMS model. The model was calibrated using a storm event from 2007 with discharges from the following stream gages:

- No. 01097000 Assabet River at Maynard
- No. 01099500 Concord River below Meadow Brook
- No. 01098530 Sudbury River at Saxonville

Within HEC-HMS, three major components are required to run a hydrologic analysis. These components include the Basin Model, Meteorological Model, and Control Specifications. The NRCS Curve Number method was used to calculate runoff in the basin model. The NRCS Unit Hydrograph was selected to transform runoff because the parameters required are readily available and because it is widely accepted and used by FEMA and the engineering community. The NRCS type III storm component was used to create the meteorologic model. The Control Specification was based on 5-minute time steps.

Calibration of the HEC-HMS models was performed using precipitation data and stream gage data, where available. The calibration procedure consisted of comparison of the HEC-HMS model discharges using actual precipitation from a 2007 storm event with recorded stream gage discharges from the same storm event. Systematic adjustment of the HEC-HMS parameters were made until the HEC-HMS model agreed favorably with the actual storm event discharges at the stream gages.

Discharge Comparison

The effective discharges were obtained from the “Summary of Discharges” tables located in the effective FIS report from Middlesex County. Differences between the effective discharges and the 2012 discharges are due to the different computation methods used, the date of preparation of the effective computations (approximately 1975-1985), and the additional 30 year period of record of stream gages in the watershed used for the 2012 computations.

A summary of the discharge comparison for the major rivers in the Concord Watershed follows.

The Assabet River average ratio of the 2012 discharge to the effective discharge = 1.22. The effective discharge-frequency data was obtained from USGS gage analysis with records through 1984 and modified flow hydrographs. The 2012 discharge was determined from USGS gage analysis with records through 2010 and USGS Urban Regression Equations.

The Concord River average ratio of the 2012 discharge to the effective discharge = 1.00. The effective discharge-frequency data was obtained from USGS gage analysis with records through 1983. The 2012 discharge was determined from USGS gage analysis with records through 2010.

Sudbury River average ratio of the 2012 discharge to the effective discharge = 0.77. The effective discharge-frequency data was obtained using computer modeling techniques developed by the NRCS in 1972. The 2012 discharge was determined from USGS gage data through 2010 and USGS Urban Regression Equations.

The new discharges for all streams studied by detailed methods have been incorporated into Table 5 "Summary of Discharge Table" located earlier in this section.

3.2 Hydraulic Analyses

Pre-countywide 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. Information below up to and including the vertical datum is NAVD88 is common throughout all communities. Other information specific to each community is listed starting with the next page.

Locations of selected cross sections used in the hydraulic analyses are shown on the Flood Profiles. For stream segments for which a floodway was computed, selected cross-section locations are also shown on the FIRM.

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

Cross sections for the hydraulic model were developed using GIS-based automated modeling techniques from a digital terrain model of the study area. The floodplain digital terrain model developed from aerial photogrammetric topographic survey of the above water areas and boat-based bathymetric transect survey of the underwater areas.

Dimensions of the hydraulic structures were determined by field survey and/or from available plan information.

Manning's "n" values were assigned using GIS-based automated modeling techniques based on a land cover data layer developed from project planimetric and orthophoto maps. Each land cover type was assigned a representative Manning's "n" value.

10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance water-surface elevations were determined using an unsteady flow, step backwater hydraulic model, HEC-RAS version 3.1.3.

Flood profiles were drawn showing computed water-surface elevations to an accuracy of 0.5 foot for floods of the selected recurrence intervals. 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 is computed (Section 4.2), selected cross-section locations are also shown on the FIRM (Exhibit 3). All elevations in this study are referenced to NAVD88.

For the streams studied by approximate methods, the flood boundaries were determined using normal depth calculations. Field investigations and historical observations in conjunction with manual calculations were used to determine elevations for areas prone to flooding with an estimated recurrence probability of less than one percent. In many instances, flooding was determined by backwater conditions from rivers and streams that were studied using detailed methods.

Cross sections for the streams studied by detailed methods within Middlesex County involved the following techniques: aerial photographs at various scales, below water sections were obtained by field measurement, field survey, photogrammetric mapping, existing mapping supplied by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, topographic mapping, and culvert analysis.

Water surface elevations of floods of the selected recurrence intervals within Middlesex County involved the following computer programs: USACE HEC-2 step backwater computer program, NRCS water-surface profiles (WSP-2) computer program, FLOW2D computer simulation model, storage-discharge relationships, and normal bridge option.

Starting water surface elevations for the streams studied by detailed methods within Middlesex County involved the following techniques: use of the slope/area method, use of backwater computations, use of the HEC-2 program, use of normal depth analysis, use of a discharge rating curve, using the USACE report in Littleton, use of profiles of the main streams, use of various previously printed FISs for several communities within Middlesex County, developing a stage-discharge curve and then computing a backwater profile to this cross section, developing a stage-discharge relationship for the Wamesit Power Company Dam, use of critical depth, use of the NRCS TR-20 computer program, and analyzing the effects of the tide gates.

For the Middlesex County countywide FIS, revised hydraulic analyses were prepared for the following streams: Aberjona River, Aberjona River North Spur, Alewife Brook (Little River), Cummings Brook, Halls Brook, Horn Pond Brook/Fowle Brook, Little Brook, Mill Brook 3, Mystic River, Schneider Brook, Shakers Glen Brook, Sweetwater Brook, and Wellington Brook. Cross sections for the hydraulic model were developed using GIS-based automated modeling techniques from a digital terrain model of the study area. The floodplain digital terrain model developed from LiDAR survey of the water areas and boat-based bathymetric/field transect survey of the underwater areas. Dimensions of the hydraulic structures were determined by field survey and/or from available plan information.

Flood levels along the Charles River downstream of the Watertown Dam are controlled by the operation of the Charles River Dam located 6 miles downstream in the City of Boston. The DCR operates the 8,400 cfs capacity pumps at the dam so as to prevent the 1-percent-annual-chance flood from achieving 4.6 feet (beginning of damages). Stages for the 10-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood events along this reach of the Charles River are presented on the Flood Profiles.

Countywide Analyses

Cross-sections for the hydraulic model were developed using GIS-based automated modeling techniques from a digital terrain model of the study area. The floodplain digital terrain model developed from LiDAR survey of the above water areas and boat-based bathymetric/field transect survey of the underwater areas.

Dimensions of the hydraulic structures were determined by field survey and/or from available plan information.

Revised Countywide Analyses

Floodplain cross sections were placed at representative locations, approximately 500 feet apart along the stream centerline. Cross sections may be spaced at closer intervals, such as locations of sudden changes in stream geometry or direction. The cross sectional geometries were comprised of field collected survey data and the LiDAR data that was collected by Photo Science Geospatial Solutions, and USGS NED. Surveyed channel sections were obtained at the bridge and culvert faces. Additional survey was also provided on an “as-needed” basis at bridge approach sections and at long stretches of stream between structures. Surveyed channel sections were propagated upstream and downstream to non-surveyed cross sections and were blended with the LiDAR data to create a consistent channel profile.

At the downstream end of the Indian Brook redelineation the 1-percent-annual-chance water surface elevation is 300.2 feet, while the upstream end of Indian Brook (north) is at 304.26 feet. This 4 foot difference is so significant that the 1-

percent-annual-chance floodplain for the redelineation cannot be mapped with the new DEM because it is below the terrain and the new Zone A spans the entire 2,500 foot width of the floodplain. As a result, Indian Brook (redelineation) and Tributary to Indian Brook (redelineation) will be completely replaced by Zone A models and be mapped as Zone A. Indian Brook (North) will be extended to just downstream of the effective limit of detailed study at Wood Street. Indian Brook (South) will extend to the confluence of Indian Brook (North).

STARR performed surveys in Middlesex and Worcester Counties, Massachusetts, for approximately 260 bridges, culverts, and dams and 15 riverine cross sections. At each structure, STARR surveyed channel cross sections immediately upstream and downstream of the crossing along with a top-of-road profile. Sketches and five digital photos were taken at each structure. For riverine cross sections, only a sketch and two digital photographs were taken.

In addition, record plan information was available at several large structures such as DCR dams and interstate bridges. The record plans were used and documented in the hydraulic model where appropriate.

The hydraulic model used for this flood study is the USACE HEC-RAS version 4.1 (USACE 2008). HEC-RAS models were developed for the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event for the approximate studies and the 10-, 4-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent annual chance flood events for the detailed and limited detailed models.

The starting WSELs for all profiles of Beaver Brook 2, Cold Spring Brook, Concord River, Course Brook, Pratts Brook, and Sudbury River were calculated using the normal depth method.

Starting WSELs for all profiles of the Assabet River, Elizabeth Brook Reach 2, Fort Pond Brook Branch 1, and parts of Spencer Brook were developed using known water surface elevations from effective FISs, FIRMs, or tie-in cross section WSELs from HEC-RAS models, as appropriate.

The starting WSELs for all profiles of Farley Brook, Heath Hen Meadow Brook, Jenny Dugan Brook, Muddy Brook, Putnam Brook, and Stony Brook were calculated using the normal depth method.

Starting WSELs for all profiles of the Assabet River Reach 2, Beaver Brook 2, Hop Brook Reach 2, and a parts of Spencer Brook were developed using known water surface elevations from effective FISs, FIRMs, or tie-in cross section WSELs from HEC-RAS models, as appropriate.

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

During the Discovery process, STARR was provided a data submittal of the April 2009 report titled, FEMA Certification of the Saxonville Levee Project (FEMA 2009). Pertinent data included a written report of the levee freeboard analysis accompanied by a digital copy of the HEC-RAS model. All cross sections within the model were created from field run survey information. The geometry, station/elevation, and bank points were extracted from the levee project model and incorporated into the new HEC-RAS model as surveyed cross sections. In addition, the levee function in HEC-RAS was used to establish the overtopping point of the levee. No special changes were made to the hydrology for cross sections along the levee.

Split Flows

Beaver Brook 2

The Beaver Brook 2 detailed study had two split flow locations named Split 1 and Split 2. Beaver Brook 2 Split 1 occurs at the upstream end of Summer Street. During a flood event, water will back up upstream of Summer Street and continue to rise until it reaches a high point elevation, to the south, at the intersection of Summer Street and Brook Street. Once overtopped, water will travel east along Brook Street for approximately 1,200 feet before being backed up again at the intersection of Brook Street and Winter Street. Water will follow the topography of Winter Street and flow northeast approximately 200 feet where it will rejoin with Beaver Brook 2.

Beaver Brook 2 Split 2 occurs at the upstream end of a large box culvert at the intersection of Acton Road and Boston Road in Chelmsford. The culvert travels 126 feet under commercial buildings and a four lane intersection before it exits to the east. The commercial buildings at the upstream entrance act as a large headwall, and will back up water during a flood event. The water will continue to rise behind the commercial buildings until it can exit around the buildings along a side street named Cushing Place. The water will then flow downhill along Cushing Place, cross the intersection, and flow into a second side street where it will rejoin with Beaver Brook 2.

Farley Brook

During the limited detailed hydraulic modeling of Farley Brook in Chelmsford, it was determined that a 2.5 foot culvert at Sierra Drive does not have the capacity to contain floodwaters for the 10-, 4-, 2-, 1-, and 0.2-percent annual chance flood events.

During a flood event, water approaching the culvert will both flow through the culvert and overtop Sierra Drive. Water flowing through the culvert will reach the exit at the north side of Sierra Drive and continue along Farley Brook. Flow that overtops Sierra Drive will flow east and run parallel with Sierra Drive for

approximately 900 feet before running off the road into an adjacent low-lying area where it would rejoin with Farley Brook.

After completing the main channel's HEC-RAS model, the output table was used to determine the amount of flow that Sierra Drive will convey for each profile. These discharges were used in a separate HEC-RAS model with cross sections set down the roadway and into the low-lying area. The floodplains from both of the models merge together and comprise the floodplain for Farley Brook.

Sudbury River

Sudbury River Split 1 occurs at the upstream end of an old footbridge approximately 300 feet upstream of Cedar Street. More specifically, it is adjacent to the converging community boundaries of Southborough, Hopkinton, and Ashland.

During a flood event, water will back up upstream of the footbridge and continue to rise until it reaches a high point approximately 100 feet north. Once overtopped, water will continue north approximately 60 feet where it will take a sharp turn east to go through a different footbridge. Flow travels east until it passes a culvert to rejoin with the Sudbury River.

Roughness factors (Manning's "n") used in the hydraulic computations were chosen by engineering judgment and were based on field observations of the streams and floodplain areas. Roughness factors for all streams studied by detailed methods are shown in Table 10, "Manning's "n" Values."

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Aberjona River	0.035-0.150	0.014-0.300
Aberjona River North Spur	0.035-0.150	0.014-0.300
Alewife Brook (Little River)	0.035-0.150	0.014-0.300
Angelica Brook	0.030-0.035	0.050-0.060
Assabet Branch No. 3	0.030-0.060	0.030-0.130
Assabet Branch No. 4	0.030-0.060	0.030-0.130
Assabet River[1]	0.030-0.055	0.035-0.150
Baddacook Brook	0.035-0.040	0.050-0.070
Baiting Brook	0.025-0.005	0.045-0.120
Bear Meadow Brook	0.020-0.065	0.040-0.150
Beaver Brook 1	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.150
Beaver Brook 2[1]	0.060	0.035-0.100
Beaver Brook 2 Split 1[1]	0.030-0.090	0.030-0.070
Beaver Brook 2 Split 2[1]	0.030	0.030-0.050

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES - continued

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Beaver Brook 2 Split 3[1]	0.060	0.050-0.090
Beaver Brook 3	0.030-0.045	0.045-0.075
Beaver Brook 4	0.035-0.070	0.050-0.140
Beaver Brook 5	0.050-0.080	0.060-0.100
Beaver Dam Brook	0.015-0.050	0.050-0.110
Bennetts Brook	0.035	0.050
Birch Meadow Brook	0.025-0.045	0.045-0.085
Black Brook	0.030-0.035	0.055-0.085
Bogastow Brook – Jar Brook	0.055	0.160
Bogle Brook 1	0.015-0.050	0.070-0.110
Bogle Brook 2	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.240
Boons Pond and Branch	0.015-0.060	0.050-0.120
Boutwell Brook	0.030	0.050
Bow Brook	0.035	0.050-0.070
Branch of Assabet River	0.015-0.060	0.050-0.120
Branch of Elizabeth Brook 1	0.015-0.060	0.050-0.120
Broad Meadow Brook	0.015-0.035	0.045-0.080
Brook A of Shawsheen River	*	*
Brook from Waushakum Pond	0.030-0.035	0.050-0.060
Butter Brook	0.035-0.045	0.050-0.085
Catacoonamug Brook	0.035	0.050-0.070
Charles River	0.015-0.060	0.040-0.150
Cheese Cake Brook	0.030-0.035	0.010
Cherry Brook	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.240
Chester Brook	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.150
Chicken Brook	0.060	0.120
Cochituate Brook	0.030-0.035	0.050-0.060
Cold Brook	0.016-0.050	0.050-0.100
Cold Spring Brook[1]	0.035-0.050	0.050-0.100
Cole's Brook	0.045	0.035-0.090
Collins Brook	*	*
Conant Brook	0.030-0.040	0.040-0.080
Concord River[1]	0.032-0.050	0.032-0.100
Content Brook – Middlesex Canal	0.030-0.045	0.060-0.110
Course Brook[1]	0.040	0.032-0.080
Cow Pond Brook	0.035-0.040	0.050-0.070
Cranberry Brook	0.040	0.100
Cummings Brook	0.035-0.060	0.014-0.300
Dakins Brook	0.030-0.040	0.080
Danforth Brook	0.030-0.060	0.030-0.130
Darby Brook	0.015-0.045	0.060-0.070
Davis Brook	0.015-0.050	0.070-0.110

*Data not available

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES - continued

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Dirty Meadow Brook	0.060	0.160
Dopping Brook	0.045-0.060	0.050-0.160
Dudley Brook – Tributary to Dudley Brook	0.016-0.045	0.050-0.090
East Outlet	0.030-0.055	0.050-0.095
Elizabeth Brook 1[1]	0.015-0.060	0.050-0.120
Elizabeth Brook 2[1]	0.040-0.055	0.040-0.120
Elm Brook	0.015-0.050	0.020-0.180
Farley Brook[1]	0.050	0.035-0.090
Farley Brook Split 1[1]	0.035-0.050	0.035-0.090
Farrar Pond Brook	0.045-0.075	0.050
Fort Meadow Brook	0.030-0.060	0.030-0.130
Fort Pond Brook	0.012-0.070	0.015-0.140
Fort Pond Brook Branch 1[1]	0.050	0.045-0.090
Fort Pond Brook Branch 2	0.035-0.070	0.050-0.140
Grassy Pond Brook	0.015-0.050	0.015-0.085
Graves Pond Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Great Road Tributary	0.035	0.080
Greens Brook	0.040	0.085-0.180
Guggins Brook	0.015-0.070	0.015-0.140
Gumpas Pond Brook	0.035	0.070
Hales Brook	0.035-0.055	0.080-0.100
Halls Brook	0.035-0.100	0.014-0.300
Hayward Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Heath Brook	*	*
Heath Hen Meadow Brook[1]	0.033	0.050-0.090
Heath Hen Meadow Brook Split 1[1]	0.033-0.050	0.050-0.090
Hobbs Brook 1	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.240
Hobbs Brook 2	0.045-0.075	0.045-0.075
Hog Brook	0.030-0.060	0.030-0.130
Hop Brook	0.015-0.035	0.045-0.080
Horn Pond Brook / Fowle Brook	0.030-0.100	0.014-0.300
Inch Brook	0.025-0.045	0.025-0.085
Indian Brook	0.035-0.050	0.050-0.100
Ipswich River	0.020-0.065	0.040-0.150
James Brook	0.035-0.040	0.050-0.070
Jar Brook	0.055	0.120
Jenny Dugan Brook[1]	0.033-0.050	0.050-0.090
Jones Brook	0.030-0.040	0.110
Kiln Brook	0.050-0.080	0.060-0.100
King Street Tributary	0.035-0.042	0.070-0.100
Landham-Allowance Brook	0.016-0.035	0.050-0.070
Lawrence Brook	0.030	0.060-0.075

*Data not available

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES - continued

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Little Brook	0.035-0.10	0.014-0.30
Locke Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Lower Spot Pond Brook	0.020-0.024	0.044
Lubbers Brook	0.030-0.055	0.075-0.120
Malden River	0.020-0.050	0.020-0.050
Maple Meadow Brook	0.035-0.055	0.065-0.088
Marginal Brook	0.035-0.045	0.045-0.085
Marshall Brook	0.014-0.045	0.060-0.070
Martins Brook	0.040-0.102	0.060-0.090
Martins Pond Brook	0.035-0.040	0.050-0.070
Mascuppic Brook	0.030	0.070
Mason Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Meadow Brook	0.024-0.045	0.060-0.070
Meadow River Branch	0.015-0.050	0.100
Merrimack River	0.020-0.055	0.040-0.200
Mill Brook 1	0.035	0.050-0.075
Mill Brook 2	0.030-0.040	0.030-0.080
Mill Brook 3	0.035-0.150	0.014-0.300
Mill Pond Tributary	0.020-0.035	0.080
Mill River	0.045-0.100	0.110
Mineway Brook	0.030-0.045	0.070-0.100
Mongo Brook	0.040-0.050	0.120-0.160
Morse Brook	0.035	0.050-0.070
Mowry Brook	0.015-0.035	0.045-0.080
Mud Pond Brook	*	*
Muddy Brook[1]	0.050	0.050-0.090
Mulpus Brook	0.035	0.050-0.070
Munroe Brook	0.050-0.080	0.060-0.100
Mystic River	0.035	0.014-0.300
Nagog Brook	0.045	0.070
Nashoba Brook	0.015-0.045	0.040-0.120
Nashua River	0.030	0.060-0.070
Nissitissit River	0.040	0.060-0.090
Nonacoicus Brook 1	0.035	0.050
Nonacoicus Brook 2	0.035	0.050
North Lexington Brook	0.050-0.080	0.060-0.100
Pages Brook	0.013-0.050	0.100
Pages Brook Branch	0.024-0.050	0.100
Pantry Brook	0.016-0.040	0.050-0.100
Pearl Hill Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Peppermint Brook	0.035	0.070
Pine Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075

*Data not available

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES - continued

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Pole Brook	0.020-0.060	0.090-1.100
Reedy Meadow Brook	0.035-0.050	0.050-0.070
Pratts Brook[1]	0.050	0.035-0.090
Putnam Brook[1]	0.055	0.050-0.090
Reservoir No. 1-North Branch	0.030-0.035	0.050-0.060
Reservoir No. 3	0.030-0.035	0.050-0.060
Richardson Brook	0.035-0.045	0.045-0.080
River Meadow Brook	0.030-0.060	0.020-0.100
Run Brook	0.016-0.045	0.050-0.100
Salmon Brook	0.030-0.035	0.100
Sandy Brook	0.035-0.045	0.050-0.100
Saugus River	0.045-0.100	0.110
Saunders Brook	*	*
Sawmill Brook 1	0.038-0.040	0.080-0.090
Sawmill Brook 2	0.030-0.040	0.080
Schneider Brook	0.035-0.15	0.014-0.300
Shakers Glen Brook	0.035	0.014-0.300
Shawsheen River	0.012-0.050	0.020-0.150
Skug River	0.040-0.098	0.075
Snake Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
South Meadow Brook/Paul Brook	0.020-0.035	0.070-0.080
Spencer Brook[1]	0.032-0.050	0.032-0.090
Spring Brook	0.024-0.045	0.030-0.160
Squannacook River	0.035-0.040	0.060-0.080
Stony Brook[1]	0.033-0.050	0.032-0.090
Strong Water Brook	0.014-0.045	0.040-0.090
Sudbury River[1]	0.032-0.090	0.032-0.100
Sudbury River Split 1[1]	0.050	0.040-0.090
Sutton Brook	*	*
Sweetwater Brook	0.035	0.014-0.300
Tadmuck Brook	0.030	0.055-0.070
Tadmuck Swamp Brook	0.030	0.070
Taylor Brook	0.035-0.050	0.015-0.120
Town Line Brook	0.020	0.035
Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook	0.015-0.040	0.040-0.120
Tributary 1 to Sudbury River	0.030-0.040	0.080
Tributary 2 to Assabet River	0.015-0.040	0.040-0.060
Tributary 2 to Tributary 1 to Cole's Brook	0.015-0.040	0.040-0.120
Tributary 3 to Bogle Brook 2	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.240
Tributary 4 to Bogle Brook 2	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.240
Tributary A to Cold Brook	0.030-0.045	0.070-0.140
Tributary A to Course Brook[1]	0.040	0.040-0.090

*Data not available

[1]Updated values for the revised countywide study

TABLE 10 - MANNING'S "n" VALUES – continued

Stream	Channel "n"	Overbank "n"
Tributary A to Hop Brook	0.040	0.060-0.120
Tributary A to Pantry Brook	0.030-0.040	0.090-0.110
Tributary A to Squannacook River	0.035	0.050-0.070
Tributary B to Hop Brook	0.035-0.040	0.120
Tributary B to Squannacook River	0.035	0.050-0.075
Tributary B to Vine Brook	0.040-0.045	0.040-0.090
Tributary C to Vine Brook	0.040	0.070-0.120
Tributary to Beaver Brook 3	0.040-0.050	0.075-0.095
Tributary to Cold Spring Brook	0.035-0.045	0.050-0.085
Tributary to Indian Brook	0.035-0.050	0.050-0.100
Tributary to Martins Brook	0.045-0.065	0.060-0.090
Tributary to Mill Brook	0.030-0.065	0.030-0.150
Tributary to Nonacoicus Brook 1/Long Pond Brook	0.035	0.050
Tributary to Waushakum Pond	0.035-0.045	0.050-0.085
Trout Brook	0.040	0.100
Trout Brook 1	0.035-0.050	0.070-0.090 \
Trout Brook 2	0.035	0.050-0.070
Trull Brook	0.030-0.060	0.050-0.080
Trull Brook Tributary	0.030-0.050	0.050-0.100
Unkety Brook	0.035-0.040	0.050-0.070
Varnum Brook	0.030	0.045-0.160
Vine Brook	0.020-0.080	0.020-0.100
Walker Brook 1	0.035	0.050-0.070
Walker Brook 2	0.035	0.050-0.070
Walker Brook 3	0.015-0.035	0.045-0.080
Walkers Brook	0.020-0.065	0.040-0.150
Wellington Brook	0.035-0.150	0.014-0.300
West Chester Brook	0.015-0.040	0.030-0.150
Whitehall Brook	0.035-0.050	0.050-0.100
Willard Brook	0.035	0.050-0.075
Winthrop Canal	0.040	0.070-0.100
Witch Brook	0.035	0.050-0.070

All qualifying bench marks within a given jurisdiction that are cataloged by the National Geodetic Survey (NGS) and entered into the National Spatial Reference System (NSRS) as First or Second Order Vertical and have a vertical stability classification of A, B, or C are shown and labeled on the FIRM with their 6-character NSRS Permanent Identifier.

Bench marks cataloged by the NGS and entered into the NSRS vary widely in vertical stability classification. NSRS vertical stability classifications are as follows:

- Stability A: Monuments of the most reliable nature, expected to hold position/elevation well (e.g., mounted in bedrock)

- Stability B: Monuments which generally hold their position/elevation well (e.g., concrete bridge abutment)

- Stability C: Monuments which may be affected by surface ground movements (e.g., concrete monument below frost line)

- Stability D: Mark of questionable or unknown vertical stability (e.g., concrete monument above frost line, or steel witness post)

In addition to NSRS bench marks, the FIRM may also show vertical control monuments established by a local jurisdiction; these monuments will be shown on the FIRM with the appropriate designations. Local monuments will only be placed on the FIRM if the community has requested that they be included, and if the monuments meet the aforementioned NSRS inclusion criteria.

To obtain current elevation, description, and/or location information for bench marks shown on the FIRM for this jurisdiction, please contact the Information Services Branch of the NGS at (301) 713-3242, or visit their Web site at www.ngs.noaa.gov.

It is important to note that temporary vertical monuments are often established during the preparation of a flood hazard analysis for the purpose of establishing local vertical control. Although these monuments are not shown on the FIRM, they may be found in the Technical Support Data Notebook associated with this FIS and FIRM. Interested individuals may contact FEMA to access this data.

3.3 Vertical Datum

All FISs 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 in use for newly created or revised FISs and FIRMs was National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD29). With the finalization of the NAVD88, many FIS reports and FIRMs are being prepared using NAVD88 as the referenced vertical datum.

All flood elevations shown in this FIS report and on the FIRM are referenced to NAVD88. Structure and ground elevations in the community must, therefore, be referenced to NAVD88. It is important to note that adjacent communities may be referenced to NGVD29. This may result in differences in base flood elevations across the corporate limits between the communities.

Prior versions of the FIS report and FIRM were referenced to NGVD29. When a datum conversion is effected for an FIS report and FIRM, the Flood Profiles, base flood elevations (BFEs) and ERMs reflect the new datum values. To compare structure and ground elevations to 1-percent-annual-chance flood elevations

shown in the FIS and on the FIRM, the subject structure and ground elevations must be referenced to the new datum values.

As noted above, the elevations shown in the FIS report and on the FIRM for Middlesex County are referenced to NAVD88. Ground, structure, and flood elevations may be compared and/or referenced to NGVD29 by applying a standard conversion factor. The conversion factor to NGVD29 is +0.8 foot. The BFEs shown on the FIRM represent whole-foot rounded values. For example, a BFE of 102.4 will appear as 102 on the FIRM and 102.6 will appear as 103. Therefore, users that wish to convert the elevations in this FIS to NGVD29 should apply the stated conversion factor(s) to elevations shown on the Flood Profiles and supporting data tables in the FIS report, which are shown at a minimum to the nearest 0.1 foot.

NAVD88 = NGVD29 + conversion factor

For additional information regarding conversion between the NGVD29 and NAVD88, visit the National Geodetic Survey website at http://www.ngs.noaa.gov, or contact the National Geodetic Survey at the following address:

NGS Information Services
NOAA, N/NGS12
National Geodetic Survey, SSMC-3, #9202
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3282
(301) 713-3242

4.0 FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT APPLICATIONS

The National Flood Insurance Program encourages commonwealth and local governments to adopt sound floodplain management programs. Therefore, each FIS includes a flood boundary map designed to assist communities in developing sound floodplain management measures.

4.1 Floodplain Boundaries

In order to provide a national standard without regional discrimination, the 1-percent-annual-chance flood has been adopted by the FIA as the base flood for purposes of floodplain management measures. The 0.2-percent-annual-chance flood is employed to indicate additional areas of flood risk in the community. For each stream studied in detail, the boundaries of the 1- and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floods have been delineated using the flood elevations determined at each cross section; between cross sections, the boundaries were interpolated using topographic maps at a scale of 1:2,400 and a scale of 1:24,000 with contour intervals of 4 and 10 feet, respectively. In cases where the 1- and 0.2-percent annual-chance-flood boundaries are close together, only the 1-percent-annual-chance boundary has been shown.

For the countywide FIS, streams studied by approximate methods, the boundary of the 1-percent-annual-chance flood was delineated using the Flood Hazard Boundary Map for the municipalities of Middlesex County.

Small areas within the flood boundaries may lie above the flood elevations and, therefore, may not be subject to flooding. Owing to limitations of the map scale and lack of detailed topographic data, such areas are not shown.

For these streams, the following data bulleted below was used: Aberjona River, Aberjona River North Spur, Alewife Brook (Little River), Cummings Brook, Halls Brook, Horn Pond Brook/Fowle Brook, Little Brook, Mill Brook 3, Mystic River, Schneider Brook, Shakers Glen Brook, Sweetwater Brook, and Wellington Brook.

- 7.5-Minute USGS Digital Quadrangles for the study area.
  1:24,000 scale
  10-foot topographic contour interval

- MassGIS 2005 (April 2005) Color Digital Orthophotos for the study area.
  1:5,000 scale
  0.5 meter per pixel

- MassGIS 2002 LIDAR topography for the study area.
  1:5,000 scale
  Suitable for 2-foot contour generation

- Town of Winchester basemap for Winchester only.
  1:5,000 scale; 2-foot topographic contour interval

Floodplain boundaries were delineated on the project digital terrain (DTM) model using GIS-based automated techniques.

Each stream studied by detailed methods in this countywide revision, the 1- and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain boundaries have been delineated using Triangulated Irregular Network (TINs) developed from 2010 LiDAR data provided by Photo Science Geospatial Solutions. TINs provide the terrain and topography that HEC-GeoRAS reads and attaches to cross-section cut lines. HEC-GeoRAS was used to link the GIS data to a HEC-RAS model and to delineate the floodplain once water surface elevations are calculated in the HEC-RAS model. Floodplains were then cleaned and made to appropriately tie-in to adjacent studies, both detailed and approximate, including those in adjacent counties. A Floodplain Boundary Standard (FBS) check was run to ensure compliance.

For the streams studied by redelineation, 2010 LiDAR data was used. The LiDAR provided more updated topographic information that is more accurate and higher resolution than the topographic information reflected in the hydraulic analyses used previously.

For the streams studied by approximate methods, only the 1-percent-annual-chance floodplain boundary is shown on the FIRM. The boundary of the 1-

percent-annual-chance floodplain was delineated using the same method as above using USGS 1/3 arc second NED. This data is referenced to NAVD88.

4.2 Floodways

The project HEC-RAS unsteady flow model was used to compute a regulatory floodway for the one percent-annual-chance event.

The initial encroachment analysis was performed using the steady flow option in HEC-RAS. A steady flow file model was developed using the peak flows predicted in the 1-percent-annual-chance unsteady flow model. The steady flow encroachment analysis used the equal conveyance reduction and Method 5, where the model optimizes the encroachments to match a target water surface rise, in this case 1.0 foot. The results produced a reasonable approximation of potential floodway encroachments. The steady flow encroachment stations were applied to the unsteady flow model. The model results from the unsteady flow model run with the steady flow encroachments predicted that the observed water surface at many cross sections would be greater than 1.0 foot.

A method was developed to determine encroachment stations that could be applied fairly to all rivers and reaches within the unsteady flow model and result in a maximum water surface rise at any cross section of 1.0 foot. All reaches within the model were divided into subreaches defined both upstream and downstream by hydraulic structures. The average top width of the right and left overbank flow areas, determined from the results of the 1-percent-annual-chance model, were assigned to all cross sections within each subreach.

The model encroachment stations were calculated by encroaching on the left and right overbank by a percentage of the average overbank top width for each subreach. The same encroachment percentage was applied to all sub-reaches. An encroachment of one percent resulted in a maximum water-surface rise of 1.0 foot at several locations within the study area. Many reaches are far below the target 1.0-foot increase, but if the encroachments are increased uniformly across the watershed, the predicted water surface will increase to greater than 1.0 foot in the downstream sections of the model domain.

The following detailed study streams in Middlesex County did not have a floodway calculated: the Charles River, Cranberry Brook, Dakins Brook, Farley Brook, Gumpas Heath Hen Brook, Jenny Dugan Brook, Pond Brook, Lower Spot Pond Brook, the Malden River, Mineway Brook, Muddy Brook, Pratts Brook, Putnam Brook, Reservoir No. 1 – North Branch and Reservoir No. 3, Stony Brook, Tributary A to Cold Brook, Tributary A to Dudley Brook, Tributary A to Hop Brook, Tributary A to Pantry Brook, Tributary B to Hop Brook, Trout Brook, and Valley Pond. Portions of the following detailed study streams in Middlesex County did not have a floodway calculated: Beaver Brook 1, Chester Brook, Hales Brook, Martins Brook, Pantry Brook, and Stony Brook 2. In addition, portions of the Sudbury River in Middlesex County did not have a floodway shown due to the pooling effects from Reservoir No. 2 Dam and Weir Dam.

A floodway has been calculated for all of the streams included in the hydrodynamic model of the Concord and Mystic Watersheds.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts requires no rise in flood elevations for projects in the floodplain.

The floodways presented in this FIS were computed for certain stream segments on the basis of equal conveyance reduction from each side of the floodplain.

Floodway widths were computed at cross sections. Between cross sections, the floodway boundaries were interpolated. The results of the floodway computations are tabulated for selected cross sections (Table 8, located in Volume 2). The computed floodways are shown on the FIRM (Exhibit 2). In cases where the floodway and 1-percent-annual-chance floodplain boundaries are either close together or collinear, only the floodway boundary is shown.

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 12, "Floodway Data" (located in Volume 2). In order 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 of the 1-percent-annual-chance flood by more than 1.0 foot at any point. Typical relationships between the floodway and the floodway fringe and their significance to floodplain development are shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1 **- FLOODWAY SCHEMATIC**

5.0 INSURANCE APPLICATIONS

For flood insurance rating purposes, flood insurance zone designations are assigned to a community based on the results of the engineering analyses. The zones are as follows:

Zone A

Zone A is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to the 1-percent-annual-chance floodplains that are determined in the FIS by approximate methods. Because detailed hydraulic analyses are not performed for such areas, no base flood elevations or depths are shown within this zone.

Zone AE

Zone AE is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to the 1-percent-annual-chance floodplains that are determined in the FIS by detailed methods. In most instances, whole-foot base flood elevations derived from the detailed hydraulic analyses are shown at selected intervals within this zone.

Zone AH

Zone AH is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to the areas of 1-percent-annual-chance shallow flooding (usually areas of ponding) where average depths are between 1 and 3 feet. Whole-foot base flood elevations derived from the detailed hydraulic analyses are shown at selected intervals within this zone.

Zone D

Zone D is the flood insurance risk zone that corresponds to unstudied areas where flood hazards are undetermined, but possible.

Zone X

Zone X is the flood insurance rate zone that corresponds to areas outside the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, areas within the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, and to areas of 1-percent-annual-chance flooding where average depths are less than 1 foot, areas of 1-percent-annual-chance flooding where the contributing drainage area is less than 1 square mile, and areas protected from the 1-percent-annual-chance flood by levees. No base flood elevations or depths are shown within this zone.

6.0 FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

The FIRM is designed for flood insurance and floodplain management applications.

For flood insurance applications, the map designates flood insurance rate zones as described in Section 5.0 and, in the 1-percent-annual-chance floodplains that were studied

by detailed methods, shows selected whole-foot base flood elevations or average depths. Insurance agents use the zones and base flood elevations in conjunction with information on structures and their contents to assign premium rates for flood insurance policies.

For floodplain management applications, the map shows by tints, screens, and symbols, the 1- and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplains. Floodways and the locations of selected cross sections used in the hydraulic analyses and floodway computations are shown where applicable.

The current FIRM presents flooding information for the entire geographic area of Middlesex County. Previously, separate FIRMs were prepared for each identified floodprone incorporated community and the unincorporated areas of the county. This countywide FIRM also includes flood hazard information that was presented separately on FBFMs, where applicable. Historical data relating to the maps prepared for each community, are presented in Table 11, "Community Map History."

COMMUNITY NAME	INITIAL IDENTIFICATION	FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY MAP REVISIONS DATE	FIRM EFFECTIVE DATE	FIRM REVISIONS DATE
Acton, Town of	July 26, 1974	None	June 15, 1978	January 6, 1988
Arlington, Town of	June 28, 1974	January 14, 1977	July 5, 1982	
Ashby, Town of	April 29, 1977	None	August 1, 1996	
Ashland, Town of	February 8, 1974	August 6, 1976	July 16, 1981	
Ayer, Town of	March 22, 1974	September 3, 1976	July 19, 1982	March 18, 1991
Bedford, Town of	September 7, 1973	None	September 7, 1973	July 1, 1974 February 26, 1976 June 15, 1983 July 4, 1988
Belmont, Town of	July 26, 1974	December 10, 1976	June 15, 1982	
Billerica, Town of	September 20, 1974	September 17, 1976	November 5, 1980	August 5, 1985
Boxborough, Town of	September 20, 1974	December 17, 1976	September 15, 1978	September 8, 1999
Burlington, Town of	August 9, 1977	None	July 5, 1984	
Cambridge, City of	June 21, 1974	November 19, 1976	July 5, 1982	
Carlisle, Town of	August 16, 1974	December 10, 1976	October 15, 1980	May 17, 1988
Chelmsford, Town of	October 25, 1974	October 8, 1976	June 4, 1980	January 16, 2004

TABLE 11

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MA (ALL JURISDICTIONS)

COMMUNITY MAP HISTORY

COMMUNITY NAME	INITIAL IDENTIFICATION	FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY MAP REVISIONS DATE	FIRM EFFECTIVE DATE	FIRM REVISIONS DATE
Concord, Town of	September 6, 1974	None	June 15, 1979	June 3, 1988
Dracut, Town of	August 9, 1974	June 25, 1976	July 2, 1980	June 5, 1989
Dunstable, Town of	November 29, 1974	July 16, 1976	July 5, 1982	
Everett, City of	June 7, 1974	July 30, 1976	June 3, 1986	
Framingham, Town of	August 2, 1974	December 13, 1977	February 3, 1982	March 15, 1984 November 19, 1986 March 16, 1992
Groton, Town of	September 6, 1974	November 12, 1977	July 5, 1982	
Holliston, Town of	August 2, 1974	November 5, 1976	September 30, 1980	September 10, 1982
Hopkinton, Town of	July 19, 1974	October 8, 1976	July 5, 1982	
Hudson, Town of	July 26, 1974	November 12, 1976	December 15, 1979	
Lexington, Town of	June 28, 1974	December 10, 1976	June 1, 1978	September 30, 1983
Lincoln, Town of	December 13, 1974	October 15, 1976	June 1, 1978	June 17, 1986
Littleton, Town of	July 19, 1974	August 20, 1976	June 15, 1983	

TABLE 11

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MA
(ALL JURISDICTIONS)

COMMUNITY MAP HISTORY

COMMUNITY NAME	INITIAL IDENTIFICATION	FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY MAP REVISIONS DATE	FIRM EFFECTIVE DATE	FIRM REVISIONS DATE
Lowell, City of	May 31, 1974	None	April 16, 1979	February 15, 1984 May 15, 1991 September 30, 1992
Malden, City of	July 26, 1974	May 24, 1977	May 19, 1987	August 20, 2002
Marlborough, City of	July 26, 1974	November 15, 1977	January 6, 1982	
Maynard, Town of	July 26, 1974	December 10, 1976	June 15, 1979	
Medford, City of	July 26, 1974	September 24, 1976	June 3, 1986	
Melrose, City of	June 28, 1974	June 18, 1976	August 5, 1986	
Natick, Town of	July 26, 1974	April 9, 1976	February 1, 1980	
Newton, City of	June 28, 1974	None	June 1, 1978	November 2, 1983 July 17, 1986 June 4, 1990
North Reading, Town of	August 30, 1974	None	April 3, 1978	January 6, 1983 April 3, 1989 March 5, 1996 June 16, 2004
Pepperell, Town of	August 2, 1974	August 13, 1976	July 2, 1981	June 2, 1993
Reading, Town of	June 21, 1977	None	July 2, 1981	

TABLE 11

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MA
(ALL JURISDICTIONS)

COMMUNITY MAP HISTORY

COMMUNITY NAME	INITIAL IDENTIFICATION	FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY MAP REVISIONS DATE	FIRM EFFECTIVE DATE	FIRM REVISIONS DATE
Sherborn, Town of	May 27, 1977	None	June 18, 1980	
Shirley, Town of	June 28, 1974	November 19, 1976	July 5, 1983	
Somerville, City of	July 26, 1974	November 27, 1976	July 17, 1986	
Stoneham, Town of	August 2, 1974	December 13, 1977	July 3, 1986	
Stow, Town of	October 18, 1974	December 6, 1977	August 1, 1979	
Sudbury, Town of	August 23, 1974	December 10, 1976	June 1, 1982	November 20, 1998
Tewksbury, Town of	December 10, 1971	August 2, 1974	July 18, 1977	July 2, 1981
Townsend, Town of	September 20, 1974	August 13, 1976	August 2, 1982	
Tyngsborough, Town of	August 2, 1974	November 26, 1976	September 2, 1982	
Wakefield, Town of	August 2, 1974	None	October 17, 1978	September 2, 1988
Waltham, City of	June 28, 1974	April 15, 1977	December 18, 1979	December 19, 1979 July 5, 1984
Watertown, Town of	June 28, 1974	December 3, 1976	September 30, 1980	
Wayland, Town of	July 26, 1974	December 24, 1976	June 1, 1982	February 19, 1986
Westford, Town of	October 18, 1974	August 6, 1976	June 15, 1983	

TABLE 11

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MA (ALL JURISDICTIONS)

COMMUNITY MAP HISTORY

COMMUNITY NAME	INITIAL IDENTIFICATION	FLOOD HAZARD BOUNDARY MAP REVISIONS DATE	FIRM EFFECTIVE DATE	FIRM REVISIONS DATE
Weston, Town of	July 26, 1974	October 1, 1976	July 2, 1980	
Wilmington, Town of	March 1, 1974	July 2, 1976	June 15, 1982	January 18, 1989 June 2, 1999
Winchester, Town of	July 19, 1974	November 19, 1976	June 18, 1980	
Woburn, City of	August 2, 1974	June 28, 1977	July 2, 1980	

TABLE 11

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MA (ALL JURISDICTIONS)

COMMUNITY MAP HISTORY

7.0 OTHER STUDIES

FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the following towns in Essex County, Massachusetts: Saugus (FEMA, 1983), Lynnfield (FEMA, 1990), Middleton (FEMA, 1980), North Andover (FEMA, 1993), Andover (FEMA, 1989) and Methuen (FEMA, 1987).

FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the following towns in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire: New Ipswich (FEMA, 1991), Hollis (FEMA, 1979), Hudson (FEMA, 1979) and Pelham (FEMA, 1980). FISs have been prepared for the City of Nashua (FEMA, 1978) in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. FIRMs have been prepared for the following towns in Hillsborough County, New Hampshire: Mason (FEMA, 1981) and Brookline (FEMA, 1987).

FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the following towns in Worcester County, Massachusetts: Ashburnham (FEMA, 1984), Westminster (FEMA, 1982), Lunenburg (FEMA, 1983), Lancaster (FEMA, 1982), Harvard (FEMA, 1983), Bolton (FEMA, 1980), Berlin (FEMA, 1980), Northborough (FEMA, 1979), Southborough (FEMA, 1981), Milford (FEMA, 1984), Upton (FEMA, 1982) and Westborough (FEMA, 1979). FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the City of Fitchburg (FEMA, 1991) in Worcester County, Massachusetts.

FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the following towns in Norfolk County, Massachusetts: Medway (FEMA, 1980), Millis (FEMA, 1985), Medfield (FEMA, 1979), Dover (FEMA, 1987), Wellesley (FEMA, 1987), and Needham (FEMA, 1989). FIRMs have been prepared for the Town of Brookline in Norfolk County, New Hampshire.

FISs and FIRMs have been prepared for the following cities in Suffolk County, Massachusetts: Chelsea (FEMA, 1982) and Boston (FEMA, 1982). FISs have been prepared for the City of Revere (FEMA, 1984) in Suffolk County, Massachusetts.

Revised countywide FIS report for the adjacent Massachusetts County of Worcester has been completed.

Information pertaining to revised and unrevised flood hazards for each jurisdiction within Middlesex County has been compiled into this FIS. Therefore, this FIS supersedes all previously printed FIS Reports, FHBMs, FBFMs, and FIRMs for all jurisdictions within Middlesex County.

8.0 LOCATION OF DATA

Information concerning the pertinent data used in the preparation of this FIS can be obtained by contacting FEMA, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Division, 99 High Street, 6th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

9.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Acton Survey and Engineering, Inc. (1968-1975). Topographic Plans, Acton, Massachusetts.

American Air Surveys, Inc. Aerial Photography. (December 1968). Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

American Society of Civil Engineers. (June 1979). Corps Takes New Approach to Flood Control. New York.

Avis Airmap, Inc., of Braintree, Massachusetts. (Carlisle, Massachusetts, December 1980). Topographic Maps compiled from aerial photographs, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Avis Air Map, Inc. (Natick, Massachusetts, December 1977). Aerial Photography and Topographic Mapping, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Berger Associates of Columbus, Ohio. (Newton, Massachusetts, December 1977). Topographic Maps compiled by aerial photographs, Scale 1:1,000, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Billerica Minute-Man. (January 31, February 1 and 8, 1979). Various Articles. Billerica, Massachusetts.

Boston Globe. (January 28 and 29, 1979). Various Articles. Boston, Massachusetts.

Boston Herald-American. (January 26, 1979). Boston, Massachusetts.

Boston Herald-American. (January 25, 1979). "January Set a New Record." Boston, Massachusetts.

Boxborough Conservation Commission. (July 24, 1974). Guidelines for Applications under Chapter 131, Section 40.

Brater, Ernest F., and Horace William King. (1976). Handbook of Hydraulics, Sixth Edition. McGraw-Hill. New York.

Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc. (undated). Town of Dracut, Massachusetts, Sewerage Works Improvements, Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc. (March 1983). FLOW2D User's Manual. Boston, Massachusetts.

Camp, Dresser & McKee, Inc. (March 1980). MITCAT User's Manual. Boston, Massachusetts.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (Waltham, Massachusetts, October 1977). Photogrammetric Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (Belmont, Massachusetts, April 1977). Aerial Photogrammetric Maps, Scale 1"=200', Contour Interval 5 feet.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (Town of Sherborn, Massachusetts, April 1977). Aerial Photogrammetry, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (1976). A Study of the Upper Sudbury River Watershed. Waltham, Massachusetts.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (1974). Mill Brook Hydrological Flood Plain Study.

C. E. Maguire, Inc. (1961). Analog Computer Study.

Chow, Ven Te, ed. (1964). Handbook of Applied Hydrology. McGraw-Hill. New York.

Chow, Ven Te. (1959). Open-Channel Hydraulics. McGraw-Hill. New York.

C. J. Thomas, Director of Planning and Development of the City of Newton. (May 3, 1978). Personal Communication to T. D. Mann, Mayor, Alderman, and Planning and Development Board.

City of Lowell. (undated). Topographic and Sounding Information Prepared for Sewer Interceptors, Scale 1"=40', Contour Interval 1 foot.

City of Newton. (as amended through May 2, 1977). Zoning Ordinances. Massachusetts.

City of Woburn. (January 1977). 1970 Zoning Ordinance.

City of Woburn. (January 1977). Road System, Scale 1:12,000.

City of Woburn. (January 1977). Wetlands, Scale 1:12,000.

City of Woburn. (January 1977). Zoning, Scale 1:12,000.

City of Woburn. (City of Woburn, Massachusetts, 1965). Topographic Map, Lockwood, Kessler, and Bartlett, Incorporated, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Col-East, Inc., of North Adams, Massachusetts. (Burlington, Massachusetts, flown in March 1976). Aerial Photography, Scale 1"=666'.

Col-East, Inc., of North Adams, Massachusetts. (Burlington, Massachusetts, March 1976). Topographic Maps compiled from Aerial Photographs, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Col-East Photogrammetric Engineers, Inc., P.O. Box 347, North Adams, Massachusetts. (1974). Town of Watertown: Base Maps, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Col-East, Inc. (North Adams and Norwood, April 1973). Topographic Maps, Tewksbury, Massachusetts, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. 100 Nashua Street. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Commerce and Development. Massachusetts Profile of Ayer. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Commerce and Development. Massachusetts Profile of Framingham. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Commerce and Development. Massachusetts Profile of Groton. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Metropolitan District Commission. (1979, Amended). A Study of the Upper Sudbury River Watershed. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Natural Resources. (Nashua River, 1973, Additional Contours 1976). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Commerce and Development. (1975). Massachusetts Profile for Ashland. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Commerce and Development. (1975). Massachusetts Profile of Hopkinton. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (April 1973). Route 128, Stoneham, Reading, Wakefield, and Lynnfield, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Natural Resources. (Town of Dunstable, Massachusetts, 1973, Revised 1976). Topographic Mapping, Nashua River, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (Arlington-Brighton, Massachusetts, 1972; Townsend, Massachusetts, 1965). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (November 12, 1967). Topographic Maps, Route 26, Burlington to Middleton, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (December 11, 1966). Topographic Maps for the Relocation of Route 62, Concord to Wilmington, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts. (Boston, Massachusetts, 1965, amended by Chapter 65 of the Acts of 1978). General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Chapter 131, Section 40.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (Boston, Massachusetts, 1958; Town of Wayland, Massachusetts, 1958). Topographic Mapping File 158A, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (1957). Topographic Mapping File 128A and 156A, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Works. (1957 and 1973). Topographic Mapping File 180A and 307, Scale 1:1,200 reduced to 1:2,400, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts. (1955). House Document No. 3255, "Report of the Department of Public Works to Study Drainage Conditions in the Area of the Saugus River and its Tributaries in Wakefield, Reading, Lynnfield, and Saugus."

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Geodetic Survey. (1939). High-Water Data Floods of March 1936 and September 1938. Boston, Massachusetts.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Metropolitan District Commission. Metropolitan Water Works Sudbury Sections, Yield of Sudbury River Watershed. Boston, Massachusetts.

Dunphy, John E., Jr. (West Acton, Massachusetts, February 1965). Boxborough Water Resources Map, Scale 1:6,000.

Emmons, Fleming & Bienvenu, Inc. (April 14, 1976). Topographic Maps of Chelmsford, Massachusetts, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Fay, Spofford and Thorndike, Inc. (July 1975). Preliminary Hydrology Study in the Alewife Corridor or Cambridge, Arlington, and Belmont, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (February 2002). Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, City of Boston, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Berlin, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Southborough, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (September 18, 1991). Flood Insurance Study, City of Fitchburg, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (May 19, 1987). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Brookline, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (July 17, 1986). Flood Insurance Study, City of Somerville, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (July 3, 1986). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Stoneham, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (June 3, 1986). Flood Insurance Study, City of Everett, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (June 3, 1986). Flood Insurance Study, City of Medford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (October 16, 1984). Flood Insurance Study, City of Revere, Suffolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (January 5, 1984). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Milford, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (December 15, 1983). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Ashburnham, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (October 1, 1983). Flood Insurance Study, City of Boston, Suffolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (June 15, 1983). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Bedford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (June 15, 1983). Flood Insurance Study, Town of North Andover, Essex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (August 2, 1982). Flood Insurance Study, City of Chelsea, Suffolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (February 2, 1982). Flood Insurance Study, City of Chelsea, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (February 2, 1982). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Upton, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (January 5, 1982). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Arlington, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (January 5, 1982). Flood Insurance Study, City of Cambridge, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (December 15, 1981). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Belmont, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (January 2, 1981). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Reading, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 28, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Brookline, Norfolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 5, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Middleton, Essex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (October 15, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Carlisle, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (July 2, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Methuen, Essex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (May 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Billerica, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (March 14, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Pelham, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (February 1, 1980). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Lynnfield, Essex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (January 1980). Flood Insurance Study, City of Woburn, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (December 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Winchester, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (December 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Bolton, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Westborough, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 15, 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Northborough, Worcester County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (September 5, 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Wellesley, Norfolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (June 15, 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Concord, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (June 15, 1979). Flood Insurance Study, City of Nashua, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (April 16, 1979). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Hollis, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (December 1978). Flood Insurance Study, City of Nashua, Hillsborough County, New Hampshire. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (December 1977). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Lincoln, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Andover, Essex County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Pepperell, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Harvard, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Lancaster, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Lunenburg, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

Flood Profiles of the Merrimack River, Hooksett, New Hampshire to Lawrence, Massachusetts. (March 1922, revised 1937).

Green Engineering Affiliates, Inc. (1971). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet. Boston, Massachusetts.

Hudson Daily Sun. (March 19 and 20, 1968). Hudson, Massachusetts.

Hudson Daily Sun. (August 19 and 20, 1955). Hudson, Massachusetts.

Hydrologic Engineering Center, 2008. CPD-69. HEC-RAS (Version 4.1), River Analysis System, User's Manual, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, California.

James W. Sewell Co., of Old Town, Maine. (Acton, Massachusetts, 1985; Stoneham, Massachusetts, 1984). Topographic Maps, compiled from aerial photographs, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 4 feet. Acton, Massachusetts.

James W. Sewell Co., of Old Town, Maine. (Acton, Massachusetts, April 1984). Aerial Photographs, Scale 1:12,000. Acton, Massachusetts.

James W. Sewell, Inc., of Old Town, Maine. (Everett, Massachusetts, 1984; Medford, Massachusetts, 1984; Somerville, Massachusetts, 1984). Topographic Maps compiled by photogrammetric methods, Scale 1"=400', Contour Interval 4 feet.

James W. Sewell, Inc., of Old Town, Maine. (Melrose, Massachusetts, 1984). Topographic Maps compiled from aerial photographs, Scale 1"= 400', Contour Interval 4 feet.

James W. Sewell Company. (Old Town, Maine, March 1976). Topographic Mapping, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 Feet. Concord, Massachusetts.

James W. Sewell Company. (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1972). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers. (April 1975). "A Comparison of Methods for Estimating Flood Peaks on Streams in Massachusetts," Volume 62, No. 1. G. D. Tasker (author). Boston, Massachusetts.

Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers. (October 1974). The Proposed Charles River Project.

Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers. (January 1942). "Report of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers Committee on Floods," Volume XXIX, No. 1, Section 2. A. T. Safford, et al. (author).

King, H. W., and E. F. Brater. (1976). Handbook of Hydraulics, 6th Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York, New York.

L. Robert Kimball & Associates. (1980). Topographic Plan of Land in Lowell, Massachusetts, Scale 1:600, Contour Interval 1 foot.

"Lexington Minuteman." (March 21, 1968, and August 25, 1955). Lexington, Massachusetts.

Lexington Planning Board. (November 1975). Zoning Map of the Town of Lexington.

Lexington Planning Board. (November 1975). Zoning By-Laws of the Town of Lexington.

Lexington Planning Board. (January 23, 1967). Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in Lexington, Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development. (July 1973). City and Town Monograph, Town of Boxborough. 100 Cambridge Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Department of Public Works, Division of Waterways. Survey Notes, River Meadow and Beaver Brooks.

Massachusetts Department of Public Works, Project Division. (Chelmsford, Massachusetts, November 1953). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Massachusetts Department of Public Works, Project Division. (November 1952). Relocation of Route 110, Worcester to Newburyport.

Massachusetts Department of Public Works. (Boston, Massachusetts, 1935-1968). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:120 and 1:2,400. Boston, Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Geodetic Survey. (November 1936). High Water Data Floods of March 1936 in Massachusetts.

Metcalf and Eddy, Inc. (September 1978). Report to the Town of Burlington, Massachusetts on Stormwater Management, Phase I. Boston, Massachusetts.

Metcalf and Eddy, Inc. (January 1974). Report to Arlington Redevelopment Board upon Engineering Feasibility of Developing Reeds Brook Urban Renewal Project Area.

Moore Survey and Mapping Company, Inc. (Wilmington, Massachusetts, 1977; Winchester, Massachusetts, 1977). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Moore Survey and Mapping Corporation. (Route 2 Arlington-Cambridge, Massachusetts, flown April 21, 1974). Photogrammetric Maps, Scale 1:480, Contour Interval 1 foot.

Moore Survey and Mapping Corporation. (Boxborough, Massachusetts, April 4, 1973). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Moore Survey and Mapping Corporation. (Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, 1960). Topographic Mapping, Marlborough, Massachusetts, Scale 1:2,000, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Moore Survey and Mapping Corporation. Town Map, Town of Boxborough, Massachusetts, Scale 1:6,000.

Nashua River Watershed Association. (September 1970). Hydrology and Water Resources of the Nashua River Watershed. D. W. Caldwell (author). Groton, Massachusetts.

National Weather Service. (Accessed October 12, 2006). www.nws.noaa.gov/er/box. Boston, Massachusetts.

Northeast Air Photographers & Associates. (Weston, Massachusetts, April 1977). Aerial Photography, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Northeast Regional Climate Center and USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service, Extreme Precipitation in New York & New England - An Interactive Web Tool for Extreme Precipitation Analysis. From the internet: http://precip.eas.cornell.edu.

Northern Middlesex Area Commission. (1974). Flooding and Drainage Problems in the Northern Middlesex Area.

Oregon State University. (Accessed October 12, 2006). www.oregon.state.edu.

Planning Board. (Amended to January 1, 1976). Map of the Town of Acton, Massachusetts, Scale 1:16,944. Acton, Massachusetts.

Proprietors of the Locks & Canals, Lowell, Massachusetts. (September 1936). Contour Plan of Merrimack River from Pawtucket Dam to below Moody Street Bridge, three sheets.

Quinn and Associates, Inc., of Horsham, Pennsylvania. (Town of Dunstable, Massachusetts, December 1978). Aerial Photographs, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Quinn and Associates, Inc., of Horsham, Pennsylvania. (Town of Littleton, Massachusetts, December 1978). Maps Developed from Aerial Photography, Scale 1"=1,200', Contour Interval 5 feet.

Raytheon Autometric. (Boston, Massachusetts, 1977). Topographic Mapping, Nashua River, Nissitissit River, Reedy Meadow Brook, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Raytheon Autometric of Wayland, Massachusetts. (Waltham, Massachusetts, April 1974). Topographic Maps compiled from aerial photographs, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Raytheon Company Autometric Operations. (Sudbury, Massachusetts, 1971). Orthophoto Mapping, Scale 1:1,200, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Resource Mapping Systems, Inc., of Wayland, Massachusetts. (Everett, Massachusetts, 1978; Medford, Massachusetts, 1978; Somerville, Massachusetts, 1978). Topographic Maps compiled by photogrammetric methods, Scale 1"=400', Contour Interval 2 feet.

Resource Mapping Systems, Inc., of Wayland, Massachusetts. (Malden, Massachusetts, 1978). Topographic Maps compiled by photogrammetric methods, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Sewell, James W. (1974). Topographic Maps of Reading, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 2 feet.

Sewell, Inc., of Old Town, Maine. (Malden, Massachusetts, 1984). Topographic Maps compiled by photogrammetric methods, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Sewell, Inc., of Old Town, Maine. (Malden, Massachusetts, April 1984). Aerial Photographs, Scale 1:12,000.

Teledyne Geotronics of Long Beach, California. (Tyngsborough, Massachusetts, April 1979). Topographic Base Maps, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Teledyne Geotronics, of Long Beach, California. (Town of Ashland, Massachusetts, 1977; Nonacoicus Brook, Long Pond Brook, Bowers Brook, James Brook, and Bennetts Brook, 1977; Sudbury River, Cold Spring Brook, Indian Brook, Tributary to Indian Brook, 1977; Carlisle, Massachusetts, 1977; Groton, Massachusetts, 1977; Squannacook River, Mulpus Brook, Walker Brook, Morse Brook, Catacoonamug Brook, Bow Brook, 1977). Topographic Maps obtained by photogrammetric methods, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Teledyne Geotronics. (Framingham, Massachusetts, Long Beach, California, 1977; Sudbury River, 1977; Squannacook River, Witch Brook, Mason Brook, Walker Brook, Locke Brook, 1977). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Teledyne Geotronics of Long Beach, California. (Groton, Massachusetts, 1977). Aerial Photographs, Scale 1:2,400.

Teledyne Geotronics of Long Beach, California. (Sudbury River, Mill Brook, and Snake Brook, 1977). Aerial Photography and Aerial Photogrammetry, Scale 1:2,400.

Teledyne Electronics of Long Beach, California. (Sudbury River, Mill Brook, and Snake Brook, 1977). Topographic Mapping, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Teledyne Geotronics. (Maynard, Massachusetts, 1976). Aerial Photography and Topographic Mapping, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

Teledyne Geotronics. (November 1976). Aerial Photography and Topographic Mapping of the Town of Hudson, Massachusetts, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 4 feet.

The Melrose Free Press. (June 10, 1982). Melrose, Massachusetts.

The Melrose Free Press. (March 21, 1968). Melrose, Massachusetts.

The Melrose Free Press. (October 11, 1962). Melrose, Massachusetts.

Town of Arlington. (Adopted October 8, 1975, amendments through May 1976). Zoning Bylaw.

Town of Bedford. (April 4, 1979). Zoning By-Laws. Bedford, Massachusetts.

Town of Billerica. (1980). Regulations of the Board of Health. Billerica, Massachusetts.

Town of Billerica. (1979). Zoning By-Laws. Billerica, Massachusetts.

Town of Carlisle, Board of Health. (February 1, 1980). Rules and Regulations. Carlisle, Massachusetts.

Town of Carlisle. (1979). Zoning By-Laws. Carlisle, Massachusetts.

Town of Concord. (April 1977). Zoning By-Laws. Concord, Massachusetts.

Town of Concord. (March 1968). River Elevations (and other historical information).

Town of Concord. Base Map and Overlays (showing land use, floodplains, topographic zones, generalized and specific soil types, and superficial geology). Concord, Massachusetts.

Town of Framingham. Department of Public Works. FEMA Certification of the Saxonville Levee Project. Framingham, Massachusetts. April 17, 2009

Town of Natick. (January 1977). Zoning By-Laws. Massachusetts.

Town of North Reading, Department of Public Works. (November 23, 1969). Wetland Boundary Maps, Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 5 feet.

Town of Reading. (February 1976). Zoning By-Laws and Map.

Town of Wakefield. (November 15, 1975). Zoning By-Laws, Chapter VI.

Town of Wilmington. (March 1977). Zoning By-Laws. Wilmington, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. Topographic Maps, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 5 feet. Lowell, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (November 2002). HEC-RAS User's Manual, Version 3.1.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (November 2002). HEC-RAS Hydraulic Reference Manual, Version 3.1.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (October 2002). HEC-GeoRAS User's Manual, Version 3.1.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (1979). Identification and Location of High Water Marks – Flood of January 1979, Six Rivers in Southern New England. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (May 1976). Charles River Watershed, Natural Valley Storage Project, Design Memorandum No. 1, Hydrologic Analysis.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (March 1975). Flood Plain Information, Beaver Brook, Littleton, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (June 1974). Application of the HEC-2 Bridge Routines, Training Document No. 6. Davis, California.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center. (May 1974). Floodway Determination Using Computer Program HEC-2, Training Document No. 6. Davis, California.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (December 1972). Saxonville Local Protection, Sudbury River, Merrimack River Basin, Framingham, Massachusetts, Design Memorandum No. 1, Hydrologic Analysis. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (1972). Flood Plain Information, Merrimack-Shawsheen-Spicket Rivers. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (September 1971). Flood Plain Information, Ipswich River, North Reading and Wilmington, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (July 1971). Sudbury River, Saxonville Local Protection, Framingham, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (September 1968). Flood Plain Information, Concord and Shawsheen Rivers, Bedford, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (June 1966). Flood Plain Information, Assabet River-Westborough to West Concord, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (February 1965). Interim Report on Review of Survey, Saxonville Local Protection, Sudbury River, Merrimack River Basin, Framingham, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (February 1939). Profile of September 1938 Flood, Concord River, Miles 49-54. Boston, Massachusetts.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division. Topographic Maps, Scale 1:4,800, Contour Interval 5 feet: Dracut, Massachusetts.

U.S. Census Bureau. U.S. Census 2010, from the Internet: http://2010.census.gov accessed August 8, 2012.

U.S. Congress. (June 1938). Public Law 761-75, House Resolution 10618, Flood Control Act of 1938.

U.S. Congress. (June 1936). Public Law 738-74, House Resolution 8455, Flood Control Act of 1936.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (1984). "Baiting Brook Watershed Project – Constance M. Fiske Flood Retarding Dam."

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (March 1981). "Baiting Brook Watershed – Final Environmental Impact Statement."

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (August 1978). Water and Related Land Resources of Central Region, Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (1978). Water and Related Land of Central Region, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (June 1975). Flood Hazard Analyses, Upper Assabet River Tributaries. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (January 1975). Technical Release No. 55, Urban Hydrology for Small Watershed.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (Townsend, Massachusetts, 1974; Ashby, Massachusetts, 1974; Shirley, Massachusetts, 1969). Map of Flood-Prone Areas, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (June 1973). Flood Hazard Areas, Upper Sudbury River, Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (August 1972). National Engineering Handbook, Section 4, Hydrology. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (March 1971). Preliminary Investigation Report, Crystal Lake, North Chelmsford, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (1970). Flood of March 1968 in Eastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. G. K. Wood, L. A. Swallow, C. G. Johnson, and G. H. Searles (authors).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (March 1970). Inventory of Potential and Existing Upstream Reservoir Sites, Merrimack Study Area. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (February 2, 1970). "Hydrographs at Maynard and Hudson for the 10- and 100-year flood based on 10 SUASCO structures in place and with no SUASCO structures." Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (Townsend, Massachusetts, 1969; Framingham, Massachusetts; Maynard, Massachusetts, 1974). Map of Flood Prone Areas, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (May 1966). Soils and their Interpretation for Various Land Uses, Town of Concord, Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (March 1964). Supplement to the Work Plan for the SuAsCo Watershed, Middlesex and Worcester Counties, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with Middlesex Soil Conservation District. (August 1963). Soils and their Interpretations for Various Land Uses, Town of Acton, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. (August 1958). Watershed Work Plan for Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, SuAsCo Watershed, Middlesex and Worcester Counties, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Middlesex Conservation District. (January 1957). Watershed Work Plan for Watershed Protection and Flood Protection, Baiting Brook Watershed, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (1979). Identification and Location of High Water Marks – Flood of January 1979, Six Rivers in Southern New England. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (May 1976). Natural Valley Storage Project, Design Memorandum No. 1, Hydrologic Analysis.

U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (May 1973). Charles River Locks and Charles River Basin, Massachusetts, Design Memorandum No. 1, Hydrology and Tidal Hydraulics.

U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, New England Division. (September 1968). Flood Plain Information Report, Concord and Shawsheen Rivers, Bedford, Massachusetts. Waltham, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads. (March 1965). Hydraulic Charts for the Selection of Highway Culverts, HEC #10.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads. (December 1965). Hydraulic Charts for the Selection of Highway Culverts, HEC #5.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau. (December 1955). Technical Paper No. 25, Rainfall Intensity, Duration-Frequency Curves. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (In progress). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Dover, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (In progress). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Medfield, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (In progress). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Millis, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Medway, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (Unpublished). Flood Insurance Study, City of Woburn, Middlesex County, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (July 17, 1986). Flood Insurance Study, City of Newton, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (December 1977). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Chelmsford, Middlesex County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (May 1977). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Wellesley, Norfolk County, Massachusetts, Draft Report.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (Natick, Massachusetts, 1977). Zoning Map, Scale 1:14,400.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 1976). Flood Hazard Boundary Map, Holliston, Massachusetts, Scale 1”=400’.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (November 19, 1976). Flood Hazard Boundary Map, City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Scale 1:1,200.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (August 20, 1976). Flood Insurance Study, Town of Needham, Norfolk County, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration. (July 26, 1974, revised April 9, 1976). Flood Hazard Boundary Map, Town of Natick, Massachusetts, Scale 1:12,000.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1987). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:25,000, Contour Interval 3 Meters.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1983). Water-Supply Paper 2214, Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts. S. W. Wandle, Jr. (author). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1983). Water-Supply Paper 2207, Flood Characteristics of Urban Watersheds in the United States. V. B. Sauer, W. O. Thomas, Jr., V. A. Stricker, and K. V. Wilson (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (May 1981). Water Resources Data for Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Boston, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1979). Water Resources Investigations 79-61, Coastal Flood of February 7, 1978, in Maine, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. R. A. Gadoury (author). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Westford, Massachusetts, 1979; Maynard, Massachusetts, 1979; Hudson, Massachusetts, 1979; Ayer, Massachusetts, 1979; Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1979; Lowell, Massachusetts, 1979; Nashua South, Massachusetts, 1979; Boston North, Massachusetts, 1971). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:25,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1977). Water Resources Investigation 77-39, Estimating the Magnitude and Frequency of Floods on Natural Flow Streams in Massachusetts. Boston, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (March 1974). Open-File Report, Flood Magnitude and Frequency of Massachusetts Streams. Carl D. Johnson and Gary D. Tasker (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1983. Estimating Peak Discharges of Small, Rural Streams in Massachusetts, Water Supply Paper 2214.

U.S. Geological Survey 1983. Flood Characteristics of Urban Watersheds in the United States, Water Supply Paper 2207.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Framingham, Massachusetts, 1974; Marlborough, Massachusetts, 1974; Pepperell, Massachusetts, 1969; Townsend, Massachusetts, 1974; Lexington, Massachusetts, 1971). Map of Flood-Prone Areas, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1973). Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-482, Flood of March 1968 on the Ipswich River, Massachusetts. L. A. Swallow and D. J. Fogarty (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1971; Wilmington, Massachusetts, 1965, Photorevised 1978; Reading, Massachusetts, 1966; Billerica, Massachusetts, 1965; Lowell, Massachusetts, 1966; Boston North, Massachusetts, 1971; Marlborough, Massachusetts, 1969, Photographically Enlarged to Scale 1:2,400). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1970). Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-371, Flood of March 1968 on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers, Massachusetts. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1970). Water-Supply Paper No. 1779-M, Historical Floods in New England. M. T. Thomson, W. B. Gannon, M. P. Thomas, G. S. Hayes, et al. (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1970). Open-File Report, Flood of March 1968 in Eastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. G. K. Wood, L. H. Swallow, C. G. Johnson, and G. H. Searles (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1970). Flood of March 1968, in Eastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Boston, Massachusetts.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Concord, Massachusetts, 1970). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Photographically enlarged to Scale 1:2,400, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Ayer, Massachusetts, 1970; Hudson, Massachusetts, 1970; Maynard, Massachusetts, 1970; Westford, Massachusetts, 1970; Framingham, Massachusetts, 1965, Photorevised 1979). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Shirley, Massachusetts, 1969; Pepperell, Massachusetts, 1969; Ayer, Massachusetts, 1969; Wilmington, Massachusetts,

1965, Photorevised 1978). Maps of Flood-Prone Areas, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Framingham, Massachusetts, 1969; Holliston, Massachusetts, 1969; Marlborough, Massachusetts, 1969; Natick, Massachusetts, 1969; Medford, Massachusetts, 1969, Newton, Massachusetts, 1970; Nashua South, Massachusetts-New Hampshire, 1963; Westford, Massachusetts, 1966). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1967). Water-Supply Paper 1849, Roughness Characteristics of Natural Channels. Harry H. Barnes, Jr. (author). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Maynard, Massachusetts, 1965; Westford, Massachusetts, 1966). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Billerica, Massachusetts, 1965; Wilmington, Massachusetts, 1965). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Billerica, Massachusetts, 1965; Lowell, Massachusetts, 1966; Nashua South, New Hampshire, 1965; Pepperell, Massachusetts, 1965; Westford, Massachusetts, 1966). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Hudson, Massachusetts, 1965). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 20 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1964). Water-Supply Paper No. 1779-M, Historical Floods in New England. M. T. Thomson, W. B. Gannon, M. P. Thomas, G. S. Hayes, et al. (authors). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1964). Water-Supply Paper 1671, Magnitude and Frequency of Floods in the United States, Part 1-A, North Atlantic Slope Basins, Maine to Connecticut. A. Rice Green (author). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1961 to 1973). Surface Water Records of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1960). Water-Supply Paper 1420, Floods of August-October 1955, New England to North Carolina. D. B. Bogart (author). Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (July 1957). Computation of Peak Discharge at Culverts.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Lexington, Massachusetts, dated 1943, photorevised 1971). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Boston North, Massachusetts, 1943, Photorevised 1972; Boston South, Massachusetts, 1943, Photorevised 1970; Lexington, Massachusetts, 1943, Photorevised 1971; Newton, Massachusetts, 1943, Photorevised 1970). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:12,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (1937). Water-Supply Paper No. 798, The Floods of March 1936, Part I, New England Rivers. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. (Various Years). Water Resources Data for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

U.S. Geological Survey. (1973). Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-482, Flood of March 1968 on the Ipswich River, Massachusetts. L. A. Swallow and D. H. Fogarty (authors).

U.S. Geological Survey. (Lexington, Quadrangle, Massachusetts, 1971; Boston North, Massachusetts, 1971; Reading, Massachusetts, 1966). Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Geological Survey. (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1971; Boston North, 1971; Wilmington, 1965; Reading, Massachusetts, 1966). 7.5-Minute Series Map of Flood Prone Areas, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Geological Survey. (Lexington and Concord, Massachusetts, 1970). 7.5-Minute Series, Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000.

U.S. Geological Survey. (1970). Flood of March 1968 in Eastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. G. K. Wood, L. A. Swallow, C. G. Johnson, and G. H. Searles (authors).

U.S. Geological Survey. (Reading, Massachusetts, 1966; Wilmington, Massachusetts, 1965). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Quadrangle Maps, Scale 1:24,000, Contour Interval 10 feet.

U.S. Geological Survey. (1966). Water Supply Paper 1826, Water Resources of the Ipswich River Basin Massachusetts. E. A. Sammel, et al. (author).

U.S. Geological Survey. (Years 1966-1975). Water Resources Data for Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, Parts 1 and 2.

U.S. Geological Survey. (Hudson and Maynard Quadrangle, Massachusetts, 1965). 7.5-Minute Series Topographic Maps, Scale 1:24,000.

U.S. Geological Survey. (1964). Water Supply Paper 1671, Magnitude and Frequency of Floods in the United States, Part 1-A, North Atlantic Slope Basin, Maine to Connecticut. A. Rice Green (author).

U.S. Geological Survey. (Published annually). Water Resources Data for Massachusetts.

Wakefield Daily Item. (March 20, 1968).

Wakefield Daily Item. (October 8-9, 1962).

Water Resources Council. (June 1977). "Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency," Bulletin 17A. Washington, D.C.

Water Resources Council. (March 1976). "Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency," Bulletin 17. Washington, D.C.

Worcester Telegram. (March 20, 1968). Worcester, Massachusetts.