



## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FLOOD AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES

1301 K Street, NW • 8th Floor East • Washington, DC 20005

Telephone (202) 218-4133 • Facsimile (202) 478-1734

### NAFSMA Position On Floodplain Management Issues

(Adopted April, 2005)

#### *Introduction*

The National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies (NAFSMA), founded in 1978, is an organization of public agencies whose function is the protection of lives, property and economic activity from the adverse impacts of storm and flood waters. Most of the 105 member agencies either belong to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) or represent agencies which belong to the NFIP. The total population represented by these agencies is in excess of 100 million citizens.

NAFSMA's mission is to advocate public policies which facilitate and enhance the achievement of the public service functions of its member agencies. NAFSMA is committed to working with all other groups, at any time, to resolve floodplain management issues.

NAFSMA has identified the following areas of concern with regard to the NFIP and how the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is managing this program as it affects the public service functions of its member agencies. NAFSMA's positions regarding these areas of concern follow.

#### *Department of Homeland Security*

FEMA is now a part of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). There is some concern in the natural hazards mitigation community that its focus could be shifted from natural hazards to terrorism.

**FEMA must retain a strong natural hazards component as a part of DHS; including flood hazard mapping, map modernization, mitigation and disaster response. Otherwise, FEMA should be returned to its previous status as an independent agency reporting to the President.**

#### *Mapping Issues*

FEMA is in the second year of its map modernization program, which will convert the nation's Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to digital products.

**NAFSMA fully supports FEMA's on-going map modernization program.**

The early experience of NAFSMA members engaged in map modernization projects with FEMA has been that, in many instances, the National Service Providers' libraries cannot provide the work maps the FIRMs are based on, and the project budgets are not adequate to restudy those areas. In these instances the FEMA regional offices seem to be favoring digitizing the inaccurate FIRMs in order to meet budget and map production goals. This procedure will result in the perpetuation of inaccurate maps.

**NAFSMA believes it is important to expand the total budget and extend the time frame in order to meet the original accuracy and quality goals of the map modernization program.**

Because the benefits of the modernization program go beyond the sale of flood insurance, flood insurance policy holders should not be required to bear the additional cost of the modernization program; but rather the public as a whole should participate in the funding of the modernization program.

**NAFSMA supports adequate funding of the map modernization program in the Federal budget.**

FEMA's Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) initiative is of particular interest to NAFSMA. Many NAFSMA member agencies have the expertise and financial capability to conduct the types of activities; such as hydrology, hydraulics, and topographic mapping; which are used to develop Flood Insurance Studies (FIS's), restudies, FIRMs and Letters of Map Change. These agencies also often design and implement projects which reduce flood hazards and lead to the need to revise FIS's and FIRMs. In some cases, these agencies are in the best position to certify the completion of these projects and complete the needed map revisions in a timely manner.

**NAFSMA encourages FEMA to continue its implementation of the CTP initiative, while utilizing NAFSMA member agencies to the fullest extent possible. This includes CTP participation in the map modernization program.**

In the past, NAFSMA has encouraged FEMA to allow the inclusion of future hydrologic conditions on the FIRMs, at the request of the local governments, for advisory or regulatory purposes (but not for purposes of flood insurance); and to consider showing other hazards on the FIRMs when requested by the local governments. A recent rule published by FEMA allows the inclusion of future hydrologic conditions, but does not address other hazards.

**NAFSMA encourages FEMA to consider showing other hazards on the FIRMs when requested by the local governments.**

During its five-year existence the Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC) provided a valuable forum for floodplain managers across the entire spectrum to come together and discuss floodplain management issues. In its final report the TMAC recommended that the Director of FEMA convene an annual forum of stakeholders to review the progress of the Map Modernization Program and discuss further improvements of FIRMs and related issues.

**NAFSMA encourages FEMA to convene an annual meeting of floodplain management stakeholders as recommended by TMAC; and commits itself to active participation in such meetings.**

FEMA requires local governments to assure the maintenance of flood carrying capacity of flood management projects, such as enlarged channels, as a condition of revising FIRMs to reflect the effects of the projects. At the same time the Corps of Engineers, under its 404 permit process, makes it more difficult and expensive for local governments to perform the required, and necessary, maintenance. The Technical Mapping Advisory Council, in its 1998 annual report, encouraged FEMA to work with the Corps of Engineers to develop 404 permit regulations which exempt maintenance of FEMA credited flood management projects.

**NAFSMA agrees with the Technical Mapping Advisory Council that maintenance activities should be exempt from 404 permit requirements.**

A number of NAFSMA member agencies have had experiences with map determination companies where obviously incorrect determinations have been made, resulting in erroneous flood insurance purchase requirements which have cost citizens insurance premiums that they should have not have had to pay. These companies generally refuse to accept more detailed and/or more current information from the local governments, no matter how knowledgeable these agencies are about the flood hazards in their own communities.

**FEMA should revise its procedures to require map determination companies to accept credible technical evidence from local government officials regarding the determination of flood insurance purchase requirements. Further, FEMA should periodically evaluate and report the accuracy of the determinations made by the various companies.**

### ***Flood Management Projects***

There are a tremendous number of existing structures within identified floodplains in this country; most of which were constructed before floodplains were mapped, or modern floodplain management techniques were widely used. The protection of these existing structures, and the physical and economic well-being of their occupants, is a matter of great importance to the member agencies of NAFSMA. In many instances the best way to mitigate the flood hazard in these areas (measured in terms of costs, time involved and social disruption) is with remedial projects utilizing structural flood management methods.

There are certainly differences between remedial projects and preventive projects. Non-structural methods, such as floodplain regulations, subdivision regulations, land acquisition, and other activities that preserve the natural and beneficial functions of the drainageways, are most appropriate and cost effective in preventive situations dealing with new development. In many instances, non-structural methods are not cost effective or timely in providing remedial solutions to existing flood hazards. It is infeasible to think that all of these existing structures are going to someday be removed and the land returned to open uses compatible with the flood hazard; and yet that seems to be the focus of FEMA's mitigation philosophy.

**FEMA should work with affected local governments to select and support the mitigation alternatives most appropriate for each situation.**

FEMA has structure buyout/relocation grant programs which generally impose conditions on the acquired property which prohibit the use of the property for any structural flood management measures. While it is recognized that FEMA's emphasis is on non-structural solutions, a blanket prohibition on structural solutions can be counter productive. For example, an excavated floodway could reduce flood hazards while still preserving the open space intent of the original grant programs.

**FEMA should modify its grant conditions to allow consideration of the use of these acquired properties for cost effective flood management projects which reduce flood hazards and are compatible with the overall objectives of the particular grant program.**

### ***Mitigation Planning***

The FY03 budget reduced the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (post-disaster mitigation) from the previously authorized 15% to 7.5%, and also established a competitive pre-disaster mitigation grant program.

**NAFSMA strongly believes in both pre- and post-disaster mitigation activities, and urges full funding of both programs.**

### ***Community Rating System***

The Community Rating System (CRS) was adopted by FEMA, and later codified by Congress, to encourage participants in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) to do more than the minimum required by the NFIP in return for reduced flood insurance premiums within the communities. Points are awarded for activities undertaken by the local governments, and the amount of the premium reduction is based on the number of points the community receives.

The current amount of paperwork required to apply to and remain in the CRS has been reduced from the time it was first initiated, but NAFSMA member agencies believe that there is still room for more improvement. In addition, member agencies continue to be dismayed with the lack of trust FEMA shows in local governments with regard to the accuracy of their paperwork.

Many urban areas are fragmented among many local jurisdictions, each of which are individual participants of the NFIP and CRS. As such, each jurisdiction must submit its own paperwork, resulting in duplicate work for regional efforts, such as flood warning plans and stormwater management efforts. Other Federal programs also require submission of essentially duplicate information from time to time.

NAFSMA fully supports continued participation in the Community Rating System Task Force.

**FEMA should continue past efforts to reduce paperwork associated with the CRS, including coordination of required information between neighboring jurisdictions, state and regional agencies, and Federal programs with similar information requirements. NAFSMA is willing to assist FEMA in the identification of common information required by different Federal programs and to try to streamline submittal requirements. Further, NAFSMA member agencies would appreciate a CRS evaluation process which demonstrated more trust in the local agencies.**

### ***Conclusion***

The member agencies of NAFSMA want to work with FEMA on the common goal of protecting the lives and property of American citizens. However, they want their commitment, their expertise and their unique circumstances to be recognized by FEMA, and they want their work products to be more readily accepted by FEMA. We have to work together. To do otherwise is to waste precious resources.