

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

Attendees: Alan Luloff, Dave Guignet, Brooke Seymour, Joanna Rohlf and Laura Algeo.

### 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. DxV options have been discussed. Developing floodways using 2D models is difficult and an iterative process. Using DXV outputs from 2D modeling helps with that process. Laura in 2D FW IPT calls has highlighted that while dxv is good for identifying unsafe areas it does not address the cumulative impact issue that the FEMA floodway surcharge limit of one-foot addresses.

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. The M&ES committee has been provided a copy of the report.

Brooke indicated that she does not have a specific recommendation. Floodways take longer to develop using 2D modeling. DxV provides a starting point.

Dave asked when does resiliency fit into this process.

When mapping floodways KS has been using 1D modeling for floodways and then mapping the rest using 2D modeling but are now going to be developing floodways using 2D modeling.

Flows in MD are predicated to increase by 25%. Dave indicated that future conditions should be included. Brooke indicated they are finding that in some cases precipitation is decreasing in arid regions. However, changes in land-use are still resulting in higher flows.

Laura asked if there should be different criteria for different land uses. Should public infrastructure have a higher standard.

### Floodway Higher Standards

ASFPM has been funded to prepare materials promoting higher standards floodways. One of the components of the project is interviewing FEMA regions. The regions have been very responsive to an email that Laura sent out regarding the project. We are asking the regions if they include a discussion of higher standards floodways when they initiate floodway projects. The responses from the regions varied a lot. We also are asking the regions if they are requesting BFE+1 as risk assessment products. 2 regions are but one does not routinely provide the information to communities.

Laura indicated that FEMA is going through a process of identifying where BFE +1 products have been done and putting them on a viewer. Plan is to make visuals useable.

The BFE+1 dataset would be useful when discussing a higher standards (no or lower surcharge) floodway to show the amount of additional area in the community would be flooded if the floodway fringe was filled

One of the case studies we will be including is King County, WA. Some communities may not relate since King County includes the City of Seattle. On the last call Brooke indicated the City of Cherry Hills Village is a small affluent community that has similar regulations. She indicated that she can provide a contact. This might also make a good case study. This city hires contractors to review proposals vs. having staff do the review.

Dave indicated that their BFE +1,2 and 3 assessment showed that there were 70% more structures in the BFE +1,2 and 3 zones. Dave provided some of the results of their analysis (attached).

Brooke indicated that in the MHFD it is apparent that there is a lot of development just outside the SFHA.

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 indicated that there is an issue with a LOMR that has been submitted. It is unclear how the LOMR will impact the floodway being developed.

#### Maps going through the map adoption process

We discussed the issue of getting BLE studies and studies conducted by CTPs through the mapping process. MHFD has completed 10 studies but the region has indicated that they only will be able to process to regulatory 1 study. Increased funding was discussed. Laura highlighted that staffing is more of an issue than funding. In addition to salary issues the work-from-home issue has an impact. FEMA regions want people in seats and therefore require staff to be in the office a certain percentage of time. FEMA headquarters does not have that requirement nor does the private sector so regions are finding it difficult to maintain staff levels.

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. Attached are the notes from that breakout.

Laura indicated that FEMA is working on a decision tree related to prioritizing studies for upgrading. She shared her screen and showed the group some the factors being included.

In Kansas some communities have maps but the county does not. FEMA now wants all maps to be countywide. Laura indicated that the county wide maps could include blank panels for areas outside the community.

#### CTP webinars

The recording of the Nov 9<sup>th</sup> webinar on culverts has not yet been posted. Reminders have been provided to Kevin Curie.

A next webinar will be on Floodway higher standards in the Feb/March timeframe.

AL 12/17/22