

Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – Oct 12, 2022

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

CTP Co-chair vacancy

Darryl has accepted a position with the private sector so we will need to identify a replacement. Nicole Maccherone may have a suggestion.

Webinars

Safety Grates on Culverts

The announcement for the webinar should go out tomorrow.

The presenters on the safety portion of the webinar have asked for at least 40 minutes so the section on MO culvert sizing and Mile High Flood District crossing improvements will be shortened to 5 minutes.

Floodway Higher Standards

ASFPM has been funded to prepare materials promoting higher standards floodways. We discussed details of the project. ASFPM is preparing a packet that will include a fact sheet and a graphic that shows that the surcharge goes beyond the floodway. The packet will also include 3 case studies. One is related to King County, WA where the county has a county zero-rise floodway which basically is the floodway fringe. In this zone, a no-rise analysis is required, compensatory storage is required and no development is allowed if flood depths exceed 3 feet or the velocity exceeds 3 fps. A second case study included will be the City of San Marcos, TX where the entire SFHA is designated as floodway and a third is Charlotte Mecklenburg, NC where in addition to the FEMA floodway, the FIRM includes an encroachment zone which is based upon a 0.1 foot surcharge.

One component of the project is evaluating the number of structures impacted by BFE+1 flood extents. Maryland did an analysis of BFE+3 along the coast.

MO is doing an analysis of BFE +1, 2 and 3 in conjunction with the 2D modeling being conducted.

These data would be used to document the impact of a one-foot surcharge.

It was suggested that this guidance associated with higher standards floodways would be appropriate for the next webinar in the January – March timeframe.

Urban Flooding

Francisco Pena Guerra has reached out to Brooke for some contacts related to this topic. They are planning to hold a workshop in Florida. Bill Brown with ASFPM used to work in the City of Arlington, TX. In that role he dealt with urban flooding issues so he has some experience on the topic.

Maps going through the map adoption process

MHFD funds their own flood hazard mapping studies. In the past, FEMA would take these studies and process them through the map adoption process. MHFD has gotten some pushback recently suggesting that studies and maps could be adopted locally without the need to process them to get them included on the community FIRMs. The region has indicated that the budget is tight (and they are short-staffed)

so there is a need to be thoughtful and strategic about selecting studies to go through the map adoption process.

Local regulation is problematic for a number of reasons: 1) it is confusing to have a FEMA map and a local map that are not the same and 2) it is challenging for locals to track changes and process revisions outside the FEMA process.

One of the breakout sessions at the CTP conversation in Orlando was related to the issue of when BLE modeling and mapping should be upgraded and go through the FEMA FIRM regulatory process. The notes from that session have not been provided to the CTP subcommittee.

It was suggested that this would be a good topic for the Operating Partners meeting.

CTP subcommittee call schedule

Having a monthly call on the 2nd Monday of the month at noon Central Time fits peoples' schedules

AL 10/14/22