

Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – April 8, 2024

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

Future CTP webinars

A webinar on the 2D Integrated Planning Team effort has been suggested for a webinar in the April – May timeframe. Laura Algeo has been provided a draft announcement with May 5 or 7 as options. As indicated previously two dates and times need to be selected. One for the webinar (90 minutes) and the second for a technical check a day or two earlier (30 minutes). If that is the week selected, the announcement should go out this week – or we can move the webinar back.

Regarding a webinar for the July – September timeframe, it has been mentioned that ASFPM has a project evaluating the impact of a one-foot floodway surcharge. One foot of surcharge in the floodway should be something less than one foot when spread out beyond the floodway. A paper on the topic has been accepted for the ASFPM conference in Salt Lake City. This could be a webinar topic for the July – September timeframe. Our initial results show on average a rise of 0.8 of a foot but in some locations the rise is higher (e.g. 2 feet). Joanna indicated that for the City of Topeka they did an analysis and in some locations there was 2 to 3 feet of rise.

Another option would be to look at the papers that were not selected for the conference. Steve McMaster leads the review team that selects the papers for the conference. He or members of the review team may recall a paper that would be a good option.

Another option could be on dam inundation mapping. MD has developed a web application for viewing dam break inundation maps. While it is completed – MD has not yet sent out notices on the site. It is on a different tab (similar to CRAB) since it is non-regulatory.

CTP Conversation

Note: on the last call we determined that instead of an ice breaker, we have people introduce themselves and indicate their favorite movie or something about their pets (or other get to know you type question)

Laura has sent out an email to the subcommittee indicating that her presentation would be about 35 minutes.

Regarding options for webinars we can add agenda item related to this issue.

The ASFPM board of directors has suggested that ASFPM provide some training on 2D modeling. The ASFPM Flood Science Center receives some FEMA funding annually and we plan to suggest that this be the focus. This would be for CTPs and community staff. It would be useful to receive some feedback from those in attendance regarding training on 2D modeling.

2D modeling and 2D floodways received high marks from the questionnaire sent out and the poll posted at the CTP Community of Practice meeting. One issue on floodways being discussed is whether floodways on existing mapping can be removed when new mapping is developed. Brooke highlighted that without floodways there are no evaluation lines. Without evaluation lines it is difficult to do a no-rise analysis. [Note: on the last call we discussed that one question that could be asked of attendees – who is tracking cumulative impacts of projects if they do not have a mapped floodway.]

Brooke also indicated that Brian Koper has come up with examples of where you remove a floodway. Floodways are problematic on bifurcated streams with multiple flow paths. Brooke highlighted that floodways are also problematic in an urban setting where flow paths can split and flow along streets.

Joanna indicated that regarding training on 2D modeling Kansas is proposing to do some short half-day training for non-engineers.

CTP Social

Regarding the date of the social, there was not a clear preference. Tuesday is the day selected for the CTP Social. Brooke was recently in Salt Lake City and indicated that a place called Hall Pass might be good option since there was plenty of space and that there was a patio area where if it was crowded some could spill out into that area.

Joanna has reached out to several vendors that are willing to help sponsor the event.

We also want to make sure the CTPs attending will have a good opportunity to provide comments. In past years we have had flip charts and broken into smaller groups to enable attendees to provide comments.

FEMA is proposing to upgrade their IT infrastructure – this could impact the amount of funding available for mapping since there is only one pot of funding. The FEMA Region VI flood data viewer is a successful site being hosted by USGS. Other regions are looking to also work with USGS to host their data also. For a national web service for FEMA to host flood data they are looking to develop something within FEMA. USGS would have a difficult time meeting the DHS requirements.

We discussed having Rick Sacbibit or David Bascom present on where FEMA is headed with flood modeling and mapping. Laura indicated that Christina Lindner will be attending the conference and would likely be able to provide a presentation on FFRD – the Future of Flood Risk Data at FEMA not to be confused with FFRMS (the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard). In implementing the FFRMS FEMA is developing BFE plus 1,2 and 3 for the nation. Some states are doing something similar including MO and MD. It was suggested that we have a sheet with abbreviations.

Even though FFRD includes the word future it initially would not include future conditions (other than sea level rise) but the framework will be flexible and robust enough so that in the future, future riverine conditions can be included.

FEMA will be presenting at the Mapping & Engineering Standards committee meeting earlier in the day. We will have to coordinate topics with the M&ES committee of which Brooke is a co-chair.

Laura indicated that if she received a listing of topics by Wednesday March 13 they could include a poll question during the CTP Community of Practice webinar on Friday March 15.

We have the April and May subcommittee calls to finalize the agenda for the annual conference.

AL 4/08/2024