FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION UPDATE

The importance of assessing the validity of flood hazard designations on effective flood maps has been reinforced by the catastrophic floods of the last several years. The National Flood Insurance Program’s flood hazard mapping program, which produces the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) that guide floodplain management and help establish flood insurance rates, undertook in 2003 a multi-year initiative to modernize the nation’s flood maps. As the Map Modernization initiative reached its midway point last year, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) deliberatively assessed the course it was taking, in response to those catastrophic floods and to input from the its stakeholders, including Congress, the U.S. Government Accountability Office, and the Department of Homeland Security’s Inspector General [see News & Views, June 2006, p. 1]. As a result FEMA has made some shifts in the initiative’s direction, articulated in Flood Map Modernization Mid-Course Adjustment [available at http://www.fema.gov/pdf/fhm/mm_mca.pdf].

The Multi-Year Flood Hazard Identification Plan (MHIP) is FEMA’s detailed plan for setting priorities for modernizing maps nationwide. It is revised annually and includes (as Appendix A) the schedule for producing and delivering flood maps. Version 2.0 of the MHIP, issued in September 2006) reflects the Mid-Course Adjustment by establishing increased flexibility in setting priorities for map modernization and in focusing resources on areas of the country where flood risk is the highest. The result of this will be that areas of high flood risk (generally those counties or parts of counties with high-density population and/or high growth rates) will receive more attention and areas where flood risk is the lowest will be deferred. Appendix A of the new MHIP has been partially shaped by the shift in direction; however, as with any plan, individual flood map update details may change. The 60-day comment period for MHIP Version 2.0 gives flood mapping stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback on the revised Flood Map Modernization plan. Mapping partners that participate in the business planning process, including states, commonwealths, territories, and some Cooperating Technical Partners, will have the opportunity and flexibility to request additional changes to the flood map update sequencing through the FY07 State Business Plans, which are administered through the FEMA Regional Offices.

This version of the MHIP also frames the path for potential changes in the new Floodplain Boundary Standard (adopted in 2005), which requires that the mapping technician use the best available topographic data to determine an accurate boundary for the floodplain, rather than simply transferring the boundary from a paper map to a digital one. To improve adherence to the Floodplain Boundary Standard, FEMA is instituting an “audit” procedure by which the accuracy of the delineation on DFRMS in preparation is assured. This procedure is outlined in the draft document, Flood Map Modernization Floodplain Boundary Standard Audit Procedures, dated June 9, 2006. It includes self-certification by mapping partners that their products meet the standard, along with procedures for selecting products for audit, determining whether the standard has been met, and remedying maps that are found not to meet the standard. The Association of State Floodplain Managers’ Mapping [continued on page 14]
from the Chair

Pamela Mayer Pogue, CFM

Okay, so I made one trip to the beach. I probably would have had better luck had I set my sights on visiting beaches up and down the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts rather than the six-mile drive to my favorite Rhode Island piece of shoreline. August was very productive (so much for the Dogs Days of Summer!). I had the pleasure of visiting the NOAA Coastal Services Center in Charleston to meet with the staff of their Coastal Hazards Division. This meeting was extremely insightful as the Center staff showcased for us many of the projects they are pursuing in which ASFPM could partner and from which our members and coastal communities would benefit. The top of the agenda, of course, is providing training using the Coastal NAI Handbook. The staff at the Center is energetic and eager to work with us to provide training to the professionals in the field of both coastal zone management and floodplain management. This will continue to provide an excellent opportunity to strengthen the connections between these fields.

Just as exciting, I was invited by the FEMA insurance “side of the house” to attend a planning meeting for next year’s National Flood Conference. Many thanks to Ed Pasterick and his staff for including the ASFPM in this effort. For the first time, next year’s National Flood Conference (to be held in early May 2007 in Denver) will offer a CFM® prep course and exam. Additionally, there will be an “ASFPM Issues” track during one full day of the conference. The Planning Committee is also enthusiastically reaching out to the Colorado Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Managers to host sessions as well. It would be beneficial to both the insurance industry and their local chapters if the National Flood Conference group were to reach out to state flood mitigation chapters and associations and State NFIP Coordinators. We hope to develop a similar track for the insurance industry in Norfolk next year. We can pull together the mitigation and insurance issues!

Immediately after that came an opportunity to be part of the team of instructors for the Advanced Floodplain Management Concepts (E191) course at the Emergency Management Institute in Emmitsburg, Maryland. Not only was the class spectacular, but also I was impressed with how well the course was put together and want to relay special appreciation to Tom Hirt, who advocated relentlessly for No Adverse Impact floodplain management and for the ASFPM. A plus from the course was the discussion among participants of how they address the various issues of the NFIP within their states and communities. I strongly recommend taking this course at EMI. A word of advice, however: If you do get the opportunity to team instruct, never miss a conference call, even if you are at 32,000 feet.

September brought trips to San Antonio, Texas; Boston, Massachusetts; and Glenwood Springs, Colorado. I finally had the pleasure to attend the National Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Management Agencies (NAFSMA) annual meeting in Texas. Susan Gilson, Executive Director, and that group have long been strong allies of ASFPM in issues including Map Modernization, levees, and support to the U.S. Geological Survey for the National Streamgage Program. In mid-September I spoke about the levee issue at the annual meeting of the Association of State Dam Safety Officials in Boston. Most of the subsequent discussion focused not just on the need for a National Levee Safety Program, but also on the conviction that such a levee program should not be an exact mirror of the Dam Safety Program because improvements need to be made. Many folks approached me afterwards and were very complimentary of the ASFPM and voiced strong interest in forming closer alliances between our two organizations.

My final act in September was attendance at the annual meeting of the Colorado Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Managers (CAFSM). As usual I learned a great deal from this group. First, I was impressed by their project competitions and presentations during one of the sessions of the conference. These presentations are very creative and the projects are fantastic. Most meetings
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Gilbert F. White
1911–2006

The father of floodplain management, Gilbert Fowler White, died on October 5 at his home overlooking Boulder Creek in Boulder, Colorado.

White, the Gustavson Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Geography at the University of Colorado since 1980, was a widely known and much-loved figure in geography, public policy, floodplain management, water resources, and environmental initiatives worldwide.

Born November 26, 1911 in Hyde Park, Illinois, White reportedly became interested in human-environment interaction during summers spent at a family ranch in Wyoming. He received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from the University of Chicago, and his 1942 doctoral dissertation, Human Adjustment to Floods, has been called the most influential ever written by an American geographer. “Floods are ‘acts of God,’” he wrote, “but flood losses are largely acts of man.”

Throughout his career, White championed the sound, comprehensive management of floodplains and the adoption of a broad range of adjustments to floods. He advocated adaptation to or accommodation of flood hazards rather than the structural flood control measures that dominated federal policy in the early 20th century.

He was instrumental in the investigations and reports that preceded the passage of the 1968 National Flood Insurance Act, and maintained a vigilant watch on the unfolding of the massive, multi-layered framework of flood loss reduction, insurance, and mitigation actions that sprang from that Act.

In the 1970s he foresaw the critical role that state governments could play in floodplain management and lent his guidance and support to the fledgling Association of State Floodplain Managers, participating in its activities whenever possible and offering criticism as well as praise for its efforts. “Over the years,” ASFPM Executive Larry Larson says, “Gilbert was a guiding force for all of the Association’s missions. His vision for wise use of floodplains and his persistence in working toward that—and his insistence that all the rest of us do so, too—was absolutely invaluable.”

In 1985, the ASFPM named in White’s honor what was to become its most prestigious award. The Goddard-White Award has been conferred to just 17 individuals since then, in recognition of exemplary achievements towards sensible floodplain management in the vein contemplated by White.

White was an inaugural trustee of the ASFPM Foundation, established in 1996 as an incubator for research and education that promotes wise floodplain management. The Foundation sponsors the Gilbert F. White National Flood Policy Forum, which periodically convenes the field’s scientists and experts to consider and explore pressing policy issues.

Less well-known to floodplain managers were White’s major contributions to the study of water systems in developing countries, the management and preservation of arid lands, global environmental change, international cooperation on water resources issues in such areas as the Mekong Delta and the Middle East, nuclear winter, geography education, the management of nuclear waste, and the mitigation of a wide range of natural hazards.

White was a member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 2000, he was presented the National Medal of Science by President William J. Clinton. He received dozens of awards and honors and was the author of hundreds of papers, articles, reports, and books.

White’s long and productive life is ably chronicled in Living with Nature’s Extremes, by Robert E. Hinshaw, published this past spring by Johnson Books. Copies can be obtained through the ASFPM at http://www.floods.org/TheOrganization/GFW_Bio.asp.

White is survived by his second wife, Claire Sheridan; by his children William White of Ithaca, New York; Mary White of Boulder, Colorado; and Frances Chapin of Edmonds, Washington; stepchildren Monika Profitt of Seattle and Daniel Profitt of Boulder, Colorado; and four grandchildren. His first wife, Anne Elizabeth Underwood, died in 1989.

Donations may be made in White’s memory to the ASFPM Foundation for a special memorial fund for continuing work on flood policy through http://www.floods.org/Foundatio...Fndtn_Pledge_Form.pdf. Donations also may be made to the CU Foundation at the University of Colorado for the Gilbert F. White Graduate Fellowship Endowment via diane.smith@colorado.edu.
MORE FROM FEMA ON COASTAL CONSTRUCTION

Two new documents on coastal construction were issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency this summer.

*Recommended Residential Construction for the Gulf Coast: Building on Strong and Safe Foundations* is a manual that gives homebuilders, contractors, and local engineering professionals a series of recommended foundation designs that, although not wholly traditional, are considered to be some of the better approaches to constructing strong and safe foundations in the hazardous areas along the Gulf Coast. The goal was to offer residential foundation designs that would require minimal engineering oversight and that would be flexible enough to accommodate many of the homes identified in *A Pattern Book for Gulf Coast Neighborhoods*, prepared for the Mississippi Governor’s Rebuilding Commission on Recovery, Rebuilding and Renewal.

The manual contains closed foundation designs for elevating homes up to 8 feet above ground level and open foundation designs for elevating homes up to 15 feet above ground level. It also covers the types of hazards that must be considered when building in the area, how to determine the magnitude of the loads placed on a building by one or a combination of hazards, the different foundation types and methods of construction for residential buildings, and diagrams of foundation designs. A series of appendixes provides examples of how the foundation designs can be used; lists of the assumptions made in developing the foundation designs presented; detailed calculations on how to design the foundations for residential buildings (with examples), information for homebuilders to use to estimate installation costs; and additional resources for more information.


*Hurricane Katrina in the Gulf Coast: Building Performance Observations, Recommendations, and Technical Guidance* is the report of a Mitigation Assessment Team deployed by FEMA to Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi to assess damage caused by Hurricane Katrina. The team reports that Katrina tested building performance by causing substantial flood damage over large areas of the coastal zones of the three states. Destructive flood conditions included storm surge, wave action, erosive forces, flood-borne debris, and long-duration flooding. The flood conditions of Katrina exceeded flood depths and loads used in building design. Although it was less significant than the flood damage, widespread wind damage also occurred even though the wind speeds were generally at or below the building code design standard. Roof coverings, in particular, performed poorly. Poor performance of critical and essential facilities was widespread, most of it due to storm surge.

Base flood elevations were exceeded in many areas, and often by many feet, because they were set based on storm history prepared in the early 1980s and because many areas were “protected” by levees and the elevations there were set based only on expected interior precipitation and accumulation, not on what would occur if the levee were to fail. The length of time in which floodwaters stayed in place in parts of New Orleans saturated building materials and caused further damage. Many affected communities had not adopted up-to-date model buildings codes or had no building codes at all.

The team makes numerous detailed technical recommendations for improving building performance, including adopting modern building codes at state and local levels, applying existing design and construction techniques known to reduce damage, mapping Coastal A Zones onto new Flood Insurance Rate Maps, siting critical facilities outside the 500-year floodplain, evaluating flood and wind resistance of existing facilities, and using modern storm surge data to revise base flood elevations throughout the area.

KATRINA, ONE YEAR AFTER

One year after the calamity, Hurricane Katrina is still the focus of discussions on floodplain management, insurance, loss mitigation, disaster response and recovery, sustainable rebuilding, and many other issues. A number of reports have been issued at the anniversary of the storm, looking back at what has already been accomplished and forward to what remains to be done, not only in onsite recovery but also in applying Katrina’s lessons to public policy.

One such report, One Year After Katrina: Progress Report on Recovery, Rebuilding and Renewal, outlines Mississippi’s efforts and major accomplishments in recovery during the past year. It explains actions taken and funds used to confront recovery problems in categories such as housing, public infrastructure, economic development, human services, public safety, and environmental restoration and natural storm defenses. A discussion of initial efforts and important next steps is also included. It was issued by Governor Haley Barbour’s Recovery Commission and can be accessed at http://governorbarbour.com/recovery/documents/oneyearafterkatrina.pdf.

An article released by the Sun News and Wire Service illustrates a situation now confronting thousands of people in the Gulf Coast area—even some not affected by the hurricane. The cost of flood insurance may end up either driving people out of the higher risk areas or inducing them to take sometimes-expensive mitigation measures. According to the article, private insurers are retreating from this hurricane-scarred region, and New Orleans residents in particular face a new economic reality. One real estate agent is quoted as saying, “It used to be the conversation with a potential buyer went, ‘What’s the price? What’s the square footage? And where is it located?’” Now the conversation is, “What’s the price? What’s the square footage? Did it flood and can I get insurance?” Many people are foregoing the purchase of new homes in the city because of the cost of insurance policies, even from the “last-resort” state-run insurance pool modeled after Florida’s. The situation is said to parallel that of hurricane-prone Florida, where even some long-time residents in the riskiest areas are moving out in part because their premiums continue to rise. “Hurricanes send Homeowners’ Premiums Skyrocketing,” by Rukmini Callimachi of The Associated Press, is available online for a limited time at http://www.myrtlebeachonline.com/mld/sunnews/business/15373268.htm.


The ASFPM continues to maintain its page of Katrina resources at http://www.floods.org/TheOrganization/Katrina.asp.

The Natural Hazard Center’s Disaster Research newsletter compiled this list of additional anniversary reports:

- “Speeches and News Releases: Hurricane Katrina: Rebuilding the Gulf Coast Region”
  The White House
  http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/katrina/

- “Continuing Progress: A 1-Year Update on Hurricane Recovery and Rebuilding”
  http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/GulfCoast_Katrina1yearFactSheet.pdf

- Hurricane Katrina - One Year Later (website)
  Federal Emergency Management Agency
■ Hurricane Katrina (website)  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
http://www.katrina.noaa.gov/

■ HUD Katrina Accomplishments—One Year Later (website)  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  

■ Transcript: Hurricane Katrina, Coastal Protection and Reconstruction Efforts  
U.S. Department of State, Foreign Press Centers  
http://fpc.state.gov/fpc/71049.htm

■ Broken Promises: The Republican Response to Katrina  
U.S. Senate and House of Representatives Democrats, 19 pp.  
http://www.democraticleader.house.gov/pdf/Katrina1Year.pdf

■ A Year of Healing: A Red Cross Report on Katrina, Rita & Wilma  
American Red Cross, 20 pp.  

■ Katrina: One Year Later (website)  
The Times-Picayune  
http://www.nola.com/katrina/

■ Hurricane Katrina: One Year Later: What Must We Do Next?  
American Society of Civil Engineers, 13 pp.  
http://www.asce.org/files/pdf/Ch9_What%20Must%20We%20Do%20Next.pdf

■ Building a Better New Orleans: A Review of and Plan for Progress One Year after Hurricane Katrina  
http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20060822_Katrina.htm

■ “Special Edition of the Katrina Index: A One-Year Review of Key Indicators of Recovery in Post-Storm New Orleans”  
The Brookings Institution, 16 pp.  
http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/200512_KatrinaIndex.htm

■ Forgotten Communities, Unmet Promises: An Unfolding Tragedy on the Gulf Coast  
Oxfam America, 52 pp.  

■ Envisioning a Better Mississippi: Hurricane Katrina and Mississippi—One Year Later  
Mississippi State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 81pp.  

■ “The Faces of Hurricane Katrina: A Portrait of Poverty Throughout America”  
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund, 5 pp.  
http://www.civilrights.org/press_room/KatrinaPaperandFAQs.pdf

■ GulfGov Reports: One Year Later  

■ After the Storm: Social Capital Regrouping in the Wake of Hurricane Katrina  
Mercatus Center, George Mason University, 40 pp.  
http://www.mercatus.org/repository/docLib/20060823_After_the_Storm.pdf

■ “Washing Away—Losing Louisiana” (television program)  
Louisiana Public Broadcasting  
http://www.lpB.org/programs/washingaway/
WHERE WE ARE, NOW THAT CONGRESS HAS LEFT TOWN

The Congress has recessed for the election campaigns after a frenetic week of trying to get as many important bills passed as possible. The priorities seemed to be legislation linked to security and defense issues and legislation expected to be helpful to Members in their re-election campaigns. Hence, final action was taken on only two of the 12 regular appropriations bills: Defense and Homeland Security.

Despite many efforts to bring other measures to the House or Senate floors and much toil over negotiations to arrive at House-Senate conference agreements, many pieces of legislation that were almost ready for final action will now have to wait for the lame duck session in November or for another effort in the next Congress. Two measures of importance to floodplain managers are in this “on the shelf” category: the Flood Insurance Reform Act and the Water Resources Development Act.

The agenda and accomplishments of the lame duck session will certainly be affected by the outcome of the elections. Motivation for action on some legislation could change. Clearly, a major focus will be completing action on the other 10 appropriations bills for FY 2007. Already, differing approaches are emerging in the House and Senate. Indications are that the Senate Appropriations Committee may prefer to gather many of the remaining bills into an omnibus appropriations bill. House Appropriations leadership has asked the Senate not to do this but rather to consider each bill on its own merits. The House approach would result in a much longer lame duck session.

What did get Done

DHS Appropriations—Late on Friday night, September 29th, the Senate followed the House’s lead in adopting the Conference Report on H.R. 5441, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations for FY 2007. It has now gone to the White House for the President’s signature. The conference agreement had been held up over issues concerning chemical security, immigration, and importation of prescription drugs. The latter threatened to hold up agreement to the Conference Report and possibly to have delayed its approval until the lame duck session. Fortunately, those issues were sufficiently resolved to allow for final Congressional action. That means that FEMA has a defined budget for FY 2006 and that FEMA functions will be restored under a new description of its structure and responsibilities (see H.Rept. 109-699).

FEMA Reorganization—The DHS Appropriations bill includes the FEMA restructuring compromise agreed to by all of the relevant authorizing committees in the House and Senate. Significantly, the measure will restore Preparedness and the State and Local Programs office to FEMA. The FEMA Director will become a Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security and will have Cabinet status during a major disaster. Provision is made for a “fence” around FEMA, allowing it to function with more autonomy and protecting its funds, while remaining within DHS. The new structure will be similar to the Coast Guard’s status within DHS.

When it became clear that this compromise was likely to succeed, ASFPM expressed support for it while noting the Association’s preference for FEMA’s restoration to fully independent status. Among other provisions, the bill

- Makes the FEMA Director a Deputy Secretary of DHS;
- Provides that President may designate the Deputy Secretary as a Cabinet member during a disaster;
- Specifies emergency management qualifications for the Deputy Secretary;
- Prevents the transfer of FEMA authorities, personnel, assets, and funds;
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- Restores Preparedness activities to FEMA;
- Returns training, exercises, and grant administration to FEMA;
- Sets up a national advisory council of state and local officials and first responders;
- Provides for rebuilding FEMA’s professional and reserve workforces; and
- Increases funding for FEMA’s two operating accounts by 10% for two years.

The restructuring of FEMA is required to take effect on March 1, 2007.

**Budget Items**—Unfortunately, two programs important to floodplain management were reduced in the Conference agreement from the levels that had been approved in both the House and Senate versions of the bill. Flood Map Modernization was funded at $196 million, down from the previously approved $199.8 million. Pre-Disaster Mitigation was funded at $100 million, down from the previously approved $150 million.

**Stafford Act Amendments**—As a part of the authorizing compromise on FEMA’s structure, some amendments to the Stafford Act were included. Significantly, the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program was restored to 15% from 7.5% for Presidentially declared disasters up to $2 billion, 10% for disasters of more than $2 billion but less than $10 billion, and 7.5% for disasters of more than $10 billion but less than $35.333 billion.

**North American Wetland Conservation Reauthorization Act**—H.R. 5539, reauthorizing the North American Wetland Conservation program, was agreed to and sent to the President for signature at the end of September. First enacted in 1989, the Act has awarded grants to more than 1,500 conservation projects and leveraged hundreds of millions of dollars in cost-shared funding from thousands of non-federal partners. To date the grant program has resulted in the protection and restoration of an estimated 23 million acres of wetlands and associated habitat in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

**What did Not get Done**

**Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act**—The Senate has still not passed its version of this bill, S. 3589. The bill was reported out of committee at the end of June, but various “holds” by various Senators have prevented it coming to the Senate floor. At present, Mary L. Landrieu (D-LA) and David Vitter (R-LA) have holds on the bill. Their concerns reportedly relate to the many different kinds of premium increases included in the bill. The ASFPM has expressed concerns to the Senate Banking Committee about the cumulative effect of all of the premium increases, suggesting the need to better evaluate the economic impact on policyholders and the potential effect on the policyholder base.

The House passed its version (H.R. 4973) at the end of June. There are significant differences between the House and Senate versions which were summarized on page 13 of the August issue of *News and Views*. A notable omission from the previous list of similarities is that both bills provide for gradually moving vacation or second homes to actuarial premium rates. A difference is that the Senate bill includes business properties.

**Levee Safety**—Although the House Levee Safety bill, H.R. 4650, has been reported out of committee, it has not yet been considered on the House floor. The Senate version is included in the very large Water Resources Development Act (WRDA; H.R. 2864 as passed by the Senate). Both bills provide for an inventory of levees and assessment of their condition and establish a Levee Safety Program. There are differences, however, in the nature of assessment to be handled by the

[continued on page 9]
Washington Report (cont.)

Corps of Engineers as opposed to what assessment responsibilities belong to the levee owner. Despite Congressional understanding of the need to act on levee safety issues, the matter is, at present, caught up in the many other issues confronting WRDA.

WRDA—House and Senate Conferees and staff worked until the last day before recess on reaching agreement between House and Senate versions of WRDA. For the first time in six years, both Houses of Congress have passed versions of a WRDA bill in the same Congress. Since a WRDA bill is intended to authorize Corps programs and projects every two years, this has been a significant delay and there was considerable pressure from Members of Congress to achieve agreement before they left to campaign. Unfortunately, this was not possible, but the Chairmen and Ranking Members of both House and Senate Committees have committed to “passing a comprehensive, bipartisan bill when Congress returns in November.”

In addition to many water projects, the Senate version contains language requiring evaluation and reconstruction of the Corps’ Principles and Guidelines, language establishing a peer review process, and language establishing a Water Policy Coordinating Committee. A detailed discussion appeared on page 11 of the August News & Views.

Dam Safety—The House passed H.R. 4981 on September 27th. This bill amends the National Dam Safety program to include an inventory of dams that would include an assessment of each dam based on inspections done by either a federal agency or a state dam safety agency. The bill has now been referred to the Senate.

The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure had reported out H.R. 4981 on September 20th. On the same day, it also reported out H.R. 1105, a bill amending the National Dam Safety program to provide grant assistance to states for rehabilitation and repair of deficient dams. The bill would authorize $50 million in grants to states for FY 2007 and $100 million annually from FY 2008 through FY 2010. Separate additional appropriations are authorized for the additional FEMA personnel that would be needed to administer the grant program. That bill has not yet been considered on the House floor, but that may occur in November.

Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2006—This bill (H.R. 4772) passed the House just before recess. It provides for greater access to federal courts for those whose property rights have been affected by decisions of federal, state, and local governments. Property owners who allege unconstitutional “takings” by state and local governments are often denied access to federal district courts until opportunities for compensation through state courts are exhausted. This bill would give greater access to federal courts.

—Meredith R. Inderfurth, Washington Liaison
Rebecca Quinn, CFM, Legislative Officer

USGS GETS NEW DIRECTOR

On September 15 the U.S. Senate confirmed the appointment of Mark D. Myers as the new director of the U.S. Geological Survey. Myers, an internationally recognized geologist and former State Geologist and head of Alaska’s Geological Survey, had been nominated to the post in May [see News & Views, June 2006, p. 11]. Myers, an expert in North Slope sedimentology and geology, brings 22 years of experience in geological science and management. He is the former State Geologist and head of Alaska’s Geological Survey; past president and board member of the Alaska Geological Society; and is certified by the American Institute of Professional Geologists and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. As State Geologist of Alaska, Myers managed a research organization of about 100 employees, including geoscientists, engineers, land managers, accountants, commercial analysts, and auditors. The survey generated analyses and interpretations [continued on page 10]
of data on geologic resources and natural conditions as well as maps and inventories of mineral and energy resources on state land. Myers served as an officer in the U.S. Air Force Reserve from 1977 to 2003, retiring as a Lt. Colonel. He received his doctorate in geology from the University of Alaska-Fairbanks in 1994, specializing in sedimentology, clastic depositional environments, surface and subsurface sequence analysis, and sandstone petrography. Myers earned his B.S. and M.S. degrees in geology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

NEW DEPUTY FOR FLOOD INSURANCE

Edward L. Connor has been selected as the new Deputy Director of Insurance, serving under David I. Maurstad, Federal Insurance Administrator, within FEMA. Connor began with FEMA in 1992 after 20 years in the insurance industry and most recently served as the Chief of Risk Insurance in the Mitigation Division, working with the WYO companies, insurance producers, and state insurance commissioners. As Deputy Director of Insurance he serves as liaison between the NFIP and the Flood Insurance Producers National Committee, the Institute for Business and Home Safety’s Flood Committee, the National Conference of Insurance Legislators, and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

— All referenced legislation and committee reports — can be viewed at http://thomas.loc.gov.

from the Chair (cont.)

I have attended and my own personal experience in Rhode Island has involved planning, policy development, training, and outreach initiatives. Because much of their membership consists of engineers, the CAFSM devoted much of its meeting to engineering projects, past successes, and how to address flood mitigation from a project perspective. I really enjoyed learning so much from these folks as not only has Rhode Island been unsuccessful in getting a mitigation project funded through either Flood Mitigation Assistance or Pre-Disaster Mitigation (remember we have not had Hazard Mitigation Grant Program money since 1991) but last year, FEMA Region I did not have a single PDMC project award. FEMA, if you are out there, how about starting a mentoring program in which you take the successful PDM grantees and have them share their knowledge with us fledgling states? I learned from the CAFSM folks that a FMA or PDMC project does not have to simply consist of a culvert enlargement. Oh, one other valuable lesson I learned when traveling to a State Chapter meeting: Never, ever make a football bet against the state you are traveling to, because inevitably, even when your home team is a 13-point favorite playing on home turf, you will end up wearing the opponent’s jersey for the rest of the week of the conference.

So what is coming up? The ASFPM has been asked to give a full session on NFIP 101 to the National Conference of Insurance Legislators (NCOIL) annual meeting in California in November. I will be presenting with our colleagues from Flood Smart and FEMA insurance staff. I welcome the opportunity to speak with these state legislators from around the country about how mitigation is tied to insurance and how they must go back to their states and meet their NFIP State Coordinators and Local Chapters (I will be providing them with handouts that have this contact information). Also, I will discuss the critical nature of state building codes and their impact on how structures are built and the risks that may then be posed and how that translates to ratings for insurance. Also to be covered will be the NFIP reform and reauthorization. If you have any ideas I would love to hear them.

Fall will be no less busy. At the end of October the ASFPM Policy Chairs will be descending upon the great state of Rhode Island for a weekend session in which we will work feverishly to integrate NAI into the Policy Committees, develop a 5-year work plan for NAI, restructure the policy committees, and review work to date on the upcoming 2007 National Floodplain Policies in Review. If you are in the area and have Friday night free, October 27th, dinner at my house—stop on by!
U.S. CITIES TAKING CHANCES

As part of its annual Sustainable U.S. City Ranking, SustainLane.com, a resource for healthy and sustainable living, measured the natural disaster risk to America’s 50 largest cities. The ranking was devised based on primary research by SustainLane and on information from Risk Management Solutions (http://www.rms.com/). It considered hurricanes, major flooding, catastrophic hail, tornado super-outbreaks, and earthquakes and looked at potential frequency of disasters as well as the projected extent of damage. Miami, Florida, was rated the riskiest U.S. city and Mesa, Arizona, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, tied for the least risky of the 50 largest U.S. cities.

Based on these criteria, Miami, Florida’s site on a peninsula between two prolific hurricane zones made it the city with the greatest risk. New Orleans is next, followed by Oakland, California, which straddles the Hayward Earthquake Fault; San Francisco, which lies on the San Andreas Fault and is also at risk for tsunamis; Honolulu, subject to hurricanes, storm surge flooding, and tsunamis; and San Jose, California, which is also near the San Andreas Fault.

Some of the largest U.S. cities are much less likely to be affected by such natural disasters. Leading the pack for safe cities when considering such scenarios are Mesa, Arizona, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, both of which are least likely to face hurricanes, earthquakes, catastrophic hail, or tornado super-outbreaks, because they lack conditions needed to create these disasters. Catastrophic flooding is also not as likely. Other major U.S. cities ranking high for safety from natural disaster risk include Cleveland, Ohio; El Paso, Texas; and Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona.

It is instructive to compare the level of risk to another set of city rankings on the same website, “quality of life combined with indicators of sustainability programs, policies and performance.” For example, two of the highest-risk cities (Oakland and San Francisco) nevertheless were given high marks for sustainability. Houston, on the other hand, also a high-risk city, was termed “sustainability endangered.” At the other end of the scale, Detroit and Albuquerque, considered among the safest in the first ranking, were termed “sustainability laggards.”

The website on which the results are reported also features frank comments on the rankings, the methods used to make them, and discussion about rebuilding in New Orleans. See http://sustainlane.com/page/89/1/Press+Release+++SustainLane.com+Measures+Natural+Disaster+Risk+for+U.S.+Cities.html.

Risk from Natural Disasters:
50 Largest U.S. Cities
(#50 is riskiest, #1 is safest; numbers repeated due to ties)

50. Miami, FL
49. New Orleans, LA
48. Oakland, CA
47. San Francisco, CA
46. Honolulu, HI
45. San Jose, CA
43. Los Angeles, CA
42. Houston, TX
41. Tulsa, OK
40. Oklahoma City, OK
39. Columbus, OH
38. Sacramento, CA
37. Virginia Beach, VA
36. Seattle, WA
35. Memphis, TN
32. New York, NY
31. Jacksonville, FL
30. Boston, MA
29. San Diego, CA
28. Portland, OR
27. Charlotte, NC
26. Baltimore, MD
25. Washington, DC
24. Louisville, KY
23. Indianapolis, IN
22. Fort Worth, TX
21. Dallas, TX
20. Arlington, TX
19. Austin, TX
18. Athens, GA
17. Nashville, TN
16. San Antonio, TX
15. Las Vegas, NV
14. Albuquerque, NM
13. Denver, CO
12. Chicago, IL
11. Philadelphia, PA
10. Minneapolis, MN
9. Detroit, MI
8. Fresno, CA
7. Boulder, CO
6. Tucson, AZ
5. Phoenix, AZ
4. El Paso, TX
3. Cleveland, OH
2. Milwaukee, WI
1. Mesa, AZ
RESTORATION OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL FLOODPLAIN RESOURCES BY CORPS AND NEW JERSEY

by JoAnne Castagna, Ed.D

This past summer, a volunteer from the Somerset County Historical Society warmly welcomed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers visitors at the historic Van Veghten House in Somerset County, New Jersey. He enthusiastically explained that the very room in which they stood was where General George Washington danced the night away at a dinner party during the Revolutionary War.

The visitors were a team conducting the Finderne Wetlands Mitigation Project on the house property. It was evident to the team that the state is proud of its history. This was taken into account when the Corps’ New York District and the State of New Jersey decided in 2000 to collaborate on this mitigation project to enhance and restore the land around the house to create wildlife habitat and a public park.

The Finderne Wetlands effort is part of the Green Brook project designed to reduce flood damage in New Jersey’s Raritan River Basin in north-central New Jersey, in Middlesex, Somerset, and Union counties. The project is located on 130 acres of land along the Raritan River in Bridgewater Township, Somerset County.

According to Megan Grubb, Biologist and Coordinator, New York District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the wetland mitigation work is satisfying the mitigation requirements that the Corps has with all of its flood damage reduction projects. “The project is enhancing existing wetlands, forested land, and grassland habitats on the site and creating more than 20 acres of man-made wetlands to sustain wildlife and create an educational public park,” said Grubb.

The land was used for farming crops and livestock from the late 1600s to just a few years ago, when Somerset County purchased it for open space preservation and park development. Years of farming had caused erosion problems on the land.

One of the farms is the historic Van Veghten House. By 1699, the Van Veghten family was farming a huge tract of land that included all of the property now under construction at the mitigation site. The 18th century red brick Dutch farmhouse still stands on the bluff above the floodplain with a view to the Raritan River.

The house, now occupied by the Somerset County Historical Society, has a rich history that includes sheltering General Nathaniel Greene (General Washington’s Quartermaster General), during the Revolutionary War while his soldiers camped nearby. The Corps has been working since 2000 with the County’s Parks Commission to plan, design, and construct the site.

Construction Commences

Construction began by moving earth on the mitigation project in January. The land was graded for approximately 2 months, around-the-clock, to prepare it for spring seeding. Grading set the stage for the mitigation work by achieving a soil elevation that supports the water required for wetland plant growth. The soil in the wetland creation areas was then tilled using a 30-inch plow-bedding harrow, to create mounds and depressions, mimicking the uneven surface of a natural wetland. The soil was fertilized and limed and this past spring nearly 100,000 trees and shrubs were planted. Habitat mitigation areas were also seeded with a mixture of native grasses and wild flowers.

Several wetland habitats, forested land, and grassland habitats were enhanced or created to provide nesting and foraging areas for a variety of birds, amphibians, reptiles, aquatic invertebrates, butterflies, and mammals.

The public will be able to view these habitats by walking along a 2-mile nature trail created by the Corps. The trail meanders throughout the site and has signs that educate the public about the habitats and the wildlife they are supporting, as well as provide facts about the nearby Van Veghten House. Also on the site are two playing fields with parking lots and access roads, making the site a part of the Raritan River Greenway.

[continued on page 13]
Natural and Cultural Values Restoration (cont.)

“Most of the mitigation work was completed in the summer of 2006. Twelve acres of recreational area, such as the trail and playing fields, will be opened to the public in the spring of 2007 after the grasses and plants have had a chance to grow,” added Grubb.

Enhancement Components

About 25 acres of riparian forest were restored by seeding and planting. The riparian buffer was widened to 100-300 feet to create a habitat for wildlife that thrives in this type of environment, including birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians. In addition, the increased buffer sustains shade cover for fish habitat within the river. In this buffer area, various shrubs and trees were planted including elderberry, spicebush, and black haw viburnum and hickory and silver maple trees. These trees were selected because of their shaggy bark at maturity that could provide a suitable roosting habitat for bats during the summertime.

Stream restoration was performed on an unnamed 800-foot stream, referred to as the “Finderne Brook,” which runs through portions of the site. The stream was being eroded and the Corps took steps to create a more natural water flow and restore its habitat. To improve the water flow, the floodplain, or area bordering the stream, was widened to prevent the stream’s banks from eroding and an undersized pipe culvert that was constricting flow was replaced with a natural bottom arched culvert bridge. To improve the stream habitat and stabilize the banks, the stream was graded, seeded with floodplain grass, planted with wetland plant cuttings, such as willow species, and covered with a degradable coir matting, made of coconut fiber, to stabilize riverbank soils until vegetation takes hold. To prevent soil erosion, supplemental riverbed stone was placed in the stream. The stones create pools and riffles for fish and invertebrates, and crayfish and pickerel frogs, which have already been sighted in the stream.

Forested wetland has deciduous woody vegetation with a tree canopy over 20 feet high. Approximately 14 acres of existing forested wetland were enhanced by planting oak, ash, and sycamore trees and shrubs that included summersweet, silky dogwood, and high bush blueberry.

Scrub-shrub wetland has primarily woody vegetation that is less then 20 feet tall. About eight acres were enhanced by seeding and planting the wetland to make it more desirable for various species of wildlife. Five acres of emergent wetland (wet marsh) were enhanced by seeding and planting the wetland to make it more desirable for various species of wildlife.

Thirty-nine acres of enhanced grassland has transformed the property around the Van Veghten House, providing visitors an unobstructed view across the floodplain towards the Raritan River. The floodplain was seeded with warm season grasses, including Indian grass and bluestem and wildflowers, such as ox-eye daisy, asters, and coreopsis, which will support a population of pollinating birds and insects, and the meadow will be a foraging area for the resident fox and red-tailed hawk, as well as other birds and small mammals.

Twenty-one acres of pasture were turned into forested wetland. The land was graded then seeded with a mix of wetland plants and floodplain grasses, and planted with bare root and container plant material. Trees planted included oaks, ash, and sycamore, and shrubs were summersweet, silky dogwood, and high bush blueberry. In some areas the land was graded to create vernal pools, ephemeral spring ponding areas used by salamanders, invertebrates, and frogs for breeding.

For more on Veghten House, call the Somerset County Historical Society, (908) 218-1281.

Dr. JoAnne Castagna is a technical writer for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York District. She can be reached at joanne.castagna@usace.army.mil.
Map Modernization (cont.)

and Engineering Standards Committee has commended FEMA for implementing the Floodplain Boundary Standard and has conveyed comments on the audit procedures proposed in the draft. The ASFPM letter can be read at http://www.floods.org/PDF/ASFPM_Ltr_FEMA_Floodplain_Boundary_Standard_0906.pdf. The new audit procedures also establish horizontal tolerances of accuracy for the floodplain boundary, set according to the class of risk of the area being mapped.

The new MHIP also outlines a new “validation” standard that is being contemplated by FEMA to help mapping partners determine where new studies must be conducted, where updates to existing flood hazards should be performed, and what might quality an existing study to be deemed still valid. The standard being considered would take into account flood risk, physical (on-the-ground) changes, climatological changes, and advances in engineering methods.

In summary, the new MHIP and the Mid-course Adjustment will refine procedures for determining where new studies are needed, allow refinements to and confirmation of adherence to the Floodplain Boundary Standard, and help ensure the products delivered through Flood Map Modernization are timely and tied to a topographic source.

MHIP Version 2.0 can be viewed, and comments submitted, at http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/fhm/mh_main.shtm.

State & Local Report

NEW JERSEY STRENGTHENS FLOOD CONTROL RULES

New Jersey Governor Jon S. Corzine has announced significant changes to the rules of the Flood Hazard Area Control Act. After flooding in March and April—the third worst on record along the Delaware River—a Flood Mitigation Task Force was formed to study and implement measures to reduce future impacts of flooding in New Jersey communities. In August, the Task Force’s final report was released and draft rules proposed in response to its recommendations.

The new rules will clarify and reorganize New Jersey’s regulations to limit new development in floodplains. Current buffer zones of 25 to 50 feet will increase to 50, 150, or 300, feet depending on the waterway’s category. To provide additional buffer protection, the administration will support the inclusion of funding within the Garden State Preservation Trust for the purchase of low-lying properties, known as Blue Acres, which are prone to flooding.

Environmentally responsible stream cleanings and the relocation and reconstruction of damaged buildings will be streamlined through increased access to general permits. New permits-by-rule will give property owners authority to undertake specific regulated activities without prior written approval from the Department of Environmental Protection. This will streamline activities as complicated as using machinery to remove major obstructions from waterways or elevating buildings above flood hazard areas, as well as activities as simple as building a fence or a patio.

Adding fill, which includes construction material, buildings, and roads, to a floodplain can make a river more prone to flooding. Current development rules require that if any fill is added to a flood plain, an 80% equivalent of that fill must also be removed from the same plain. The new rules will increase the requirement to 100% resulting in what is called “0% net fill.”

New Jersey also is working with FEMA to modernize and digitize its floodplain maps. This will result in more accurate maps that can be easily updated and used to more reliably predict future flooding. Finally, steps are being taken to address several problem spots involving drainage problems, backwater flooding, and channels blocked by debris.
MISSISSIPPI INSURORS MUST CLARIFY FLOOD EXCLUSIONS

Insurance policyholders throughout the state of Mississippi received, as of September 1, 2006, written notification from their insurance companies informing them of any flood and/or earthquake exclusions in their homeowners, renters, and/or windstorm policies.

Companies were required to take this action as a result of Mississippi Insurance Department Regulation 2006-2, effective August 14, 2006. The regulation also requires the companies to provide such notice at policy issuance, and thereafter upon renewal. Further notice of the exclusion is also to be provided directly on the Declarations Page of each policy.

The state legislature, in HB1319, attempted to address this issue last session, but the bill was not passed before the session ended. Mississippi Insurance Commissioner George Dale recognized the importance of the issue and instructed his staff to draft the regulation to ensure that all Mississippians received clarification on their flood and earthquake exclusions.

“This regulation should help make it very clear to policyholders what is and is not covered in a standard homeowner’s policy with regard to floods and earthquakes,” said Dale. He also emphasized that the notification does not in any fashion alter the policyholder’s policy, it merely explains the differences in what is and is not covered.

Publications, Software, AV & the Web

“Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our Waters” is the draft version of a handbook created to help communities, watershed organizations, and local, state, tribal, and federal environmental agencies develop and implement watershed plans to meet water quality standards and protect water resources. It has been released in draft form so that feedback from users can be incorporated into the final version. The watershed planning process described in the handbook comprises a series of cooperative, iterative steps to characterize existing conditions, identify and prioritize problems, define management objectives, and develop and implement protection or remediation strategies as necessary. The document is structured so that it can be followed step by step though the watershed planning process or so that readers can go to individual sections that highlight specific technical tools. 2005. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Available for download at http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/watershed_handbook/. Hard copies can be ordered free from the National Service Center for Environmental Publications at 800-490-9198 or ncepimal@one.net (refer to EPA document number EPA 841-B-05-005).

The National Lenders Insurance Council has launched a weblog to foster communication and discussion among the community of professionals concerned with flood insurance and floodplain management. This is a wonderful opportunity for these two groups of professionals to share their knowledge in an informal way. Topics discussed through comments posted so far have included lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, and interpretations of the National Flood Insurance Program requirements. Log on and ask a question or share your thoughts at http://www.NLIC.blog.

This Is Smart Growth is a new publication from the Smart Growth Network (a cooperative initiative of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Sustainable Communities Network, the International City/County Management Association, and others). The full-color publication explains smart growth concepts and illustrates their outcomes in 40 cities, suburbs, small towns, and rural communities around the country. The descriptions and photos illustrate how these communities have invested taxpayer money wisely, protected natural and working lands and environmental resources, promoted healthy environments, offered people more choices in housing and transportation, created a lasting legacy for the community, and other accomplishments. September 2006. 32 pages. Available free in hard copies or download through http://www.smartgrowth.org/library/articles.asp?art=2367.

Webcasts for Watershed Practitioners are free monthly webcasts for watershed practitioners sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. On October 11, “Getting Started in Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring” will show how to start a volunteer water quality program, questions to consider, success stories, and where to find the best resources. Register for this session and listen to previous webcasts at [http://www.epa.gov/watershedwebcasts](http://www.epa.gov/watershedwebcasts).

The Stormwater Manager’s Resource Center (SMRC) website has been revised, reorganized, and updated to supply the latest research and resources available anywhere for the stormwater professional. A project of the Center for Wetland Resources, and funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection, the SMRC was originally launched in 2001 to provide communities covered under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase II with the tools and techniques necessary to protect their watersheds. In the intervening years the SMRC has provided indispensable resources to stormwater managers including model ordinances, design specifications, and guidance manuals, and has generated well over half a million hits. In tandem with this project, the Center has also overhauled its main website to better provide watershed practitioners with the resources they need such as guidebooks, slide shows, example watershed plans, and model ordinances. Visit the SMRC at [http://www.stormwatercenter.net](http://www.stormwatercenter.net) and the Center’s main website at [http://www.cwp.org](http://www.cwp.org).

“Does Flood Insurance Encourage Development?” examines this perennial question, raised again in light of Hurricane Katrina’s massive impact. Several experts interviewed for the article agree that, to various degrees, the availability of flood insurance has allowed people to build and live in areas that otherwise might be avoided as being too risky, even though the precise role played by insurance has not been conclusively established. The article concludes that “perhaps flood insurance has become part of the coast’s social and economic landscape . . an entitlement program that people expect to continue.” The article appeared in the spring 2006 issue of *Coastal Heritage*, a quarterly publication of the South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium. Another article in that issue, “After the Storm,” by John H. Tibbetts, looks at why—even though it is available—people fail to purchase flood insurance. Download a pdf file of the spring issue, or order a free printed copy, from [http://www.scseagrant.org/library/library_coaher.htm](http://www.scseagrant.org/library/library_coaher.htm).

“How Green Infrastructure Measures up to Structural Stormwater Services” is a case study conducted by American Forests at the request of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The Department wanted to quantify the loss of ecosystem services that was caused by the 2003 Cedar Fire that swept into the city of San Diego. A GIS-based map of the area’s green infrastructure—trees and other vegetation together with their complex interaction with soil, air, and water—coincidentally had been prepared just months before the fire. That data, combined with a software tool that quantifies ecosystem values, told city officials that the absence of the of trees, chaparral, and shrub that were lost in the fire area would result in an estimated $25 million in expense to the city to retain the additional stormwater, and that the value of the lost canopy in terms of filtration of air pollutants was about $798,000 annually. Quantifying the ecosystem benefits of green infrastructure provides the metrics to see how local landscape, flood, stormwater and other management plans and programs measure up to state and federal regulations and local goals. Cheryl Kollin. 2006. *Stormwater* (July/August): 138–144. Available at [http://www.stormh2o.com/sw.html](http://www.stormh2o.com/sw.html).

The National Center for Atmospheric Research Societal Impacts Program has launched a WxSoc newsgroup focusing on the societal impacts of weather and weather forecasting. Members of WxSoc are welcome to exchange societal impacts research issues and information, ask questions, and send notices of related journal or news articles, conferences, and jobs. Notices of directly related educational and other similar opportunities are also welcome. To sign up for the WxSoc newsgroup, visit [http://www.sip.ucar.edu/wxsoc.jsp](http://www.sip.ucar.edu/wxsoc.jsp). The program will also debut a societal impacts newsletter this month. They will be looking for contributing authors and submissions of conferences, grant opportunities, etc. in the coming months. Interested contributors should contact Emily Laidlaw at (303) 497-2892 or [laidlaw@ucar.edu](mailto:laidlaw@ucar.edu). To subscribe to the newsletter, visit [http://www.sip.ucar.edu/news/](http://www.sip.ucar.edu/news/).
Calendar

See more flood-related meetings, conferences, and training at http://www.floods.org/Conferences,%20Calendar/calendar.asp.

October 16–19, 2006: Floodplain Management Challenges and Opportunities: Annual Conference of the Northwest Regional Floodplain Managers Association, Bow, Washington. Contact NORFMA at norfma@yahoo.com or see http://www.norfma.org/.

October 18–20, 2006: Fall Conference of the New Mexico Floodplain Managers Association, Carlsbad, New Mexico. Contact NMFMA at (877) 682-1389, nmfma@nmfma.org or see http://www.nmfma.org.

October 18–20, 2006: Conference of the Association of Floodplain Managers of Mississippi, Choctaw, Mississippi. Contact Lisa Reid at lreid@hattiesburgms.com.


October 23–26, 2006: 2006 Watershed Institute, Columbus, Ohio. Sponsored by the Center for Watershed Protection. Contact Rebecca Winer, Center for Watershed Protection, (410) 461-8323, rrw@cwp.org or see http://www.cwp.org/WI06/wi06info.html.

October 26–27, 2006: Advanced Topics in Floodplain Management, Denver, Colorado. Sponsored by the University of Colorado Department of Continuing Engineering Education. Call (303) 556-4907 or see http://www.cudenver.edu/engineer/cont.

October 26–27, 2006: Second Annual Conference of the New Jersey Floodplain Management Association, Somerset, New Jersey. Contact Cleighton Smith at (856) 802-0843 x 3107 or Cleighton.smith@dewberry.com.

October 30—November 2, 2006: Basic HAZUS-MH (E313), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.


November 6–9, 2006: Advanced Floodplain Management Concepts (E194), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.


November 7–10, 2006: Fall Conference of the Texas Floodplain Management Association, Kerrville, Texas. Contact John Espinoza at (512) 892-2459 or see http://www.tfma.org/.


July 9–13, 2007: RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION (E386), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.

August 13–16, 2007: ADVANCED HAZUS-MH FOR FLOOD (E172), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call EMI at (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.

August 13–16, 2006: NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM (E278), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.


September 24–27, 2007: NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM (E278), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.training.fema.gov/EMIweb/.
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Deadline is the 18th day of odd-numbered months.
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