



NAFSMA Survey on NFIP Reform

Tim Murphy

Co-Chair Floodplain Management Committee

**National Association of Flood &
Stormwater Management Agencies**



Introduction

What we did

Based upon items FEMA was looking at
Simple survey, didn't use a scientific process
Not representative of official NAFSMA policy

Survey results

High support, Support
Neutral, no consensus
Opposed, not likely to support

Evaluation criteria

Take Away



Survey Results



High Support (1)

Strengthen floodplain management standards

Establish one foot (or more) of freeboard as a minimum standard

Protect critical facilities to the 500-year event

Map and regulate coastal AE Zones

Science and engineering

Deliver flood depths based upon quality terrain data for improved insurance rating and better flood communication

Map future conditions when doing floodplain delineations

Provide multiple frequency data for improved insurance rating, grants assessment, floodplain management, and implementation of Executive Order 11988

Establish arbitration panel to resolve map appeals



High Support (2)

Insurance

- Phase-in rate increases newly identified or changed flood areas
- Require mandatory purchase of risk-based flood insurance in areas protected by a levee
- Provide higher coverage limits
- Charge actuarial rates for repetitive loss properties
- Eliminate insurance subsidies, or at least for non-residential & non-primary residences

Outreach

- Require a community to perform outreach to citizens at the beginning of the study and mapping process; assist communities with economic impact analyses



High Support (3)

Levees

Improve flood risk communication relative to levees

Certify levees to specific level of protection

Map residual risk with levees, dams, and other flood control structures

Develop new flood zones specific to leveed areas

Support



Insurance

Flood insurance policy term is longer than one year

Provide funds to communities for implementing CRS creditable activities; institute a sliding non-Federal cost share for disaster assistance and WRDA projects, depending upon CRS rating;

expand community rating designations; expand promotion of CRS

Remove the annual limitation on premium increases

Floodplain Management

Decouple the LOMR-F process from the mandatory purchase requirement

Allow communities to use replacement cost instead of market value when determining substantial damage

Neutral, No Clear Consensus



Forgive the NFIP debt

Do not insure new or substantially improved construction in critical habitat areas mapped by other federal agencies

Universal coverage, require States to mandate that insurers include flood as a covered peril

Flood insurance would only be available through the federal government for structures built prior to a specific date

Every property is actuarially rated across the watershed and all communities in the watershed receive an annual insurance bill

States design their own flood program, federal government only sets minimum standards

Municipal level insurance model, Federal government offers flood insurance to municipalities

Opposed, Not Likely to Support (1)



Insurance

Abolish the mandatory purchase requirement

Discontinue the NFIP

Do nothing with the NFIP

Allow individuals to opt out of flood insurance if they also waive their rights to disaster assistance

Full Privatization, the Federal Government would not be involved at all in the servicing and backing of flood insurance

Opposed, Not Likely to Support (2)



Federal Role

Federally-backed flood insurance would be replaced by expanded eligibility for disaster assistance. This means that tax-payers assume the costs of flooding.

Federal role limited to special classes of population, under this option private market delivers all aspects of floodplain management, insurance, and building standards. Federal government role limited helping special classes of population when adversely affected by private market

Full privatization, the federal government would not be involved at all in the servicing and backing of flood insurance. The private market is left to enforce land use and building practices and mitigation would be funded by private markets



Evaluation Criteria



Evaluation Criteria

Ranked from most important to least important

Minimize exposure to flood hazards to avoid loss of life and property

Minimize the complexity of interaction between various levels of government

Encourage individuals to assume the risk of flooding

Maximize the natural functions of floodplains as a means to reduce flood losses

Individuals incur costs of increased risk gradually

Maximize the economic benefits relative to the economic costs

Political acceptability, balance and preserve various viewpoints to ensure successful adoption and implementation

Assistance is provided to those who cannot afford the cost of flood



Take Away

Take Away



The NFIP needs to be reformed, doing nothing isn't an option

Floodplain management standards should be strengthened

The NFIP's financial health needs to be improved

Support better and more detailed mapping products along with

There needs to be more outreach

Okay with improving mapping and identifying risks around levees

Abandoning the NFIP was the worst proposal



Questions