INTRODUCTION and REGIONAL OVERVIEW
Region 5 consists of the following states: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. Currently, all six states have chapters of the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM). The region is impacted from sources of flooding mainly from the Ohio River and tributaries, Mississippi River and tributaries, and a number of tributaries to the Great lakes.

OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL ISSUES / CONCERNS

1. CAP-SSSE funding:
   - The delays in funds being awarded continues to be a problem, and gets worse every year;
   - The uncertainty and delays continue to jeopardize good planning and maximizing efficiencies;
   - Constraints on the level of funding continues to impeded the states abilities to increase sound floodplain management efforts;
   - Requirements of meeting FEMA metrics takes away from time and effort to improve local floodplain management. These metrics provide no Floodplain Management benefit.
   - FEMA Region V staff rarely leaves the office;
   - Significant turnover of seasoned staff at FEMA Region V and the impact this will have on State Floodplain Management Programs;
   - Valuable funds are being used to pay contractors to produce documents which simply already exists.

2. Changes to criteria for Individual Assistance
   - Definitions of major or destroyed structures does not reflect extent of damage caused by flood waters;
   - States must now meet a higher number of major or destroyed homes due to population;
   - Does not reward extraordinary efforts of states that acquire floodway and repetitive loss properties to reduce vulnerability.

3. Changes to criteria for Public Assistance Threshold
   - State agency costs cannot be counted for the counties where the work was done except for those counties that meet their threshold;
   - Only those counties that meet their threshold can be counted toward the state threshold instead of the true statewide threshold.
4. Mitigation grants
   - The apparent future funding of the mitigation grants could have severe impacts. PDM funding has been critical for the planning component of mitigation, and for mitigation projects in many parts of the country. As PDM funding is reduced to nothing, and the majority of the mitigation grants are being incorporated into the new National Preparedness Grants Program (NPGP). We have great concern that mitigation projects and planning will not be funded through the NPGP, since the focus is clearly on terrorism. The other main source of funds for mitigation, HMGP, is tied to disasters;
   - Reinstitute “Annual Allotment” of FMA funding to states;
   - PDM funding should be increased if trend is to move towards Catastrophic Declarations Only for HMGP funding;
   - The HMGP grant process needs streamlining. Projects that have been proposed through HMGP take inordinately long to go through the approval process, such that the willing sellers give up on waiting and local officials vow to never go through the process again;
   - Consideration of additional criteria for states and communities that have implemented sound mitigation strategies to reduce flood risks. These additional criteria would assure communities that assistance will still be available to continue removing residents from risk areas;
   - Shortened application periods and shifting application dates are creating concerns among states and their respective communities.

5. Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan funding
   - Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program funding is not sufficient enough to meet local planning grant needs;
   - Consideration should be given to modify the five-year update requirement of DMA-2000 and extend it to ten years between updates.

6. Mapping funding
   - Many states did not receive enough funding to even cover staff salaries resulting in no new studies being initiated in critical areas;
   - Current FEMA map funding proposals will not even cover staff salaries, which means no new studies will be done in critical areas;
   - Region 5 has funded outside contractors to perform community outreach instead of supporting existing mitigation and state teams. Too much time and resources are going towards bringing these new players up to speed. State partners are spending time educating outside contractors instead of performing work;
   - Resiliency contractors are not well prepared; scripted presentations are not received well by proactive local communities who are much more involved in mitigation efforts than contractors realize. FEMA should partner with knowledgeable state staff for these meetings.

7. Levees
   - Potential decertification of levees as Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) are being updated.
8. Insurance issues
   - Need continued ASFPM outreach efforts on impacts of Grimm-Waters Reform Act of 2014, PRP, LOMA-Out As Shown and other flood insurance topics;
   - ASFPM should focus on problems with direct side of Flood Insurance business; numerous complaints are being received from owners of primary structures who have maintained continuous coverage and are now being asked for an Elevation Certificate and facing hefty premium increases.

9. Resources
   - The ASFPM efforts related to higher standards, and studies/data related to the impacts those higher standard concepts have been helpful. The research and sharing of information at the committee level has also been appreciated.

10. Legislative updates
    - Receiving updates and analysis of the implications of legislation at the national level and FEMA guidance continues to be valuable – especially related to the Grimm-Waters Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 which was in response to the major reforms resulting from the Biggert-Waters Reform Act of 2012, legislation affecting programs, & budget cuts affecting federal agencies. There will be a need to continue providing testimony on the impacts/implications of this latest attempt at Flood Insurance Reform.

11. Disaster Declarations
    - The following states in Region V received Presidential Disaster Declarations in 2013-2014:
      - Illinois (DR-1416) – flooding
      - Illinois (DR- ) – tornado
      - Michigan (DR-4121) – flooding
      - Ohio (DR-4098) – flooding
      - Wisconsin (DR-4141) - flooding

12. STATE REPORTS
State National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Reports and State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) Reports can be found as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIP Reports</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>SHMO Reports</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>20 – 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8 – 13</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>14 – 15</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>24 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>16 – 17</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>26 – 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>28 – 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **Disasters** – In 2013, much of Northern and Central Illinois was declared a flood disaster (DR IL 1416) due to ice melt and spring rains. 57 of the state’s 102 counties were declared. The most serious flooding was located in the northern half of the state including the Chicago metropolitan area. Damages in the urbanized Chicago area included widespread basement flooding outside of the mapped floodplain areas.

- **Disaster Follow up** – Illinois monitors local flood damage assessments very closely. Nearly all Illinois communities have adopted a cumulative substantial damage ordinance. Therefore, very many structures which were flooded in 2008 were pushed over the 50% threshold with 2013 flooding. Hundreds of floodprone structures were required to be demolished or mitigated. In addition, the disaster resulted in $52 million dollars being allocated for HMGP projects. The state is active using that funding for mitigation projects in nearly 30 communities across the state. Many of Illinois’ communities can now pass major floods with little or no damage.

- **Community Assistance** – Illinois now has nearly 900 participating NFIP communities. All of these communities have adopted local regulations which go above NFIP minimum standards.

  - **Workshops** – During the past year, 16 floodplain management training workshops were conducted across the state. Many of these workshops were requested by other professional organizations including realtors, surveyors, engineers, and universities. The Illinois Flood Association also hosted several twilight seminars on specific floodplain management topics (insurance, ECs, damage assessments, mitigation, etc.).
  - **CAVs/CACs** – The state conducted 42 community visits last year and resolved numerous compliance issues.
  - **Ordinance Review** – Nearly 90 ordinance reviews took place last year as part of the mapping update. Illinois remains the only state with greater than 100% map mod ordinance adoption rate. The state model ordinance goes above and beyond FEMA minimums.
  - **Other meetings** – With ever increasing frequency staff, are required or strongly “encouraged” to attend a myriad of other FPM meetings including Risk Map Discovery meetings, mapping open houses, levee meetings, USACE coordination meetings, association meetings, CRS meetings, mitigation meetings, etc… Usually several per week.

- **The Illinois Association for Floodplain and Stormwater Management** - IAFSM continues to play an active role in the education of local officials. IAFSM held the State conference in Rosemont, this year. Nearly 600 people attended.
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- **CFM** – There are currently over 500 CFMs in Illinois. CFM exams are frequently offered throughout the state.

- **CRS** – Illinois now has 57 communities in CRS. The average CRS rating in Illinois is class 6. One community (Ottawa) is soon expected to be a class 2.

- **Mitigation** – Out of 102 Counties, 93 now have approved mitigation plans or are working on them. Over the past four years, the state has received over $160 million in in HMGP funding. After 5,000+ buyouts, many of the state’s most flood prone properties have now been mitigated. The low fruit has been harvested. We are now mitigating lower priority structures.

- **State Regulations** – Higher regulatory standards in Illinois are being challenged on several fronts. Levee districts in the state have pushed legislation to allow agricultural levees to increase flood stages to the FEMA-allowed limits (rather than Illinois higher standards). A few select communities in Illinois are also pushing legislators to eliminate floodway permitting regulations which will allow development to occur.

- **Mapping** – Digital county wide Flood Insurance Rate Maps have been funded for eighty-two of Illinois’ 102 counties. However, no new countywide digital mapping efforts have been initiated to complete the remaining 20 counties since FFY 2011. Progress to complete DFIRMs in five counties was halted due to levee issues and application of the LAMP protocols to resolve those issues is slow. A number of Physical Map Revisions have been funded and there is no backlog of studies to update FIRMs. Non-regulatory product such a Flood Risk Reports and databases are funded without regard for their need or utility. Well over half of the mapping budget is allocated to outreach to achieve mitigation actions, however accurate maps do not seem to be a priority. No new engineering studies were funded in FFY2012 or 2013. Rather than supporting existing mitigation and state teams Region 5 has funded outside contractors to perform community outreach and much of the time and resources is spent bringing these new players up to speed. State partners are spending time educating outside contractors rather than just getting the work done.

**ASFPM Focus/Goals** – ASFPM appears to have moved away from the original intent of the organization. Rather than strongly promoting the goals of state and local capabilities, trends have reversed in recent years. Floodplain management is moving further away from building states and local capabilities and appears to be moving towards FEMA/DHS oversight using Federal contractors to accomplish much of the work. ASFPM needs to fight this trend and battle strongly to enable state and local floodplain management.

**Mitigation** – FEMA has made several changes in the last year to speed up the process including stricter deadlines for applicants. The waiver on benefit/cost on homes worth less than $276,000 was a significant change. The ever increasing FEMA requirements have stabilized and we have consolidated the requests resulting in better initial applications.
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- **CAP** – FEMA now dictates nearly all of the CAP workload. Therefore, competent states are forced to spend valuable time and resources meeting FEMA metrics which provide no FPM benefit. Many states have permit programs and staff that are much more capable than FEMA at this point. FEMA should recognize those states with competent programs which provide benefits to the NFIP. CAP should be used to support those qualified and competent states.

- **Refocus on local floodplain management** – FEMA metrics and ever-increasing products and tools have forced FEMA and state staff to move away from beneficial floodplain management work. FEMA staff rarely leaves the office (look at the AIR report statistics). State staff is increasingly forced to work on FEMA tools that serve little or no value to the states. Valuable funds are being used to pay contractors to produce documents which simply regurgitate past work. We know that productive floodplain management needs to be local. FEMA and state staff need to be out in the field building relationships and working with local officials on programs that have shown to provide long term value.

- **Levee Outreach** – We see little movement to resolve levee programs and unite USACE and FEMA levee certification programs. Maps remain in limbo and thousands of Illinois residents sit behind levees which have uncertain protection levels. It remains frustrating for everyone involved.

- **Insurance** – Political intrusion into the NFIP has resulted in a mind-boggling program that nobody understands. Agents are unable to write policies. Policy holders are frustrated. Those of us who do this program 24/7 are often confused. Many now agree, the NFIP needs to be eliminated and restructured entirely. Politicians need to stop “fixing” the program to buy votes.

Paul Osman, CFM, State Floodplain Programs Manager
Illinois Office of Water Resources
Indiana State NFIP Report
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- Disaster Status- State had no Presidential Declarations for storm damage since last
  ASFPM conference. Did have some significant flooding in Howard and Grant Counties.

- CAP-SSSE Update – Scheduled to conduct 30 Community Assistance Visits, 36
  Community Assistance Contacts, and 8 local officials training workshops in 2014.

- Conducted Operation Stay Afloat Conference: Had a great turnout for the event. 154 in
  attendance.

- Risk Map Status: IDNR is continuing to do a number of “Open Houses” in support of
  Risk Map. Open Houses including IDNR doing targeted mail-outs to affected property
  owners. Have had very good turn outs for the open houses. Also have a number of
  resiliencies meetings planned for the year throughout the State.

- CFM Support: Had two offerings for the CFM over the last year.

- INAFSM: INAFSM continues to get strong, have annual conference scheduled for Brown
  County State Park.

- Issues: Funding constraints continue to impede State’s ability to increase good
  floodplain management efforts. In particular the late awarding of the CAPSSE grant.
  Also have concerns about FEMA Region V have significant turnover of seasoned staff
  and what the impact will be to support of current State floodplain management program
  is a concern.

Gregory Main CFM, NFIP Coordinator
Indiana Department of Natural Resources - Division of Water
For FY 13, MDEQ, WRD floodplain management staff continued with its floodplain management CAP-SSSE related tasks based upon the 2012 CAP commitments and a projection of commitments that would become part of the anticipated final 2013 CAP-SSSE grant.

The 2013 CAP grant was posted on e-grant for the period of May 1, 2013, to May 30, 2013, and available for states to apply. The grant application was received by the FEMA and the grant was awarded and accepted by the MDEQ on July 19, 2013

**Element #1: Community Assistance Visits (CAVs)/Community Assistance Contacts (CACs):**

The grant commitment was to conduct 12 CAVs for FY 13. The CAV commitment was to do 12 Tier I communities.

In summary, all twelve of the Tier I community CAVs have been completed although two were done outside of the FY 13 grant period i.e. West Bloomfield Twp. in 2010 and the City of Flint held 12/9/2013. In addition to the 12 Tier I CAVs, two non-Tier I communities Deerfield Township and the City of Rockwood were done for a grand total of 14 CAVS. Not counting the West Bloomfield Township CAV done in 2010, the MDEQ is considering that 13 completed CAVs are part of the FY 13 CAP grant and is one over its total grant commitment of 12.

**Element #2: Ordinance/Resolution Assistance:**

At the end of FY 13, 12 of the 22 counties had effective maps representing 110 communities total being involved in either adopting new FIS’s and new flood maps or having to decide to enroll into the NFIP. Of the total number of communities (305), in the 22 counties, assistance was provided to 60 communities (39 participating and 21 non-participating) for map adoption documentation and first time enrollments.

The MDEQ would obviously have provided more assistance to more communities if there had been more projected LFD dates met by the mapping process. More communities would have had actual map adoption and enrollments deadline considerations to comply with and would have been contacting the MDEQ for assistance.
Element #7: Outreach, Workshops for local officials at the Michigan Stormwater-Floodplain Association (MSFA) Annual Conference

The MSFA held its 26th annual conference at the McCamly Plaza Hotel in Battle Creek March 5-8, 2013. The facility was well suited for the cause and holding the conference in Battle Creek facilitated the MSFA’s effort to bring the conference to various regional locations around the state in support of making it closer to attend for the community officials within that regional area.

The conference followed the association’s established multi-day pattern of workshops, Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM) exam, breakout sessions, plenary sessions, vendor/consultant networking sessions, and membership business luncheon meeting and awards recognition was another well attended conference. There were upwards of 150 attendees with a targeted audience of local community and county officials and a mix of vendors and consultants having products related to and expertise in the many aspects of floodplain management.

Staff and representatives from the MDEQ, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Michigan State University, National Weather Service, Calhoun County, U.S. Geological Survey, Michigan Association of County Drain Commissioners, the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM), Smart Vent, Spicer Group, CoreLogic Flood Services, Mona Lake Watershed Council City of Battle Creek, Kieser & Associates, Applied Polymer Systems, Inc., URS Corporation, AMEC, and Cardno JFNew, participated in conference presentations, workshops, and other various sessions of the conference. Without the participation, commitment, and support of these entities and others, the conference would not have been the success that it was.

The MSFA gives a special thanks to all of the following 2013 conference supporters:

2013 MSFA Sponsors
Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick, Inc.
Applied Science, Inc.
Driesenga & Associates, Inc.
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Mannik & Smith Group, Inc.
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Spicer Group

2013 Conference Exhibitors
Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.  Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Inc.
Applied Polymer Systems, Inc.  Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Applied Science, Inc.  Northern Concrete Pipe, Inc.
AMEC Environment and Infrastructure, Inc.  Smart Vent Flood Vents
Cardno JFNew  Snap-Tite / Isco Industries
CSI Geoturf  Spicer Group
Driesenga & Associates, Inc.  Stantec
Etna Supply Co.  US Geological Survey
Fluid Process Equipment  US Army Corps of Engineers
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2013 MSFA Conference Awards Recognition
During the annual general membership MSFA chapter business luncheon several award achievements were acknowledged and presented. They included announcement of the two 2011/2012 college scholarships selections, the new 2012 CFM recipients and the 2013 MSFA Outstanding Service Award selection. Two college students were selected by the MSFA officers and board members to each receive a $1,500 scholarship. The scholarship monies are funded by the sales of the Floodplain Watershed model marketed by the Wards Scientific supply company. The model was a concept and design effort by Mr. Mark Walton, an MSFA member and employee of the National Weather Service and Mr. Dave Chapman, MI Earth Science Teachers Association and a high school science teacher in the Okemos High School. The MSFA provided funding for construction of the initial prototype of the model and then a contract was entered into with Wards to build and market the model on a commercial scale with the MSFA to receive a portion of the sales to fund the scholarship program.

2013 MSFA Outstanding Service Award
During the awards portion of the annual MSFA membership business luncheon the MSFA Outstanding Service Award was awarded to Ms. Rhonda Oberlin employee of the City of Lansing. Ms. Oberlin works in the Lansing Office of Emergency Management.

CFM Recognition
Recognition was provided to several MSFA members for their successful accomplishment of taking and passing the Association of State Floodplain Managers’ (ASFPM) “CFM” exam during 2012. Those new Michigan CFMs receiving recognition plaques were: Tim Bradshaw, PE, CFM, David W. Mostrom, PS, CFM, Donald L. Seal, CFM, Joseph M. Smith, CFM, Glenn Soerens, PE, CFM, Karen Stickel, PE, CFM, Rod G. Williams, CFM. ASFPM now recognizes Michigan as having 75 CFMs.

Element #7a: Outreach, Workshops for Local Building and Other Officials
Twenty-five (25) workshops were conducted by MDEQ staff under the FY 13 CAP grant. The workshops all cover floodplain management in general, state and federal floodplain regulations, and various levels of detail about the NFIP and the NFIP construction criteria contained in the single state construction code. Together the 25 outreach workshops represented a minimum attendance of 830 persons statewide.

Element #7b: Outreach Training for Staff to attend the FEMA Region V Fall and Spring Conferences
The FY 2013 Fall FEMA Region V conference was held October 25-27, 2012, and hosted by FEMA Region V in Chicago. The Spring conference meeting (April 9-11, 2013) was scheduled to be hosted by the state of Indiana. However, due to spring floods in various locations of Region V many FEMA staff and impacted state staff were not able to attend the conference; so, FEMA cancelled the conference and did not reschedule it. The FY 13 CAP did not get posted and awarded until well after the proposed spring conference thus, forgoing the need to propose attendance to it and projecting its costs as part of the FY 13 CAP.
Element #7d: Outreach Newsletter

In another effort to provide written outreach to community officials and ultimately their citizens, the MDEQ drafted a postcard using template language from the FEMA Region V staff. The subject matter was the Biggert-Watters 2012 NFIP reform changes. It was mailed to all communities (2,800+/− mailings) in the state. It was a brief notice of the existence of the BW-12 NFIP changes and likely impacts it will have on citizens with NFIP policies. The notice directed officials to the FEMA BW-12 Web site for detailed information and guidance in preparation for the inquiries they would likely be receiving from their citizens. The notice also referred officials to a template letter from the FEMA Region V that was posted on the MDEQ’s Web site. The letter was designed to be used by community officials to distribute to its citizens in an effort to inform them about the BW-12 reform act and to provide helpful guidance.

Element #8a: Site-Specific Floodplain Service Assessments

The MDEQ’s longtime established site-specific floodplain service assessment program typically processes 400 to 600 requests per year depending upon the state of the economy (development trend). The FY 13 grant commitment was to charge the costs of doing 200 assessments to the grant. The FY 13 projected cost per assessment is $170. Even though construction/development trend has been on the down side, the number of service requests has been high for FY 13. This is attributed to the number of FEMA countywide floodplain mapping studies going into effect with a large number of unnumbered A zones being identified. A large number of homeowners have been informed by their lenders that their homes are now considered in high-risk flood zones and now have to buy flood insurance or obtain a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) from FEMA to avoid the mandatory insurance requirement of the NFIP.

The longtime established floodplain service assessment program has always been generally intended to assist developers in the design of floodplain development plans to take into account the location of high-risk flood zones. The program value and purpose has gradually shifted into a way for citizens to obtain help in getting LOMAs processed due to flood insurance needs. Through the established free-of-charge process, the MDEQ assists citizens in their individual LOMA processes for insurance purposes by providing estimated Base Flood Elevations (BFE) for unnumbered A zones as called for in the LOMA forms. The demand for such LOMA BFE estimation assistance has resulted in workloads in certain districts that are difficult to stay on top of and complete within the timeframes that the homeowners are forced to meet by the lending industry. This is forcing homeowners to seek other sources such as surveying and engineering firms to do the BFE estimations and obviously the homeowners must pay for the cost of such services.

For FY 13 staff processed 578 service assessment requests, 378 more than the 200 grant commitment. The additional completed assessments represent a value of $64,260 of costs above and beyond the projected commitment cost for this FY 13 element. This additional number of extra service assessments has been identified in part to which the mid grant year 4 percent “cost of living” award of $9,350 for Michigan would be used for cost coverage of doing 55 additional services above the original commitment of completing 200 services. Taking into account the additional 55 services covered by the “cost of living” money, the MDEQ completed 323 services beyond its total commitment for this element.
Element #10: Community Rating System (CRS) Support

During CAVs, CACs, workshops, the MSFA conference, and other floodplain/NFIP related meetings with communities, efforts are made to mention the CRS and to inform officials and citizens about the advantages of communities becoming involved.

Element #11: Mapping Assistance (scoping and open houses) for County Wide Map Mod Studies

No scoping meetings were held in Michigan for FY 13. Eleven preliminary map mod open house meetings, map mod conversion resiliency meetings, risk map resiliency meetings and Risk Map discovery meetings were held for FY 13:

Element #13: Disaster Response Community Assistance

Michigan did have a Presidential declared disaster this year (DR-4121). It provided public assistance to 16 declared counties. The counties were in the Upper Peninsula District, Cadillac District, Saginaw/Bay District, Grand Rapids District, and the Kalamazoo District.

The respective district floodplain engineers spent various amounts of time during and after the DR-4121 flood event responding to calls and inquiries from community officials, citizens, reporters, etc. to answer general and technical questions about rebuilding, floodplain regulations, flood insurance, etc. This was done through phone calls, emails, processing floodplain service requests, and meetings with local officials and the general public.

Joint Hazard Mitigation Strategy: DR-4121-MI

DECLARATION
On June 18, 2013, President Barack Obama issued a Major Presidential Disaster Declaration resulting in federal assistance to eligible applicants in sixteen counties designated for FEMA Public Assistance (PA) for flood damage that occurred between April 16 and May 14, 2013, and for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) assistance throughout the state.

BACKGROUND OF EVENT
Beginning on April 16, 2013, a low pressure system moved eastward across the Great Lakes, bringing showers, thunderstorms, and three to five inches of rain to parts of Michigan. As a result of this system, on April 18, 2013, there were approximately 26,858 customers in Michigan without power by 10:30 p.m. The 24-hour peak was 76,519 customers without power. The rain continued into Friday April 19, 2013, with two-day precipitation totals amounting to five inches of rain. The region saw sharp rises in river levels across Michigan, due to this system as well as rapidly melting snow. There were numerous flood warnings issued in Michigan, specifically in the west and central portions of the state. Six counties issued County Emergency Declarations, along with numerous cities. There were no mandatory evacuations in place, but numerous voluntary evacuations did occur across Michigan. A FEMA Liaison Officer reported to the State Emergency Operations Center on April 22, 2013.
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As some rivers continued to rise above record flood levels, counties took action. Sandbagging operations primarily occurred in the Grand Rapids area, where the Grand River surged to historic levels. The Grand River crested in the evening of April 21, 2013, in downtown Grand Rapids and Comstock Park. Around 10:00 p.m., the Grand River peaked at 21.85 feet in downtown Grand Rapids, breaking the record of 19.64 feet set in 1985. In Comstock Park, the river crested at 17.8 feet around the same time, surpassing the 65-year-old record of 17.75 feet set in 1948. Businesses and building owners along the river shored up their properties as much as possible and local officials had to close the Fulton Street Bridge because of a high-voltage power line threatened by the rising river. Although most rivers began to recede during the following week, there were some lingering floodwaters that continued to affect various areas of the state.

The incident was determined to be beyond the capabilities of the State and the affected local governments. Governor Rick Snyder submitted a request to the President on June 7, 2013, to declare this event a major disaster for the State of Michigan.

DR-4121-MI was declared on June 18, 2013, designating 16 counties (Allegan, Baraga, Barry, Gogebic, Houghton, Ionia, Kent, Keweenaw, Marquette, Midland, Muskegon, Newaygo, Ontonagon, Osceola, Ottawa, and Saginaw Counties) for FEMA Public Assistance. All counties in the State of Michigan are eligible to apply for assistance under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). On June 29, 2013, a FEMA/Michigan Joint Field Office (JFO) was established in Kentwood (Kent County), and declared operational as of July 1.

Les Thomas, NFIP Coordinator
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Minnesota State NFIP Report  
ASFPM 2014 Conference  
Seattle, WA

- Disaster status (covered in Jen’s):

- CAP-SSSE Update for FFY13:
  - During FFY 2013 there were 66 CAV’s/CAC’s, 13 newly enrolled & 2 converted communities, and ~60 communities received assistance with ordinance updates not related to enrollment.
  - Updated information sheet on “How to Find the FEMA Map & How to Print a FIRMette” and updated flood insurance rate comparison sheet were completed.

- Mitigation Issues & Successes (see Jen’s report):
  - The state Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) grant program continues to be strongly supported by the state legislature. There is excellent coordination with the HMGP program. The Minnesota Recovers Task Force continues to provide coordination amongst the state and federal agencies allowing those involved to respond to disaster needs more efficiently.

- Map Mod & Risk MAP:
  - During FFY13, preliminary or revised preliminary maps were issued for 7 counties. Local official meetings/open houses or RiskMAP meetings (discovery or resilience were held for 19 counties/locations, LFDs were issued for 2 counties and maps became effective in 3 counties.
  - The FY 2010 Risk MAP funded efforts involve the Root River and Whitewater River watersheds, with efforts beginning in late 2010. MnDNR staff are updating the data and updated mapping is planned for Winona and Houston counties. In FY 2011 funding was added for Houston DFIRMs. FFY12 funds are being used to develop BFEs and delineate zones for HUC 8s with portion in South Dakota and Iowa.
  - 38 of Minnesota’s 87 counties (representing 17% of the state population) are not currently scheduled for map updates under map modernization or Risk MAP, and 8 of those don’t even have paper maps. Of the 49 counties that have (or are funded to have) Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (DFIRMs), only 20 of those counties (representing 17% of the state population) have accurate boundaries (based on the LiDAR based 2-foot contours) and accurate data supporting the base flood elevations (either validated detailed studies or data supported Zone A).
  - The statewide Minnesota LiDAR collection effort & processing is complete. The 2-foot contours derived from the LiDAR has been certified for use in lieu of field surveys for Letters of Map Amendments (LOMAs) for most of the state (just the Red River Valley area to complete).
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- **Training courses offered and needed** – Five one day trainings for local officials were offered around the state, plus many shorter and special audience trainings.

- **The MN Association of Floodplain Managers** held its Annual Conference in Austin, Minnesota in November with the theme “SPAM ’Successful Planning and Management’ for Improved Flood Resistance.” There was a workshop day and the main conference day.

- **CFM support** – The MnAFPM offered a CFM review workshop and proctored one exam in 2013.

- **Other important needs, issues, or success from the State:**
  - Impacts of Biggert-Waters Reform Act of 2012 have led to many more requests for copies of elevation certificates (ECs) and base flood elevations from local officials. Since most are pre-FIRM buildings, the local officials have no elevation information and are bearers of news that an EC is required. And in many cases, these pre-FIRM buildings are in Zone As with no supporting data. That leads to considerable effort at the local, watershed and/or state level to determine BFE estimates based on best available data.

  - As noted above, only 17% of the state’s population is in a county with DFIRMs that have accurate boundaries and have data supporting all the BFEs. There is a great demand for the more accurate maps so local officials have best available data for the BFEs needed to assist citizens with existing development and to guide new development. The inaccurate boundaries have led to a large increase in the number of LOMAs, especially as lenders check new maps.

  - Potential decertification of levees continues to be an issue as floodplain maps are modernized. In many cases necessary repairs and improvements are identified during the PAL process. The cost of improving and certifying levees is significant. While the state FDR grant program has been instrumental in assisting many communities, many of the cities lack the funds to conduct necessary levee improvements or to provide the required local match for state grants.

Ceil Strauss, CFM, State Floodplain Manager
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Ecological & Water Resources
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NFIP Coordinator Comments: In the absence of chronically and severely delayed federal CAP-funding, Ohio continues to graciously extend state funds to support CAP activities in perpetual hope that our federal partners will eventually pay for the services they request. Discussions with FEMA focus on the threats to the state-federal partnership, appropriate clarifications and consistency in policy, initiatives, and technical support.

In FFY13 Ohio's FMP:

- **CAP-SSSE**
  - assisted 27 communities adopt compliant flood damage regulations (including 3 new joins); conducted 10 CAVs, 3 CACs, 44 partner meetings, 25 environmental reviews, 14 engineering reviews, 43 workshops, and our 14th annual Statewide Floodplain Management Conference (>200 in attendance);
  - resolved 16 FEMA-referred (Cold Case) CAVs
  - responded to thousands of requests for technical assistance,
  - published the 19th year of *The Antediluvian* (two editions per year)
  - continued to update Ohio’s model flood risk reduction regulations; and
  - expanded use of GIS-tools, incorporating field applications of digital technology to more efficiently identify SFHA-development.

- **CTP-MAS**
  - provided mapping services: 6 Risk MAP preliminary CW or PMRs, 2 Flood Risk Review Meetings and 5 Open Houses
  - 2 Counties went effective, 1 was new CW study
  - Participated in 7 Mitigation Outreach meetings as a part of the FY13 CTP-MAS funding cycle
  - provided review of Great lakes Mitigation Strategy Report
  - further refined GIS-based approach for preliminary reviews
  - managed contracts for both regulatory and non-regulatory products for 9 counties in 6 of the discovery watersheds.
  - Attended EMI training for CTPs
  - Updated mapping status interactive map monthly on ODNR’s webpage

**Highlights for 2013-14:**

- We are pleased to announce that two of our recent staff additions achieved their CFM.

- Intense and extended rain in nearly every month of 2013, often multiple times a month, (daily from mid-June to mid-July), along with high winter snowfall and ice jams that continued into spring 2014, kept floodplain managers and emergency responders on alert across Ohio. Thankfully, no fatalities were reported and, with some exceptions, damages were fairly limited. Though persistent and, at times, pernicious, the limited extent of these numerous events, and welcomed slow thaws, along with a sufficient number of insured losses, meant that neither a state nor federal declaration was triggered.
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Highlights for 2013-14 cont’d:

- Not surprisingly, Ohio’s Floodplain Management Program (FMP) has provided multiple presentations concerning BW-12 and then GW-14 (The response to both is mixed). Realtors and lenders stress how uncertainty, particularly from BW-12, adversely affects property sales; the more gradual increases with a longer timeframe of GW-14 are welcomed as providing time to plan, budget, and modify, akin to a balloon mortgage; the restoration of the grandfather conditions is universally approved; the reimbursement for successful LOMA costs is popular; as is the refunding of BW-12 rate differences; the across-the-board surcharges are almost as universally resented; the considerations for urban, and special-use facilities lack definition; the Advocate role has the potential to be effective if they coordinate with their state partners rather than merely freelance; and the absence of expanded support for mitigation should be remedied.

- Ohio’s FMP continues to provide technical assistance, pre-flood damage prevention, guidance for regulations adoption and enforcement, CTP-MAS mapping efforts, Risk MAP support, Silver Jacket initiatives, and coordination with the Ohio Floodplain Management Association (OFMA). FMP continues to build local flood risk reduction capability.

State Chapter President’s Comments: The Ohio Floodplain Managers Association (OFMA) has performed the following activities in 2013-14:

- Awarded four scholarships to local floodplain managers for attendance to 2013 Statewide Floodplain Management Conference;
- Conducted CFM Refresher Course twice;
- Coordinated the 2013 Statewide Floodplain Management Conference;
- Coordinated/Proctored seven CFM Exams throughout Ohio, exceeded 100 CFMs in Ohio;
- Initiated use of project charters to plan activities of the Board and committees;
- Updated the OFMA Strategy for 2014, including five and one-year strategic goals
- Provided comments to ASFPM on improvements and updates for CFM Refresher course;
- Updated OFMA Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to incorporate the WMAO Code of Regulations and Division Operating Charter;
- Held annual elections at statewide conference;
- Operated under budget, demonstrating that the organization is fiscally responsible;
- Working toward integrating technology (webinar capability) to expand OFMA participation and improve dissemination of information to members;
- Completed renewal and dues for ASFPM Chapter status.

Christopher Thoms, CFM, State NFIP Coordinator
Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Wisconsin State NFIP Report
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- **Mitigation Issues & Successes** – Relocation of downtown Gays Mills to high ground is complete. True multi-agency success story that is providing funding for a new town center, low-income housing, business incubation space and enhanced river access. State and federal agencies working with Milwaukee Metro Sewer District on another stream restoration/flood mitigation projects on the Kinnickinnic River, one of three major rivers that forms the Milwaukee estuary. Multi-unit buyout of residential and commercial structures and removal of concrete lined channel. Previous efforts on the Menomonee River have brought salmon fishing back to the urban core.

- **RiskMAP status** – Conducted two resiliency meetings in both the Lower Wisconsin River and Rock River watersheds in January. New maps and non-regulatory products for the Baraboo River went effective in Sauk County last November – our first RiskMAP county. Hope to begin watershed study on the Milwaukee River next fiscal year. Upper Fox River (Illinois Fox) mapping update underway.

- **CFM numbers and accomplishments** – Held CFM exam in conjunction with L273 course in Nov.

- **Training courses offered and needed** – 12 Flood Insurance workshops completed last year. Focus this year will be on flood insurance changes (HFIAA) and implementation of new state guidance on LOMC requirements and structures in campgrounds. Hosted L273 last November in Eau Claire. 26 attendees.

- **ASFPM Assistance needed/ASFPM focus/goals for the next year** – Continued outreach efforts on HFIAA and other flood insurance topics are vital. Association needs to focus on problems with direct side of the business; Wisconsin is having numerous complaints from owners of primary structures who have maintained continuous coverage and are now being asked for an Elevation Certificate and facing 400 to 600 percent premium increases.

- **Other important needs, issues, or success from the State** – Continue to push FEMA on getting CAP guidance and funds to states in a timely manner. Provide timely information on NFIP reform progress, congressional initiatives affecting the program and budget cutbacks affecting federal agencies. Particularly concerned about mapping program. Last year’s FEMA proposal did not even cover staff salaries, which means no new studies were started in critical areas. State is working with FEMA and Wis. Cranberry Association to develop permit process for cranberry culture operations in the SFHA. This guidance, which should be available this summer, will be useful for aquaculture and other water-dependent agricultural operations.

- **Continued coordination with WDNR Dam Safety** to ensure land use control downstream of dams through the local floodplain ordinance.

Gary Heinrichs, State NFIP Coordinator
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
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- Illinois has been very busy with 2 more Presidential Declarations last year. One was for flooding in almost half the State and the other was major tornados. In the last few years we have received more than $100 million in mitigation funds, but we remain with 2 mitigation project workers and one mitigation planner. In our flooding disaster we received $250 million in applications for $30 million in funds.

- FEMA has been helpful in assisting us and the new B/C policy should improve our implementation speed. We received the approval for the update of our State Mitigation Plan in October. We are still waiting for news on the increase from 3 years to 5 years.

Ron Davis, SHMO  
Illinois Emergency Management Agency
Since last year, the State of Indiana has endured several significant weather events, with little success in Declarations. These events were severe enough that in the past, they would have been successful in securing Federal assistance for those impacted. This has been a continuation of FEMA’s reluctance to award disaster declarations. Additionally, there have been a couple of common reasons for these denials:

- Changes to the criteria for Individual Assistance
  - Definition of major or destroyed structures:
    - stronger requirements on stick built
    - The mobile home criteria does not reflect the extent of damage caused by the water making contact with the subfloor.
  - As a state we now must meet a higher number of major or destroyed homes due to our population:
    - Does not reward extraordinary efforts by Indiana to acquire floodway and repetitive loss properties to reduce vulnerability.
    - This resulted in denial of at least one flood disaster, where the state through various funding and disasters had acquired and removed more than 300 homes.
      - Had the homes not been elevated to the standards, they would have suffered substantial damage due to the increase in the flood height (exceeded the 1% flood) in several communities.

- Eligibility changes to the public assistance threshold
  - State agency costs cannot be counted for the counties where the work was done, or
  - state costs count only in counties that meet their threshold.
  - Only those counties that meet their threshold can be counted toward the state threshold and state costs count only in counties that meet their threshold. Not truly statewide threshold.
  - PNP’s with multiple offices (hospitals) with deductible is divided between all offices even if they received no damages.

The state continues to struggle with conflict of the building code and the Community Rating Services review:

- Lack of oversight on some commercial structures during state building permits significantly reduces the levels of our participating communities can achieve.
- Adoption of the IBC/IRC has been delayed to allow for some additional amendments.
- Legislation setting standards for the construction of saferooms in Indiana was passed. Must meet FEMA 320/361 requirements.
The state of Indiana using HMGP, FMA, and RFC funding has acquired more than 1170 flood plain homes since the 2001. Additional structures have been acquired after the major flooding in 1997 along the Ohio and after the 2008 statewide flooding using funding from INDOT, Office of Community and Rural Affairs, and local programs. As indicated above, no good deed goes unpunished.

- The Feds need to consider additional criteria for states and communities that have used good mitigation and floodplain management to reduce risks to assure assistance is available to continue to remove residents from risk.
  - FFy2013 FMA funding awarded to communities with highest Repetitive and Severe Repetitive losses.
  - Bring back annual allotment to give the states an opportunity to use their allotment, but unused funds would be open to a competitive process.
  - Obvious this would be the methodology when converted from three separate programs into one program under the Flood Mitigation Assistance banner.

- Need more Pre Disaster Mitigation and Flood Mitigation funding if we are moving away from disaster declarations to a Catastrophic Declaration Only. (Political suicide, because the funding would all go to the coastal and EQ communities.)
  - Lack of funding would continue to eat away at the NFIP funds due to the continuation of claims in structures that would be eligible for acquisition or flood proof/elevation during normal disasters or HMA competitive grants.
  - Once again a slap to the states in the middle of the country that have since 1993 made a commitment to not make the same mistakes when we rebuild.
  - No incentive to make the efforts to maintain local mitigation plans – lot of time and effort with little chance of funding (local’s Cost Benefit)
    - Indiana has had all of its counties with valid approved plans, but now they are due for update and it is a struggle for us to encourage the commitment of time and ever reducing funding to update plans.

**OUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

The State of Indiana Standard Mitigation Plan has met the requirements and will be approved in the next few days. We will immediately begin working on producing an Enhanced state plan. This will be our first such plan. Indiana is currently in a position that we feel we can commit the time and resources to meet the additional requirements.

The State of Indiana has successfully completed the first year of the Resiliency meetings and we have begun the next level of interaction with Risk Map and Resiliency. Waiting to see how significantly this varies from the first contact. This may allow some of our communities to follow up their planning efforts to secure technical assistance to leverage funding to accomplish their most significant issues.
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Although we need to tout the accomplishments of several of our ongoing programs in Morgan County and the Maumee River Basin, the City of Columbus leveraged some additional disaster funding to produce a “master plan” (Maumee River Basin was our first) that addresses flood risk and flood response. This was in response to their non-rain event flood. Everyone up basin from them received widespread, strong precipitation events that rapidly developed into a catastrophic flood in Columbus, Indiana. The City of Columbus during this event received only about two inches of rain. This event brought home the vulnerability of the city during a basin wide event. The plan can be reviewed at http://www.columbus.in.gov/planning/flood.

- The city adopted a NAI process with flood plain development
- Increased the free board to three feet above base flood.
- Hope to begin an intense public outreach and education program on floods and flood plain management.

Sandy Recovery Improvement Act has been a bonus and a hammer. It streamlines some of the FEMA processes, but reduces the time to develop, submit, and implement projects. Placing many of the burdens on the state and locals, to have “shovel ready” projects sitting on the shelf ready to go,
- Alternate BC for flood acquisition/elevation projects
  - Will facilitate us acquiring homes on the repetitive and severe repetitive list that could not meet the standard benefit cost and damage records did not exist to the extent that made them beneficial.
- Formal review process;
- Advance assistance to allow for development of projects
  - Great but how much of the funding will this eat up on smaller disasters
  - Wait only catastrophic, so never mind
- Removed the six month lock in, leaving only a 12 month lock in with only a 12 month window to submit applications (we must be psychic as part of the job description) or over subscribe knowing that many will not be funded
  - How happy will the sub-grantees be when they put in the effort to develop a project that won’t be funded?

Unrealistic time frame for small state staffs, catastrophic will require hiring of contractual personnel and that must meet bid requirements and time to process the bid.

Janet Crider, SHMO
Indiana Department of Homeland Security
Michigan SHMO Report
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No report submitted.

Matt Schnepp, SHMO
Michigan State Police / Emergency Management
Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM) manages the FEMA mitigation grant programs for the state.

1. **DR-4069 (June 2012)** the “Duluth” flood, HSEM submitted nearly 100% of the available funds $6.6 million, mainly the buyout/acquisition of 42 structures, and a lot of Hazard mitigation plans. 
HSEM and the MN DNR Flood Hazard Mitigation program work together to meet community’s needs post disaster.

MN DNR is acquiring 38 flood prone structures, and provides the 25% local match for HMGP acquisitions, as allowed for by the state legislature for a total of $6,450,000

The DNR also acquired two homes in imminent danger due to bluff erosion – due to extreme rainfall/flood – included in numbers above.

2. **State All Hazard Mitigation Plan Update approved in March of 2014**; includes Climate Change adaptation, HAZUS level 2 and critical facilities analysis. 

3. **Other items of interest, FEMA revisited the City of Austin, MN Loss Avoidance Study.** Loss Avoidance Studies provide a quantitative approach to assess performance of mitigation measures, in this case, property acquisitions. Working with the state and local jurisdictions, data is collected for the study and multiple analyses are conducted to determine if there were measurable avoided losses since the projects’ completion. The reports contain project descriptive information and the impacts of those projects.

Austin, Minn. 2013 Following the severe storms and floods of 2004 (DR-1569-MN), 2008 (DR-1772-MN), and 2010 (DR-1941-MN) that led to Major Disaster Declarations in areas of Minnesota, FEMA initiated a Loss Avoidance Study to assess the effectiveness of previous acquisition/demolition projects in the affected areas of Austin, Mower County along the Cedar River and its tributaries, Dobbins and Turtle Creeks. The actual flood events were analyzed to determine the Losses Avoided Ratio or percentage of savings by estimating the losses that were avoided and comparing them to the costs of the resources that were invested.
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The first LAS on this area was completed on 163 residential properties in March 2001. This study updates the original 163 properties as they relate to the 2004, 2008 and 2010 events.

Read the full 2013 Austin Loss Avoidance Report here.

Two other recent LAS include City of Montevideo and Moorhead. HSEM has updated their website to include all of these stories which can be viewed at:


Jennifer Nelson, SHMO
Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management
Ohio received a disaster declaration (DR-4098) as the result of damage from the remnants of Hurricane Sandy to shoreline infrastructure and property in Ashtabula and Cuyahoga Counties. Marinas and breakwalls in the area were the most heavily impacted. Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds resulting from this disaster will fund 6 acquisition/demolition projects, 3 community safe rooms, 1 storm shutter project, and 3 local mitigation plan update grants.

Ohio continues to be concerned about the reduction in Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant program funds available for local mitigation projects. This year one planning grant application and one residential safe room project were selected for “further review”. Two other acquisition projects and one safe room project were not selected for further review. FEMA notified the state in early January that the projects were selected and all information needed to award the grants was submitted by Ohio EMA in mid-February, the grants have yet to be awarded. States are being told that the money has not been sent from FEMA HQ to the Region offices.

Ohio also received one Flood Mitigation Assistance grant for a single structure acquisition demolition project in Sandusky County. The North Canton acquisition/demolition project was not selected for further review.

Ohio continues to have concerns about the shortened application period (shortened from 6 to 3 months last year) and the shifting application window (opened in June last year, supposed to open in April this year?) for PDM and FMA.

In addition to Hurricane Sandy, there were several flood events (late June/early July and Christmas Eve) that resulted in the activation the State Disaster Relief Program and the State Individual Assistance Programs. The state Emergency Operations Center was activated for extreme cold (polar vortices) and propane shortages this winter as well.

Rachael Evans, a mitigation specialist who has been with the Mitigation and Recovery Branch since its inception will be retiring in late May. Her expertise, program knowledge, and ability to work with the tough communities will be sorely missed. We wish her well in her retirement.
The state continue to populate our website (the State Hazard Analysis, Resource and Planning Portal) with project success stories:

(http://ohiosharpp.ema.state.oh.us/ohiosharpp/,
http://ohiosharpp.ema.state.oh.us/OhioSHARPP/MitigationProjects.aspx, and
http://ohiosharpp.ema.state.oh.us/OhioSHARPP/Links.aspx#successStories).

The website was also used to monitor properties acquired with Hazard Mitigation Assistance funds for compliance with open space requirements

(http://ohiosharpp.ema.state.oh.us/OhioSHARPP/Reports.aspx).

Ohio EMA has also been partnering with FEMA and ODNR on several Risk MAP projects in the state.

Steven Ferryman, CFM
Ohio Emergency Management Agency
DR-4141: Between June 20 and 28, 2013, the southwest and far north portions of the state experienced severe storms, flooding, and mudslides. Of particular note was a large mudslide across Highway 61 just outside of the City of Boscobel in Grant County. Rainfall totals ranged from 8 to 13 inches. Over $5 million in damages were incurred and the state received a Presidential Disaster Declaration for eight counties and one tribe.

Webinars: Wisconsin Emergency Management received a grant in 2013 to develop a series of webinars. The purpose of the webinars is to offer training and information on a variety of topics to individuals for whom attending longer training sessions out of town may be difficult. The webinar topics include application development for various types of projects, hazard mitigation planning, and grants management. The introductory webinar has been recorded and the others are in development.

Other Training: Wisconsin Emergency Management staff continues to conduct the All-Hazards Mitigation Planning workshop annually and FEMA’s G393 course, Mitigation for Emergency Managers, semi-annually. Workshops on disaster response and recovery, damage assessments, benefit-cost analysis, and other mitigation and recovery topics are also conducted regularly or provided as needed.

State Planning: This year Wisconsin Emergency Management is updating the State of Wisconsin Hazard Mitigation Plan. It is an enhanced plan and includes an annex for Rural Electric Cooperatives. Meetings will be scheduled with partner agencies to review their contributions to the Mitigation Strategy. With this update, climate change issues and a few technological hazards will be added to the Risk Assessment. The three-year update cycle continues to be a challenge in terms of staff time and resources.

Local Planning: All but three counties in the state (out of 72) have or have had a FEMA-approved hazard mitigation plan. The remaining three counties are interested in developing a plan. Two universities and several tribes and single jurisdictions have also developed mitigation plans. The biggest challenge we face is the lack of available funding for planning grants. An average of 14 local plans need to be updated annually to keep up with expirations. In recent years, the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program has not been sufficient to keep up with local planning grant needs. We are still waiting for the FFY13 PDM grants that the state submitted to be approved by FEMA.

RiskMAP: Wisconsin Emergency Management has been participating in and presenting at the RiskMAP discovery and resilience meetings for several watersheds including the Milwaukee River, the Upper Fox River, the Lower Wisconsin River, and the Upper and Lower Rock River. Additionally, the Great Lakes Coastal Flood Mapping and Outreach program is starting the scoping and discovery meeting process for various communities in the state that border Lake Superior and Lake Michigan.
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- **Rock River Flood Inundation Mapping:** Wisconsin Emergency Management has been working with the Army Corps of Engineers, U. S. Geological Survey, National Weather Service and the Department of Natural Resources to fund an initiative to map stretches of the Rock River that is highly susceptible to flooding and flood damages. The inundation maps would show the areas that would be impacted by different flood levels. The main challenge thus far has been getting the project funded.

Katie Sommers, DMA

for

Roxanne K. Gray, SHMO
Wisconsin Emergency Management Agency