Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – June 9, 2022

Attendees: Alan Lulloff, Brooke Seymour, Darryl Rockfield, Dave Guignet and Meg Galloway

Webinars

Atlas 14

We discussed proposed upcoming webinars. NOAA has reached out to ASFPM to get input on methodology recently developed on non-stationarity (future conditions) associated with Atlas 14. A call was held on May 6th with ASFPM staff and ASFPM policy committee leads. Meg Galloway is coordinating ASFPM efforts associated with Atlas 14. ASFPM has suggested the topic for an ASFPM CTP webinar. NOAA has indicated that they could present on a webinar in July. A suggested focus of the webinar would be on future conditions.

Webinar agenda:

ASFPM historic position on future conditions – where the focus was on future conditions associated with watershed development. In about 2005 the CFR was revised to allow communities to include future conditions land use on their FIRMs – usually in lieu of the 500 year flood layer.

Here future conditions associated with watershed development, increased rainfall intensity and floodway surcharge would be mentioned.

ASFPM efforts to get increased funding for Atlas 14 updates – Meg Galloway

NOAA 14/15 Non-stationarity – NOAA

Future conditions associated with land use. – Brooke Seymour

Mile High Flood District has an agreement with FEMA to make the SFHA in their jurisdictions reflect future conditions land use.

Webinar dates were identified - Wed, July 20, Thurs, July 21, Tues, July 26, Wed, July 27 and Thurs, July 28

Meg will reach out to NOAA to land on a date for the webinar.

National Water Model

We have reached out to NOAA and have identified a speaker and potential date (September 24th) for the webinar. Dave Guignet would provide a case study in the webinar.

Safety Grates on Culverts

Brooke indicated that an option could be safety grates on culverts. MHFD worked with Colorado State University to evaluate different designs related to pinning hazards and catching debri. They developed a physical model. They have developed a presentation so conducting a webinar on the topic would not be a heavy lift.

Darryl indicated that MO is working to make it easier to upgrade culverts after a flood event. As part of MO's Mapping Activity Statement, MO is including updated hydrology to ensure that bridges/culverts

that have been damaged in the past are sized to pass the 25 year flood for local roads, the 50 year for county roads and the 100 year for state roads. This is being done so that in the aftermath of the flood event the bridges/culverts damaged can be replaced with structures that have adequate capacity to pass these flood flows.

WI is working to integrate culvert inventories that have been developed or are being developed by counties in the state.

Other issues

Region 8 has taken the stance that no rise modeling should be demonstrated in the encroached floodway model, therefore ignoring any parts of a project that are located in the flood fringe. Previous discussions with the Region had indicated that if ANY part of a project is in the floodway, then no rise means 0.00 for the entire project, even if the impacts are occurring due to the portions of the project in the flood fringe. FEMA's guidance does not specifically address projects that encompass both the flood fringe and floodway, but based on ongoing discussion with FEMA HQ, modeling impacts from the complete project including fill in the fringe is good practice but is not a minimum requirement. Communities can have higher standards to require more conservative analysis. It was suggested that Mark Forest be contacted since he has some experience with this issue.

Region 8 has raised some concerns that MHFD is providing current effective models to those that request them. The region feels that since it is not part of the MHFD CTP mapping activity statement all such requests should go the FEMA engineering library since they have the "authoritative" model. MHFD has reached out to Brian Koper with FEMA headquarters. He does not seem to think that it is problematic and is suggesting the process be formalized with the CTP agreement to clarify processes. He will discuss this issue with Laura Algeo.

One concern is that when engineers request a model from the engineer library the model at times provided is not the correct effective model. This is a problem related primarily to older models. It is important that gaps in the FEMA library are addressed.

In addition, there are a number of states that provide access to effective engineering models including WI, MD, IN, MN and NC.

AL 6/15/22