

ASFPM REGION 5 DIRECTOR ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Conference-Atlanta, Georgia



Rod Renkenberger, Regional Director

5/31/2015

ASFPM REGION 5 DIRECTOR ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Conference-Atlanta, Georgia

For 2014-2015

(IL, IN, MI, MN, OH and WI)

Region 5 Dir. Rodney Renkenberger, PS, CFM



INTRODUCTION & REGIONAL OVERVIEW

The Association of State Floodplain Managers Region 5 area includes Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin. All six states have official ASFPM chapters: Illinois Association for Floodplain and Stormwater Management: www.illinoisfloods.org; Indiana Association for Floodplain and Stormwater Management, Inc.: www.inafsm.net; Michigan Stormwater – Floodplain Association: www.mi.floods.org; Minnesota Association of Floodplain Managers: www.mnafpm.org; Ohio Floodplain Management Association: www.ofma.org; and Wisconsin Association for Floodplain, Stormwater, and Coastal Management: www.wafscm.org. Each of these organizations continues to host annual meetings, provide CFM training, and host general floodplain training and seminars. Minnesota has been in three presidentially-declared disasters (DRs 4113, 4131 and 4182). The first two were rather small; however, the most recent will likely be one of the largest (current estimates are more than \$53 million for public assistance).

REGION 5 CONCERNS & PRIORITIES:

ASFPM annual conference

- Develop protocol for ASFPM to address concerns brought forward by regional directors;
- Request FEMA Region V presence at ASFPM conference to assist with addressing concerns within the region;
- Encourage ASFPM executive office to promote states mapping capabilities to FEMA Region V through a coordinated effort;
- Promote broader state roles in Risk MAP Program. States are more engaged and knowledgeable of local community's needs, are highly qualified and have proven expertise, and would increase accuracy and efficiency;

- Work with FEMA Region V to resolve inconsistencies with other regions on how programs are implemented and how states and local communities are fostered/served;
- Mapping and other program users are feeling strain in their partnership with FEMA due to a lack of FEMA's communication with member states;
- FEMA regional staff are not giving consideration to policy corrections/improvements suggested by states;
- FEMA Region V needs to engage state and local communities and their staffs to create long-term personal relationships, create a professional environment, and improve their credibility;
- Region V states should coordinate efforts when addressing mutual issues/problems in an effort to benefit from a wider expression, such as the recently published Illinois mapping letter; and
- Region V's lengthy examination of CRS-applicants is causing concern;

Community Assistance Program – State Support Services Element (CAP-SSSE)

- Funding continues to be delayed, and it is getting later every year. FEMA Region V has worked with some states to change the Period of Performance to align with individual state budget cycles, but even shifting the POP to start into the second quarter of the federal fiscal year has not rectified the problem because funding won't become available until well into the POP;
- Guidance for CAP agreement and cost sharing is late;
- States continue to fund CAP activities in hopes that they will eventually be reimbursed for their services; and
- Spending – trend is to shift away from mission of flood risk reduction to merely grants management (output vs. outcome).

ASFPM Leadership

- It is recommended and herein requested that ASFPM leadership coordinate a meeting with FEMA Region V for the purpose of addressing concerns of the region, facilitating greater communication between the regional office, states and local communities.

- The Region V states would like a report on how ASFPM is taking these recommendations and presenting them to FEMA;
- It's imperative that ASFPM start supporting the need for map coordination with the states. ASFPM should discourage the use of Risk MAP and Resiliency contractors and support bringing this objective back to the states;
- Region 5 requests the ASFPM executive office and board regularly review, respond to, and show action relative to the needs of each region. At a minimum, an annual update should be provided to the region director addressing concerns so that the director may then convey progress to members of the region; and
- Offer a region teleconference quarterly, organized by the executive office for all Region V members.

Mapping Needs/Issues

- Convince FEMA Region V that Region V states are fully capable and better suited to manage all aspects of the Risk MAP Program;
- Current national metrics ARE NOT REDUCING FLOOD RISKS/FLOOD DAMAGES;
- There continues to be concerns that the same communities get invited to many different meetings with very similar goals;
- Some of this had been due to overlap of projects with different consultants who cover the same parts of the state. Communities still feel they go to multiple meetings and give the same information to FEMA (via various consultants) over and over, and continue to have to wait for accurate maps that were identified as their highest priority;
- A clearer definition for “eligible” mitigation actions is needed. Communities have brought up proposed actions during meetings with FEMA (or consultants) that were considered as good projects, but ultimately they could not be supported through Risk MAP because the communities are not considered deployed;
- Some states still do not have DFIRMs for the majority of their state and a significant portion of those areas still have the A Zones with no supporting data from the original Flood Hazard Boundary Maps of the 1970s;

- In spite of the fact that LiDAR is available, some of the recently issued DFIRMs have boundaries that are not accurate due to timing of when map update started;
- Hazards such as ice jams, landslides, mudslides and fluvial erosion need to be incorporated into Risk MAP process and be considered for future mitigation projects; and
- Concerns continue regarding getting better available data and leveraged data into updated maps.

Example: FEMA contractors getting funding to do First Order Approximations in a big area where better data already exists. States don't want FOAs done where better data is available! Watershed districts have better data at a HUC-12 level, but since remapping is done at a HUC-8 level, better data is not incorporated since the timing won't work to do the whole HUC-8.

CRS Program

- Many communities were retrograded after the new manual was released in 2013;
- Advocate for the reevaluation of the CRS Manual (2013) to be more clear, transparent and reasonable; and
- Award more mitigation funding to States that are more pro-active towards mitigating flood damages.

Cooperating Technical Partners Program

- FEMA Region V should reconnect and coordinate with local CTPs;
- The new mapping process should result in avoiding future mitigation, not just in risk communication;
- Resiliency and Risk MAP meetings are redundant;
- Region V priorities are set without due consideration of states' knowledge, concerns and expertise; and
- Consultants being directed by FEMA, driven by metrics, and ignoring state's mapping and mitigation needs and priorities.

ICC Insurance Rider

- Disasters resulting in Substantial Damage other than flooding induced substantial damage should be considered for ICC claims.

Mitigation

- Lack of mitigation funding leaves communities little encouragement to reduce risk. More mitigation funding needed;
- Appropriate more money towards actual mitigation projects; fewer dollars towards MHMP Planning;
- Change DMA-2000 MHMP update requirement to a 10-year cycle; five-year cycle is a burden and waste of money;
- Streamline mitigation application process to promote more timely approvals;
- Rebate program through PDM used to allow state's plans to count toward DMA requirement. Now local plans are required. This is problematic for rural electric co-ops that had their plans (otherwise distributed across many communities) rolled up into the state plan, as they'll now be asked to have their projects reflected in each county plan;
- Funding for "mitigation action" is promoting meetings that raise community expectations, consume community and state partner's time, and produce very little true action at a very high cost in terms of money and lost credibility with communities; and
- Lack of mitigation options for non-substantially damaged structures interested in elevating/retrofitting, but needing some assistance. Getting more timely options to help facilitate these efforts are needed at the federal, state and local levels.

NFIP

- BW-12/GW-14 FEMA's across-the-board flood insurance surcharges continue to be resented, as is the absence of the promised map appeal reimbursements. Many are still not aware that FEMA does not intend to consider LOMA- reimbursements.

- Region is attempting to reset the successful partnership of cooperative agreements between the States and Region V as mandated by contracts.

Training/Webinars

- Some states have received grant funds 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. These webinars should be shared with all states within the region.
- Encourage FEMA Region V to offer other training opportunities in each state such as: All-Hazards Mitigation Planning workshop; FEMA G393 - Mitigation for Emergency Managers; Disaster response and recovery; Damage assessments; Benefit-cost analysis including new Landslide Acquisition benefit; Community safe room; Higher Standards; and other mitigation and recovery topics as needed.
- Promote cross-training and coordination between floodplain managers and emergency managers.