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

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

Future CTP webinars

Regarding a webinar for the July – September timeframe, an option suggested on a previous call was dam inundation mapping. MD has developed a web application for viewing dam break inundation maps. It is on a different tab than their SFHA application with their engineering maodels (similar to CRAB) since it is non-regulatory. Dave indicated he could provide a demo of the MD dam inundation mapping web site for the July – September time frame. Dave indicated that a hazard mitigation grant was the funding source for developing the inundation mapping using DSS-Wise.

A tentative date of September 12 from 1 to 2:30 pm was selected.

We usually like to have more than one speaker. One option is Meg Galloway formerly the Dam Safety Engineer with WI DNR and now with ASFPM. WI has state legislation that requires dams to be classified a high hazard dam unless there is zoning downstream to prevent development in the dam inundation zone. WI has a website that includes dams on a stream data layer.

Another option is California which has a website which provides information on dam inundation mapping. MD used the South Carolina website as a model for their website. So that is another option.

Options for future webinars include:

The Technical Mapping Advisory Council recommendations. The recommendations include mapping a flood hazard data layer that includes future conditions which include potential development in the watershed, increased rainfall intensity due to climate change and floodway surcharge. Brooke is on TMAC so she could coordinate that webinar.

New enhancements to HEC-RAS. HEC presented at the M&ES committee meeting on the new tools being developed for HEC-

[Another option mentioned on a previous call was real time weather. The National Weather Service has developed some new tools. Useful for emergency preparedness. It would be useful to understand how it can be used. Joanna suggested that a webinar on environmental hazards associated with flooding could be considered. They had a spill in which barriers were put up the contain it.]

CTP Conversation

Instead of an ice breaker, we had people introduce themselves and indicate their favorite disaster movie. That seemed to work well.

Dave took the sign-in sheets and indicated that he would scan them and provide them to the group.

Joanna has the powerpoints developed by Laura and Christina Lindemer.

The breakout sessions were a good way to have people involved. The three breakouts were the FEMA Future of Flood Risk Data Standard Operating Procedures (led by Christina), future conditions (led by Dave) and 2D Floodways (led by Alan). Joanna indicated she would reach out to Christina to obtain and

summary of that breakout. Dave and Alan indicated that they would provide a summary of their breakouts.

FFRMS Breakout comments from Dave…

The FFRMS breakout discussion focused on the soon to be released nationwide data layer. The discussion focused on how the data could be used locally (as a map) to promote resiliency and for a community to use to consider adopting higher standards. The group was joined by Andrew Martin from FEMA headquarters who discussed the rollout and the data included in the FFRMs.

FEMA Notice of Funding Opportunity

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.

Joanna indicated that they are going to be requesting funding for some face-to-face training for communities on 2D modeling. They have provided some face-to-face training for the engineering community in the past.

Note from the last call – [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.]

Another note from the last call – [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.]

AL 7/12/2024