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Interagency Approach: Silver Jackets

• State-Led Teams (Voice of our Customers)
  - States set priorities for coordinated interagency Federal support

• Interagency Method of Delivery
  - Collaboration across agencies / levels of government
  - Universal / Tailorable for all Agencies / Programs
  - Leverage resources: talent, data, funding

• Continuous, not project-specific

• Life-Cycle Risk Management

As of April 2015

Active Interagency FRM Team (SJ)
Ongoing Effort to Develop Team

Partners

U.S. Army
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Initial “Pilot” Projects

- Recognized success of Silver Jackets teams in leveraging multiple agency resources to implement sound flood risk management
- Acknowledged that gaps still existed
- Offered limited funding to leverage efficacy of Silver Jackets approach, facilitate interagency flood risk management

- **Goals:**
  - Collaboration
  - Interagency effort
  - Implementing state mitigation plans
  - Facilitating integrated flood risk management solutions

- 18 “pilot” projects initiated FY11-12
Interagency Projects Today

- 138 interagency projects initiated in 42 states/DC:
  - 18 Silver Jackets “Pilots” (FY11-12)
  - 21 Flood Risk Management Projects (FPMS)
  - 12 Levee Safety Projects (FCCE)
  - 83 Interagency Nonstructural Projects (FPMS)
  - 4 Other (2 general Silver Jackets support through NFRMP, 2 FCCE)
  - Silver Jackets is primary vehicle (133 of 138)

- Criteria for initiating projects:
  - Supports state priority in flood risk management
  - Leverages partner resources
  - Will demonstrate tangible benefits

![Interagency Projects Initiated (by FY)](chart.png)
USACE Interagency Project Funding

**Funds ($k)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funds (k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16*</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budgeted amount*
Goal and Selection Criteria

**Goal:** Promote participation by USACE staff in small interagency projects undertaken in conjunction with other partners to achieve flood risk management benefits that could not be achieved by one party alone.

**Selection Criteria:**

1. Directly protects life safety, reduces or stems increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency; or reduces future expenditures
2. Promotes shared responsibility
3. Addresses priority in State or Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
4. Leverages partner resources AND is completed in collaboration with partners
5. Increases innovation in evaluating nonstructural benefits, and/or advances development of policy, including non-monetary benefits
Goal and Selection Criteria

**Goal:** Promote participation by USACE staff in small interagency projects undertaken in conjunction with other partners to achieve flood risk management benefits that could not be achieved by one party alone.

**Selection Criteria:**

1. Directly protects life safety, reduces or stems increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency; or reduces future expenditures.
2. Promotes shared responsibility.
3. Addresses priority in State or Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.
4. Leverages partner resources AND is completed in collaboration with partners.
5. Increases innovation in evaluating nonstructural benefits, and/or advances development of policy, including non-monetary benefits.
Demonstrable Outcomes

- **Selection Criterion 1**: Directly protects life safety, reduces or stems increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency; or reduces future expenditures

- **Seeking**:
  - Progression from assessment and awareness, through action, to **reduced risk**
  - Progression from what **COULD** happen to specific changes that **WILL** result (upfront project scoping engagement, including with those who have decision authority, helps ensure specific action)
  - Maximized project impact (measurable benefits)

*26% of projects*  
*20% of projects*  
*54% of projects*

*Highest level of progression achieved/committed, per internal review
Demonstrable Outcomes

- **Selection Criterion 1:** Directly protects life safety, reduces or stems increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency; or reduces future expenditures

- **Distinguishing Factors:**
  - Describing how partners are committed to permanently removing existing structures from harm’s way
  - Describing how community action – or commitment to action – is tied to specific reduction in flood risk or flood-related expenditures
  - Using multiple partners’ programs in combination to achieve a greater, or more likely, reduction in flood risk or flood-related expenditures
  - Specific identification of who plans to take action to achieve a result
  - Unique proposals with outcomes suitable for wider application and a clear means for achieving that wider application
Demonstrable Outcomes

- **Selection Criterion 1:** Directly protects life safety, reduces or stems increases in loss of property, and/or increases resiliency; or reduces future expenditures

- **Examples:**
  - Community adopted new ordinance for new buildings: BFE plus 2 ft (KS)
  - Tribe requested assistance in starting first tribal Hazard Mitigation Plan (NV)
  - Local landowner removed berm that was cutting off conveyance/floodplain, lowering flood heights and reconnecting habitat (NE)
Shared Responsibility

- **Selection Criterion 2:** Promotes shared responsibility

- **Distinguishing Factors:**
  - Identifying who will be engaged – in conducting the project, and post-project
  - Describing how locals will be involved in project outcomes – with specific anticipated actions by identified partners (as opposed to general possible actions that might be taken)
  - Recognizing appropriate role of other agencies, and describing how those agencies will fulfill those roles in conjunction with role by USACE
  - Describing how more information-oriented outcomes will be communicated to those capable of taking subsequent action (including public outreach)
Leveraging

- **Selection Criterion 4:** Leverages partner resources AND is completed in collaboration with partners

- Leveraging resources allows more comprehensive solutions in flood risk management
  - Interagency projects leverage partner resources; no single agency has sufficient funds or authority to manage flood risk alone
  - Resources: funds or in-kind services
  - USACE funding is not a grant: combines USACE labor with partner programs to achieve a greater whole
  - Leveraging demonstrates commitment of all partners to managing/reducing flood risk collaboratively

*Each dollar invested by USACE leverages nearly another dollar from project partners*
Leveraging

- **Selection Criterion 4:** Leverages partner resources AND is completed in collaboration with partners

- **Distinguishing Factors:**
  - Describing specific partner roles/tasks in conducting the project
  - Framing significant partner contributions to conducting the project (including but not limited to funding)
### PENNSYLVANIA
#### Harrisburg Flood Inundation Mapping Interagency Project

**Project Description**
- Flood inundation mapping tool to inform the general public, local officials, and emergency managers of risk associated with a flood event.
- Inundation map library covers 20 miles along the Susquehanna River - communities 10 miles upstream and 10 miles downstream of the City of Harrisburg.
- The maps are tied to the NWS's flood forecast point.
- Map library is being displayed digitally on various map viewer websites.

**Flood Risk Reduction Benefits**
- Flood-inundation maps:
  - Provide expected extent of flooding relative to select stages/flows at the USGS stream gauge and associated flood depth.
  - Emergency managers use this mapping to coordinate evacuation, road closures, and the shutting down of power grids.
  - Local outreach conducted to inform and educate the public on how to use this data to make informed decisions about threat to life and property. Specifically, elevate valuables, move vehicles, prepare to evacuate and other preparations.

### Challenges Overcome / Continuing Challenges
- Map Viewers
  - Deciding which map viewers to load maps onto.
  - Learning the requirements for each viewer.
  - Funding for each viewer.
  - Deciding which to provide outreach materials for.
- Outreach
  - Ensuring public is aware of and can easily use map viewers, and understand accuracy of the maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>$117K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS/Harrisburg Authority</td>
<td>$25K in-kind plus $25K match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRBC</td>
<td>$30K In-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWS</td>
<td>$30K In-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>$10K In-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEMA</td>
<td>$10K In-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$247,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Successes/Best Practices
- Multiple agencies brought diverse knowledge, expertise, and resources.
- Good, timely data collection (thanks USGS!!) and model calibration were key.
- Outreach was an important component.

**Project Point of Contact**
- Stacey Underwood
- USACE Baltimore District

---

BUILDING STRONG®
## Interagency Flood Risk Management Project Proposal Template

### Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Project Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Intergency Team Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If not a formally recognized team, list participating organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Intergency POC:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include name and title.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Project Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe what the issues are, how the projects would address those issues in no more than 200 words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Leveraged Funding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any proposal must include a table quantifying leveraged resources invested by others for the project, including other federal, state, regional, or local funds. Federal project funding may not be used for construction; any construction must be funded by partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anticipated Outcomes of Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Anticipated Outcomes of Proposed Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manages Flood Risk:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life safety, reduction of property loss, increased resiliency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in Actions by Others:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results in Reduced Future Expenditures:

### Funding Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Funding Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please specify all information required to create a MOU (funding will be disbursed by FY15). Note maximum request of $100K FMAP funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Amount</th>
<th>Technical POC</th>
<th>Financial POC</th>
<th>Organization Code</th>
<th>Breakdown of Costs (Time, Contract services, Travel, etc)</th>
<th>Expected Delivery of Funds (Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Early construction proposal only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachments Reminder:

A letter of support is required from either a state lead of the Silver Jackets team or study partner indicating that the project is a state priority and describing: 1) how the proposal helps achieve state or community goals, 2) the role the state or partner anticipates taking in the conduct of the project, and 3) the state or partner’s ongoing commitment to long-term outcomes. Maps or other graphics may be included as well. Please select yes or no as to whether you have included a support letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Additional Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert comments here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline / Process

**June 23:**
- Early consideration proposals due
- Submit through USACE District/Division

**July funding**
- (FY15 funds)

**Aug 10:**
- General consideration proposals due
- Submit through USACE District/Division

**Oct funding**
- (FY16 funds)
- No delay or interruption in study executing during continuing resolution

Resubmission possible
Questions?