

Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – Nov 14, 2022

Attendees: Alan Lulloff, Dave Guignet, Brooke Seymour and Joanna Rohlf.

CTP Co-chair vacancy

Darryl has accepted a position with the private sector so we will need to identify a replacement. Darryl suggested Joanna Rohlf as a replacement. Brooke had a call with her and recommended her for the co-chair. Chad Berginnis gave Alan the go-ahead to offer her the position.

Webinars

Safety Grates on Culverts

The webinar went well. It was interesting that there were questions regarding fish passage. Fish passage is a limited concern for MHFD due to their urban setting in an arid region. Alan indicated that he discussed culvert replacement with the WI Emergency Management person and she indicated that when culverts are being replaced with federal disaster funds that she works with a WI Department of Natural Resources person to address fish passage issues.

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. We mentioned King County to FEMA Region X staff. They indicated that the county is not enforcing their regulations. Brooke indicated that the City of Cherry Hills Village is a small affluent community that has similar regulations. It allows the community to regulate development in the floodway fringe but allows the community authority to issue variances outside the FEMA regulatory floodway, if appropriate.

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 (which is based upon a 0.5 foot surcharge), the FIRM includes an encroachment zone which is based upon a 0.1 foot surcharge. A challenge for them was that a reforestation project could not proceed without a CLOMR since the project would raise flood elevation due to increased roughness.

ASFPM has interviewed 3 regions (IX, X and III). Region IX and X do BFE +1,2 and 3 risk assessment products. Region IX does not routinely provide the data to communities. These products would be useful for demonstrating the impact of one-foot surcharge floodways when promoting higher standards floodways.

Dave indicated that their BFE +1,2 and 3 assessment showed that there were 70% more structures in the BFE +1 zone.

Region III indicated that they only do floodways with one foot of surcharge. Howard County in Maryland has been treating the entire SFHA as floodway since it does not have a floodway on their FIRMs. However, the region has indicated that they plan to put a one-foot surcharge on new mapping being

developed. Dave indicated that they had an issue with Fairfax County where the county initially indicated that they wanted a higher standards (lower surcharge) floodway but when the maps came out they indicated that they wanted the one-foot surcharge floodway.

Dave Carlton has agreed to assist with a webinar on higher standards floodways in the January – March timeframe.

Modifications to the present floodway regulations

The 2D floodway subcommittee of the 2D modeling Integrated Planning Team (IPT) has put out a request to the group for alternatives to the present floodway regulations. They would like suggestions provided in the January timeframe. Alan has brought this to the attention of Larry Larson asking if ASFPM should submit something. He will ask if Siavash Beik and the Mapping & Engineering Standards committee have an opinion on the issue. Alan indicated that ASFPM developed a report on whether present practice meets the original intent and made some recommendations to FEMA. The document has not been made public. An option would be to provide an abbreviated version of the report as part of this process. Brooke requested a copy of the report.

Maps going through the map adoption process

Joanna indicated that Kansas is doing a significant amount of 2D modeling. One of the issues they are facing is whether this BLE mapping should go through the map adoption process. Some of the counties involved have had no FIRMs or only paper FIRMs.

Brooke indicated that due to the cost and time associated with the FEMA PMR process, their region is pushing for communities in the MHFD to adopt mapping produced by MHFD and not go through the FEMA map adoption process.

Laura Algeo led a breakout group at the CTP conversation in Orlando that was related to the issue of when BLE modeling and mapping should be upgraded and go through the FEMA FIRM regulatory process. One of the FEMA contractors took notes. Alan indicated that he would reach out the Laura so that the subcommittee could get copies of those notes.

Brooke has highlighted on the last call that 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.

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

Kansas

Topeka, KS did a study on how development has impacted their flooding. The study evaluated watershed sensitivity to changes in peak flow and changes in volume of runoff. The study found some watersheds were particularly sensitive to peak flow changes, while others were more sensitive to volume of runoff changes. The City of Topeka wanted to update their stormwater policy. The analysis from this study provided recommendations for science-based policy changes to design criteria, peak flow controls, runoff of volum controls and setbacks for their streams.

Joanna indicated that the state will establish a BFE if requested by a community. KS has established BFE portal for the data, and they provide the BFE based on best available model-backed data. KS has an effective floodplain viewer.

CTP subcommittee call schedule

Having a monthly call on the 2nd Monday of the month at 11:30 am Central Time fits peoples' schedules

AL 11/18/22