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_Flood Map Modernization/Risk MAP_
- All 67 counties digitally updated within first 5 years
- Mapped over 37,000 miles of floodplain
- Coastal/Levees/Riverine

_LOMR Delegation_
- Extension of flood mapping efforts
- Investing back in our communities

_NFIP Coordination_
- Liaison between communities and FEMA
- Over 426 participating communities

_Training_
- Community assistance and training
- In-house editing, creating and/or sharing of data
Implementing The Risk MAP Vision

**Goals**
- Deliver High-Quality Risk Data
- Increase Awareness of Flood Risk
- Promote Community Mitigation Action

**Products**
- Understandable Flood Maps
- Credible data—reliable, accurate, watershed-based
- Illustrations of possible Flood Depths
- Usable Flood Risk Assessments
- Tools to understand how flood risk has changed
- Continuous engagement with communities
- Enable communities to communicate flood risk to constituents
- Support that allows communities to identify risks and promote:
  - Community resiliency
  - Sustainability
  - Reduced need for federal disaster assistance

**Processes**
- Enhance delivery of Risk MAP Products
- Collaborate across all levels of government

Reduction
Risk to Lives and Property
## Risk MAP Goals and Metrics

### Program Goals and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk MAP Goals</th>
<th>Risk MAP Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Data Gaps</strong></td>
<td>• Ensure 80 percent of the Nation’s flood hazards are current by 2014 – the flood hazard data are new, have been updated, or deemed still valid through Risk MAP review and update process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address gaps in flood hazard data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Awareness &amp; Understanding</strong></td>
<td>• Increase State, local, and Tribal officials’ level of understanding of flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable increase of public awareness &amp; understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Mitigation Planning</strong></td>
<td>• Ensure 80 percent of the U.S. population (excluding territories) is covered by a Local or Tribal hazard mitigation plan that is approved or approvable pending adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead effective engagement in Mitigation Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Digital Platform</strong></td>
<td>• Percent of Local hazard mitigation plans approved using quality Risk MAP data or better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an enhanced digital platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Synergize Programs</strong></td>
<td>• Establish a culture of continuous improvement and executing projects aimed at reducing process cycle time and improving the quality of Risk MAP products and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align Risk Analysis programs and develop synergies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMA**

**Risk MAP**
Traditional products are regulatory and subject to statutory due-process requirements.

Risk MAP products are non-regulatory and are not subject to statutory due-process requirements.
FEMA Flood Mapping Budgets
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Funding
The Dilemma:

How do you meet these metrics with increased standards and decreased funding?!?!

- Alabama CTP funding mirrors National Funding Trends
- More products required (Risk MAP datasets)
- More stringent requirements from a technical

We’ll take a step by step view through the Risk MAP process at ways to potentially do more with less.
Pre-Project Scoping/Planning:

Before the Project Begins:

- Where do we need a study? (Sequencing priority)
- Where can a study be performed with limited budget and still make a difference?
- Local partnerships available in acquiring base data?
- Leverage Studies?
Surveying:

When doing new hydraulic studies, do we need traditional survey?

- Traditional Survey can be very labor intensive ($$$)
- Sometimes Survey is valid for areas where streams themselves are invalid.
- Potential Alternatives
  - As-Builts (from communities/DOTs)
  - HEC-2/effective model geometry
- Local Participation (survey labor, in-kind services from local communities)
Hydrology:

What type of study do we need? (In order of cost)

- Verify effective flows
- Regression
- Gage/Regression
- Watershed Model (HEC-HMS)
Hydraulics:

- Do we need a study?
- LDS vs. Detailed
- To Floodway or Not to Floodway
- Leverage, Leverage, Leverage
- Targeted Scopes of Work
Enjoy your night in Seattle!
Questions or Comments?

Jason.Wilson@amec.com