

**Association of State FloodPlain Managers**  
**2809 Fish Hatchery Road, Madison, WI 53713**  
**Phone: 608-274-0123 Fax: 274-0696**  
**Website: [www.floods.org](http://www.floods.org) Email: [asfpm@floods.org](mailto:asfpm@floods.org)**

Conference Call: State Business Plan Work Group

Subject: State, local and Regional Government Involvement in Flood Map  
Modernization

Date: November 24, 2003

Participants: Bill Nechamen-NY, Alan Lulloff-WI, Mark Ogden-OH, Jim Williams-NE, Brian  
Hyde-CO, Bill DeGroot-Denver UDFCD, Tom Christensen-CA, Mark Riebau,  
ASFPM

**I. Conference Call Summary for November 10, 2003**

Accepted without change.

*ACTION ITEM 1: Post November 10, 2003 Conference Call Summary on ASFPM Website*

**II. Meeting with FEMA December 9-11, 2003**

Arrangements have been made for members of the Work Group to meet with FEMA in Chicago on December 9. Alan Lulloff and Mark Riebau have been invited to make a short presentation on "ASFPM Approach to State/Local Business Plans Regarding Mapping and Floodplain Management." Issues that need to be discussed as part of ASFPM's presentation include:

- Scoping of FIS - time consuming and expensive.
- Performance measures - we need to develop a series of performance measures that FEMA can reference and support.
- Authorities and legal requirements vary greatly from state to state - how is FEMA dealing with those differences?
- Some non-state CTPs are unsure how they fit into State Business Plans. In addition, they would like to continue to receive funds directly from FEMA and not have the funding to them go through the state. They feel another layer of bureaucracy would be problematic and indicated that, in some states, contracting procedures are extremely cumbersome. Some states – particularly states that agree to take on complete oversight – are concerned that state review authority and higher standards could be bypassed in the process. The ASFPM presentation in Chicago should include a discussion on Federal/State/Regional/Local responsibilities and authorities.
- Clarify what legal requirement exists for 25% non-federal match under CAP-MAP.
- What use, if any, is being made of the implementation plans developed by each state in 2002? If not being used, why not? Each state should include their FY02 Map Modernization Implementation Plan as an appendix in their business plan.
- It is unclear as to how the ASFPM resolution on mapping is being addressed in the Map Mod initiative. Though the ASFPM mapping resolution was provided to FEMA before the business plan guidance was finalized; the final guidance did not include minimum quality standards suggested by the ASFPM resolution. It was suggested that each state reference the ASFPM mapping resolution.

Discussion:

Some felt that states that actively participate in Map Mod will essentially "pay to play." There is little financial incentive for states to do any more than what they have historically done under the NFIP due to FEMA's requirement for a 25% state match. Any additional responsibilities states take on may cost the state more than FEMA will compensate for, and is not provide the state with any increased influence on establishing priorities for studies. The benefits and costs associated with becoming an active partner in Map Mod, and post-Map Mod for long term maintenance, must be carefully defined and articulated. Virtually every state is suffering from severe budget shortfalls. Taking on new, unfunded responsibilities will be a very difficult "sell." Incentives to states to encourage active state participation need to be identified.

*ACTION ITEM 2: The work group should provide suggested performance measures that can be used to measure success under the Flood Map Modernization Initiative.*

*ACTION ITEM 3. Alan and Mark will prepare a draft power point presentation for the Chicago meeting that will be provided to the work group by December 4, 2003.*

III. ACTION ITEMS from Previous Conference Calls:  
*November 10, 2003*

- 1). Work Group to provide comments on comprehensive list of activities  
A suggestion was made that "Contracting: Solicitation, Award, and Management" be moved higher (possibly first) on the list. The list will be updated and resent to the work group.
- 2) Work Group to provide comments on the following four elements or categories of information to be provided by FEMA: (a) Definition of quality "baseline;" (b) Comprehensive list of Flood Map Mod activities; (c) A vision statement for the national program; (d) An inventory of data sets needed.  
General concurrence item (b) (see #1 above). No comments yet received on (a), (c) and (d). Note: Alan provided copies of the email wherein ASFPM requested certain information from FEMA.
- 3) Work Group to provide comments on report outline  
General concurrence that the outline is very complete.
- 4) North Carolina to provide metrics for Map Mod received from FEMA Reg. IV  
Not yet received from North Carolina. FEMA presented a power point at the NAFSMA meeting in Chicago that included the new performance metrics.
- 5) ASFPM to seek electronic copy of "North Carolina Floodplain Management Reference Manual" and forward to Work Group  
Not yet obtained
- 6) (A) Each Work Group member to provide copy of draft "vision statement" to ASFPM;  
(B) ASFPM to combine into collage and make available on website  
Draft vision statements have been submitted by Arkansas, Oklahoma, Washington and the Denver UDFCD.

It was agreed that vision statements would be brought by all members of the Work Group to Chicago and incorporated into a draft report.

*October 29, 2003*

- 1) Documents collected by "Building State Capacity" subcommittee to be sent to ASFPM to be redistributed to Work Group.  
Brian will bring the document to Chicago.
- 2) Conversion of memo regarding FEMA's responsibility for mapping flood hazard areas to a "stand alone" document that can be referenced in State Business Plans.  
In progress
- 3) Review question raised in FEMA's PowerPoint Presentation regarding Map Mod.

- Completed
- 4) ASFPM to resend "list of activities" to work group and consolidate comments.  
Completed
  - 5) ASFPM to contact GAO and advise them of Work Group initiation.  
Completed

*October 15, 2003*

There are no outstanding ACTION ITEMS.

#### **IV. Cost Estimating for State Business Plans**

The question of what to use to develop estimates of cost for State Business Plans was revisited. One person commented that many of the Implementation Plans developed in 2002 had estimates of cost and they might be a good source. Another commented that the FEMA's "Blue Book" is being used by many states already, and perhaps should be used by all for consistency. Yet others commented that the "Blue Book" numbers yield a very high estimate, particularly if used in less urbanized states.

The general consensus was, lacking any other source of data, FEMA's "Blue Book" should be used, but a database should be developed so that in the future better estimates will be possible.

#### **V. Measurements**

DHS has required FEMA to adopt performance-based management systems for all programs. Consequently, FEMA is developing metrics, or measurements, against which the performance of Map Mod will be evaluated.

States will need to develop means of measuring performance in carrying out Map Mod and, post-Map Mod, for the long-term maintenance of flood maps. Some possible "metrics" that have been suggested include:

1. Map all streams within the state with drainage area of 1 sq. mile or more;
2. Study by detailed methods all streams that flow in or through incorporated communities;
3. Assure the flood elevations and floodplain delineations correlate reasonably to the best available topographic information for the stream and adjacent corridor;
4. Assure the planimetric features on the maps (streets, highways, stream centerlines, bridges, corporate limits, section lines, etc.) correlate reasonably to the best available aerial photos or other suitable imagery;
5. The flood hydrology used to develop the floodplain map must still reasonably reflect the flood hazard and meet pertinent local, regional, state and federal technical standards.

One person commented that the scope of what needs to be mapped within a state needs to be defined by the state and local governments. It was also suggested that FEMA's metrics should include:

1. The number of states that take on an active role in Map Mod; and
2. The creation of an organization similar to the Technical Mapping Advisory Council.

*ACTION ITEM 4: (A) Develop list of metrics for inclusion in state business plans; and (B) Develop list of metrics for FEMA to adopt for Map Mod and long-term map maintenance.*