

Association of State FloodPlain Managers

2809 Fish Hatchery Road, Madison, WI 53713

Phone: 608-274-0123 Fax: 274-0696

Website: www.floods.org Email: asfpm@floods.org

Meeting: FEMA and ASFPM

Subject: Map Modernization

Dates: December 9-11, 2003

Location: Chicago, Illinois

FEMA held a meeting in Chicago with headquarters staff, representatives of all ten regional offices, and the selected National Service Provider, Michael Baker. There were approximately 130 people in attendance at the meeting.

ASFPM's State Business Plan Work Group was invited to participate in the meeting on Tuesday. In addition, the Work Group was provided space at Region V's office to hold a face-to-face meeting on Wednesday. ASFPM was also asked to report back to FEMA on the Work Group's progress on Thursday morning.

The following is a summary of the discussions that took place in Chicago.

Tuesday December 9th

The Tuesday morning session was essentially an overview of FEMA's goals and expectations of Map Mod and the Performance metrics that have been established. Presentations were made by Anthony Lowe, Ed Buikema, Director-Region V, and Mike Howard of FEMA. Presentations were also made by Roslyn Trojan, Vice President, Baker and Betty Sandbeck, IBM, one of Baker's key subconsultants, describing their vision of how the MOD, or "Mapping On Demand," team will work. It was noted that one performance measurement for the National Service Provider will be enabling partners to succeed.

Goals for Map Mod include:

For FY2004

- 20% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 10% of population (as represented by communities) has adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 20% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

For FY2005

- 50% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 20% of population (as represented by communities) have adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 25% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

For FY2006

- 65% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 35% of population (as represented by communities) have adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 35% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

For FY 2007

- 75% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 50% of population (as represented by communities) have adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 45% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

For FY 2008

- 85% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 70% of population (as represented by communities) have adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 50% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

And, for FY 2009

- 100% of population (as represented by communities) have digital GIS flood data available on-line.
- 90% of population (as represented by communities) have adopted maps.
- 20% leveraged effort toward digital GIS flood data.
- 60% of Map Mod. (appropriated) \$ put through to Cooperating Technical Partners (State and local).

The metrics offer reason to be both concerned and optimistic. The heavy emphasis on population may well result in spending too much effort and funds on developed areas, rather than on unmapped but developing areas where maps will do the most good to guide new development. On the other hand, the focus to continually increase spending on state and local CTPs should help build capacity.

Betty Sandbeck stated that the five-year plan implementation plan will include information from

the 2002 State Implementation Plans.

There was considerable mention of quality assurance and quality control in a general sense, but little mention of QA/QC in relation to best available topographic information.

All ongoing work being performed by the current Map Coordination Contractors will be transitioned to the National Service Provider within 6 months of contract award. They are taking steps to assure that "no (ongoing) study is left behind." Jim Murphy, Baker, noted the NSP plans to participate in scoping meetings for all new study starts.

The afternoon session began with a presentation by Mary Anne Lyle regarding the risk communication strategy. The firm of JWT has been retained to help develop a marketing strategy for sale of flood insurance.

ASFPM presented a brief status report on the progress of the State Business Plan Work Group and offered suggestions for FEMA to consider for different measurements of Map Mod success. We suggested that it was as important to focus on unmapped flood hazard areas that are not yet developed as it was to re-map areas that have already been developed. We also provided copies of the resolution passed by the ASFPM Board in St. Louis as a reminder that "quality" must be considered more important than "quantity." Some excellent examples from Colorado, North Carolina and Wisconsin were presented that clearly demonstrated the value in comparing the digitized floodplain limits to the best available topographic maps. (Note: A copy of the power point presentation is posted on ASFPM web site under the Mapping & Engineering Standards and project pages.)

ASFPM was asked what FEMA could do to encourage states to take an active role. It is recognized that some states are willing and able, but others either can't or are not interested. Taking an active role in Map Mod is viewed by some as "paying to play" since there is little financial incentive. State's costs are not 100% funded by FEMA. Further, states that have taken an active role don't seem to have had much influence on establishing study priorities. ASFPM responded that finding incentives for states and local government to participate in Map Mod and long-term map maintenance was FEMA's biggest challenge.

Regions III, IV, VI and IX all gave presentations on their progress on developing their Regional Business Plans. There were some striking differences in approach, but also some very similar concerns expressed. One presenter commented that he had the following concerns:

- the distribution of funds between Regions
- the accuracy of the flood data
- the focus on population, particularly when development is occurring in un-mapped flood hazard areas that are not the focus of Map Mod
- development behind levees that fail to meet current design criteria
- that 3 out of 4 states in their region can't participate in Map Mod due to lack of resources
- the need to train communities in the use of GIS to be able to make the most of the digital data that will soon be available

Region IV indicated they are putting their energy and resources into building state and local capability. They are "gambling" that states and local government will be able to take on a meaningful role, not only in Map Mod for the next 5 years, but also in a long-term map maintenance role.

They also noted that the emphasis on population was driving their decisions for funding priorities. Because of the decisions they made in FY03, before the metrics were adopted, they will be forced to focus on digital conversions of existing maps.

Region IV stated their business plan objectives are:

1. Build state and local capabilities through the CTP program
2. Meet the national performance metrics to assure continued funding
3. Transition from being "project" managers to becoming "program" managers

Wednesday, December 10th

On Wednesday the ASFPM State Business Plan Work Group met at the Region V offices. Participating in the meeting were Bill Nechamen, Lisa Jones, Alan Lulloff, Mark Ogden, Jim Williams, Brian Hyde, Bill DeGroot, Tom Christensen and Mark Riebau.

The Work Group focussed on the following issues:

- Defining the deliverable to FEMA
- Outline of report
- Assignment of writing tasks
- Agreement on timeline.
- Identify potential incentives for states to assume an active role in Map Mod and map maintenance

The "deliverables" identified in the Cooperative Agreement are:

- Recommendations for improvements to the "State Business Plan Template" for future use
- Participate in the development of state 5 year business plans for managing components of Map Mod
- Create and distribute material to educate and support members to develop business plans

It was agreed the report outline drafted by Jim Williams would form the basis of the Work Group's report to FEMA. Each member of the Work Group volunteered to write one or more sections of the report and mid-January was the agreed upon deadline for submission of the initial drafts. The intent is to complete the report, and make it available on ASFPM's website, by the end of January so all states could refer to it in the development of their business plan. The Work Group also discussed incentives that FEMA could offer to encourage states to take an active role in Map Mod and the long-term maintenance of the maps.

Thursday, December 11th

On Thursday morning Alan Lulloff, Chair of the Mapping and Engineering Standards Committee and Mark Riebau, ASFPM Project Manager, were asked to report to FEMA on the Work Groups progress.

Alan and Mark reported that the Work Group is making progress. A draft report will be developed by mid-January and the final work group report will be submitted to FEMA, and posted on ASFPM's website, by the end of January. ASFPM reiterated its concern that the heavy emphasis on population will result in missing the opportunity to map developing, but not yet

developed, flood hazards.

The major points were:

Quality:

- Use good data
- Match floodplain boundaries to best available topography
- If there is no change, don't change the date of the map, and don't require communities to adopt a digital version of the map they are already referencing

Completeness:

- Map the un-mapped flood hazard areas before they are developed
- Recognize the costs may exceed the current estimates to achieve complete mapping

How to measure success

- The number of states and local agencies taking an active part in map maintenance 10 years from now

Suggestions were also provided for incentives that FEMA could put consider that might encourage states and local government to take an active role in map maintenance and updating.

The suggestions included:

- Delegate the authority to maintain the maps, along with the necessary funding, similar to the EPA delegation of authority for the water quality program; (funds are distributed based on a formula of population and stream miles)
- Decrease/increase flood insurance rates in proportion to the states' contribution toward the mapping program. (Since map maintenance costs are paid for out of insurance premiums the cost savings realized by the program should be passed on to the states that take an active role. Alternatively, insurance rates should be higher in states that don't contribute)
- Delegate the authority for setting study priorities to states that take an active role.
- Limit the sale of flood insurance to only those areas mapped as SFHA by FEMA.

In closing, we expressed our appreciation for the opportunity to participate in FEMA's Map Mod Regional Conference, the opportunity to meet as a group, and the hospitality afforded us by Region V.

Mary Jean Pajak and Mike Howard, FEMA-Washington discussed work load projections and staffing needs analysis for the program overall. Activities associated with Map Mod at both Regional and Headquarters levels include: Program leadership; technical and engineering support; hazard mitigation planning/compliance activities; stakeholder engagement; customer service; program management; project management; oversight of contracts; and oversight of grants and cooperative agreements.

END