# Oregon Natural Hazards Program

# Floodplain Management
# 5-Year Work Plan

# Federal Fiscal Years 2005-2009

## September 2004

Prepared by:
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
Floodplain/Natural Hazards Program
635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540
(503) 373-0050
www.lcd.state.or.us

Prepared For:
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Region X, Federal Regional Center
Federal Insurance and Mitigation Division
130 228th St. SW
Bothell, WA 98021-9796

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary…… Page 1

Section I – State Authority……..Page 2

Section II – Oregon's 5-Year Vision for Floodplain Management…… Page 3

Section III – Oregon's Strategy for Improving Floodplain Management……...Page 6

Section IV – Needs Analysis and Gap Assessment…… Page 12

Section V – Map Modernization Activities…… Page 21

Section VI – Process for Evaluating Performance……..Page 22

## Executive Summary

The people of Oregon have a long history of respecting natural hazards and using community-based planning to minimize flooding impacts. Oregon has one of oldest and most comprehensive statewide land use planning programs in the nation. Oregon's state and local floodplain management programs are rooted in the statewide land use planning program and have been quite successful over the years at minimizing loss of life and property from flooding. Part of the key to success is that all cities and counties with flood hazard areas regulate their floodplains and participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Both the State and the federal government have benefited greatly[1] from the work done by Oregon's local governments to prepare comprehensive land use plans, implement floodplain development codes, and comply with the NFIP.

Oregon's floodplain management program has enjoyed much success over the years. The results of the state program have included greater public awareness of flood risks, enhanced understanding among local officials and the public of the benefits of the NFIP, continued implementation of local floodplain development ordinances that meet and in many cases exceed NFIP requirements, and on-going technical assistance for local governments and others regarding flood hazards. Oregon residents have also benefited from increased coordination between emergency managers and floodplain program managers and better communications among state-level hazard mitigation agencies. Oregon's floodplain management program continues to be steadfast but also looks to be innovative and proactive wherever possible in its efforts.

Although floodplain management within Oregon has been very successful, there is still a great need to provide technical assistance and support to local governments, property owners and other agencies. Existing efforts must be maintained, and opportunities sought for accomplishing additional, important floodplain management work. DLCD's goal is to ensure that Oregon's floodplain management program remains highly effective and that floodplain management needs are addressed to the maximum extent possible. To accomplish the later, the state's floodplain programs would benefit from additional resources to conduct a variety of program activities and projects that would facilitate better local floodplain management. With additional resources, the Department could expand upon its existing efforts and take on new, innovative tasks to achieve a more comprehensive floodplain management program.

The purpose of this work plan is to present a five-year vision of needs and opportunities for Oregon's Floodplain Management Program. The plan describes projects and activities that DLCD believes would further sound floodplain management in Oregon. The plan also provides estimates of costs to implement these projects and activities and compares projected program resources to needed resources. Another purpose of this work plan is to begin establishing performance targets and program goals to help in short- and long-term evaluation of the effectiveness of Oregon's floodplain management program.

---

[1] FEMA indicated in 1996 that, as a result of Oregon's excellent statewide land use planning program, an average of $10 million in flood losses is avoided annually. Also, as a result of the statewide land use planning program, Oregon's cities and counties had the highest participation rate in the NFIP in the nation.

## I. State Authority:

The state floodplain program is supported by strong, clear authority under Oregon's statewide land use planning program. (See Appendix A for details.) Pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 197, all local governments must prepare and administer comprehensive land use plans that address state standards. These state standards include Statewide Planning Goal 7-Natural Hazards. Goal 7 specifically addresses the identification of flood hazard areas (both riverine and coastal). Goal 7 essentially requires local adoption of floodplain management regulations that meet or exceed the minimum requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program

Under Oregon's land use planning system, once local plans are "acknowledged" as being in compliance with the statewide planning goals, local and state agencies must comply with local plan requirements and implementing ordinances. Where development does occur in identified flood hazard areas, potential damages are avoided or minimized through compliance with local floodplain development standards and permit conditions designed to mitigate potential flood damage.

Other aspects of the statewide land use planning program, adopted under Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs), indirectly support floodplain management in Oregon. For example, statewide planning Goal 5 - Natural Resources, promotes local conservation of wetlands, riparian areas, natural areas, scenic rivers, and wilderness areas throughout the state (see OAR 660, Div. 23). Also, Goal15 - Willamette River Greenway promotes, among other values, the natural, scenic, agricultural and recreational values of the Willamette River (see OAR 660, Div 20). And the state has adopted Goal 17 - Coastal Shorelands and Goal 18- Beaches and Dunes that protect coastal resources, address potential hazards from ocean and riverine flooding, and restrict development in potentially hazardous locations.

Oregon also has one of the best agricultural and forest lands protection programs in the nation under ORS Chapter 215 and statewide planning Goal 3 – Agricultural Lands and Goal 4 – Forest Lands. Agricultural lands in particular are often within floodplains and in Oregon zoned for exclusive farm use. This means that very little residential or commercial development could occur in these areas. Rural residential development is not allowed on lands zoned for agriculture and forest uses, which comprise approximately 90% of the lands in western Oregon (west of the Cascade Mountains) and 97% of the lands in eastern Oregon.

The State of Oregon has building code requirements and requires local governments to comply with state building codes in approving new developments and substantial improvements. Through the state's uniform building code, Oregon has instituted a "free-board" standard requiring the lowest floor elevation to be at least one-foot above the base flood elevation. Cities and counties throughout Oregon have adopted the "one-foot above" standard or an even higher freeboard standard.

In summation, Oregon requires all jurisdictions to develop comprehensive plans and land development codes in compliance with the 19 statewide planning goals. Under ORS

Chapters 197, 215 and 227 and OAR Chapter 660, Oregon has used its authority to establish a solid land use planning program that promotes and supports sound floodplain management that in several respects exceeds NFIP requirements.

## II. Oregon's 5-year Vision for Floodplain Management

DLCD strongly believes that the Oregon floodplain management program will continue to be successful. Success will come from the faithful administration of floodplain ordinances by local governments and state-level actions such as community assistance visits (CAVs), public outreach/education projects, working in partnership with other state agencies to maximize efficiencies, etc. But despite Oregon's past and anticipated future successes, there remains a lot of work to be done to deliver a comprehensive floodplain management program for Oregon. As this work plan reports, available resources do not match projected needs for floodplain management activities and projects. Yet there exists constant pressure to develop and redevelop in floodplains along many of Oregon's coastal and riverine shorelines, creating an equally constant demand for DLCD's floodplain management services. The state and Oregon's local governments need to remain vigilant in protecting the floodwater carrying capacity of their floodplains and preventing inappropriate, unsafe development in flood hazard areas.

One full-time staff located at the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) administers Oregon's current floodplain management program. At this time, DLCD must assume that the Oregon program will continue to be a one-person operation. During the next five years and presuming funding remains the same, DLCD anticipates performing at a minimum the same type of duties identified in the FY 2004 CAP-SSSE grant (see the attached FY 2004 CAP-SSSE grant). However, a number of variables will affect the amount of time spent performing specific duties during the next five years. For example, if a declared flood disaster occurs within the five-year period, DLCD's floodplain specialist could spend ¼ to ½ of the FTE allocation for that year performing disaster assistance duties, thereby greatly reducing time spent performing other duties listed in the grant. Or as map modernization efforts increase, the floodplain coordinator may have less time for other duties with work fluctuating accordingly. When additional funds become available but not additional FTE, the floodplain coordinator may spend additional time on contract and project management. Therefore, in creating this five-year plan, DLCD will describe a number of projects designed to improve state and local government management of floodplains that are dependent on increased funding and DLCD's capacity or level of staffing.

To begin the assessment of where Oregon's program is currently and to develop a vision for the programs future, DLCD started with a qualitative assessment of the program compared to the guiding principles for floodplain management programs developed by the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM). The comparison reveals some notable strengths and weaknesses in Oregon's program. (See table below for DLCD's assessment.)

**How Oregon Compares with ASFPM's Guiding Principles for an Effective State Floodplain Program**

| Guiding Principles | Above Average (8-10) | Satisfactory (5-7) | Needs Improvement (4-1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1. State floodplain program has strong, clear authority** | **9** | | |
| **2. Comprehensive and integrated with other state functions** | **8** | | |
| **3. Flood hazards identified and risks assessed** | | **5** | |
| **4. Floodplain functions and resources respected** | | **7** | |
| **5. Development is guided away from flood prone areas and adverse impacts minimized** | **8** | | |
| **6. Statewide floodplain mitigation strategies are in place** | | | **4** |
| **7. Informs the public about flood hazards and mitigation opportunities** | | **6** | |
| **8. Training and technical assistance opportunities exist** | | **6** | |
| **9. Funding and staffing meets demand** | | | **4** |
| **10. Effectiveness of the state's floodplain has been evaluated and documented** | | | **4** |

This exercise helps to highlight areas where DLCD should focus future efforts to build state program capacity. In addition, DLCD envisions the following variables to be important to future program success.

### A. Public Outreach

Because the desire to develop in the floodplain will likely remain great, the need to educate and communicate with local governments and the public will also remain. Outreach/education through innovative and less regulatory methods may prove to be a more successful approach compared to reliance exclusively on regulatory measures. Therefore, one of Oregon's visions is to devise a public outreach/education program that elevates floodplain and natural hazard issues to the publics' conscientious through both existing approaches and avenues not yet tried in Oregon. For example, DLCD would

continue with efforts like the Natural Hazards Planner newsletter and the natural hazards website. But DLCD could also pursue, with adequate resources, special outreach/education projects targeted at various sectors such as local governments, the general public, or school kids. Such projects might only go as far as creating materials that others can use to implement floodplain outreach/education projects or could entail implementation via DLCD.

### B. Map Modernization

Another aspect of program improvement is the need to update and modernize NFIP maps. The reliability of many of the existing NFIP maps and flood studies in Oregon can be questioned because in many parts of the state changes within watersheds have occurred since the maps and flood studies were created. Of the 257 jurisdictions that participate in the NFIP, over 70% have maps that are outdated. Problems associated with using outdated maps were raised in Oregon's Flood Map Modernization Business Plan. DLCD anticipates that much of its effort with respect to Map Modernization will focus on public outreach/education efforts specific to the importance of flood hazard mapping and how communities and the public can participate in mapping projects.

### C. CAVs, CACs and CRS

Increasing the number of Community Assistance Visits (CAVs) and Community Assistance Contacts (CACs) annually and encouraging greater participation in the Community Rating System (CRS) program are all laudable goals. However, achieving these goals at the current staffing level presents a dilemma for the department. Since all local jurisdictions with the potential to flood are enrolled in NFIP, performing timely CAVs and CACs for all jurisdictions has proven impossible for a one-person operation. Given the potential need for CAVs and CACs and resource limitations, DLCD finds it difficult to decide which jurisdictions should receive visits or contacts on an annual basis. CAVs are required to join CRS or to maintain CRS eligibility, yet CRS jurisdictions often are the most knowledgeable about NFIP requirements and best performing. Smaller jurisdictions usually need more help and require more time than those jurisdictions with more sophisticated planning programs but often have a limited number of flood insurance policies and usually minimal growth.

Unless more grant dollars are provided to perform CAVs and CACs on a more consistent basis, DLCD believes it to be more efficient to devise a strategy that splits the FTE for CAVs/CACs between CRS jurisdictions and smaller jurisdictions and to use our limited capacity to perform CAVs rather than CACs. Although CACs involve less time per jurisdiction, CAVs provide a more thorough assessment of local floodplain programs and offer greater technical assistance to individual jurisdictions. CAVs also seem to be prioritized by FEMA compared to CACs. DLCD would like to develop an alternative technical assistance approach for small jurisdictions with limited growth and insurance policies (e.g., less than 15 policies), thereby reducing the overall number of jurisdictions kept on the list as needing a CAV or CAC.

### D. Coordination with Other Agencies and Programs

DLCD has an established track record of partnering with Oregon's local governments to accomplish land use planning. Because Oregon's statewide land use program is implemented through local comprehensive plans and land use ordinances, a culture has been established that requires coordination on various levels between state agencies and local governments. This institutionalized practice of coordinating with local governments is a major reason why every flood-prone jurisdiction is a member of the NFIP.

Coordinating and working cooperatively with other agencies is a necessity when running a successful one-person program. DLCD has excellent working relationships with other state agencies and other organizations involved in planning for and responding to natural disasters. DLCD plans to continue its participation in programs that benefit the state's floodplain management program. DLCD already partners with the Oregon Office of Emergency Management (OEM) in assisting with the development and implementation of Oregon's State Hazard Mitigation Plan. DLCD also is a member of the state's Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team (IHMT) that meets regularly to discuss topics associated with disasters such as disaster preparedness, disaster planning, roles and responsibilities during a disaster, etc. Other state agencies on the IHMT besides OEM and DLCD are the Building Codes Agency, State Fire Marshal's Office, State Insurance Division, Public Utility Commission, University of Oregon - Oregon Natural Hazard Workgroup, and the Depts. of Environmental Quality, Geology and Mineral Industries, Transportation, Fish and Wildlife, Agriculture, Economic and Community Development, Forestry, State Lands, Parks and Recreation, Water Resources, and Administrative Services. Where possible, DLCD hopes to increase its coordination efforts by partnering with additional agencies to satisfy NFIP program goals.

DLCD coordinates with and relies on the Department of Administration Services (DAS)-Geospatial Enterprise Office for expertise in implementing the map modernization project currently underway in Oregon and elsewhere. Coordination with other agencies on this project will occur as needed.

## III. Oregon's Strategy for Improving Floodplain Management

### A. Developing the 5-year Floodplain Management Work Plan

Viewing the floodplain management program over a five-year span allows DLCD to better assess its capacity, needs, and priorities when compared to the process of developing annual CAP-SSSE work programs. The Department can identify a broader range of needed projects and activities from the 5-year planning perspective vs. the constraints of an annual CAP-SSSE budget. Also, the Department can better address the timeframe for various activities and projects. Some program improvements are one-time events; while others require an annual effort. Some require a great deal of time at start-up but require less time to maintain.

The 5-year plan allows us to present ideas that, although not mandated through annual CAP-SSSE agreements, could also greatly benefit the floodplain management program if time and resources allowed for them. DLCD's 5-year plan attempts to provide a larger view of how this agency intends to perform its floodplain management duties in the future – both within the bounds of anticipated resources and if additional resources become available for floodplain management work in Oregon. The plan presents a vision for possible expansion of the capabilities and functions of the floodplain management program.

The Department developed this 5-year work plan in-house, drawing on the expertise of the current state floodplain coordinator, past state floodplain coordinators, and other staff with experience in the NFIP. Key documents reviewed in the plan development process are listed here:

- 2002-2004 CAP-SSSE Work Programs from DLCD/FEMA Agreements
- 2004 Oregon Flood Map Modernization Business Plan
- 2004 DLCD's Work Program from MMMS Application to FEMA
- 05-07 DLCD Agency Request Budget
- 2003 ASFPM "Effective Floodplain Management Programs"
- 2004 ASFPM/FEMA "Five Year Floodplain Management Work Plan Outline"

This work plan is intended to be a living document. DLCD expects to review the work plan on an annual basis. Annual reviews will most likely occur at the end of each fiscal year in conjunction with development of the CAP-SSSE work program for the coming fiscal year. DLCD would also consult the plan if additional resources become available during a fiscal year. The plan will be used as a reference throughout the fiscal year. DLCD may also need to re-evaluate this work plan when information about the 07-09 state biennium begins to develop.

### B. Potential Floodplain Program Activities/Projects

DLCD has developed the following list of activities and projects as a way to document the various efforts we believe are necessary to deliver a comprehensive floodplain management program in the State of Oregon. These activities/projects are not listed in any particular order of priority. We believe that all the activities/projects listed here are potentially fundable under FEMA's CAP-SSSE program. The list includes activities/projects that would need to occur on a continual basis as well as projects with discreet beginning and ending points. These activities/projects would most likely be accomplished by a combination of direct DLCD efforts and contractual services. The Department intends to use this list as a guide for planning and implementing floodplain program efforts on an annual basis and for other short-range planning.

◇ **State Ordinance Research and Development**

- Review Oregon model ordinance for needed updates (per NFIP regulations, state laws) and develop appropriate ordinance language
- Improve overall organization of the Oregon model ordinance (readability/usability)

- Add optional sections to the Oregon model ordinance to address issues such as insurance implications, fish habitat protection, etc.
- Crosswalk the Oregon model ordinance with Oregon state building codes, creating educational material for local planners and building officials

◇ **State Model/Local Government Ordinance Assistance**

- Provide general technical assistance to state agencies, local governments, property owners, developers, general public about NFIP requirements and other flood reduction measures as reflected in the Oregon model ordinance
- Assist local governments with local adoption of revisions to local floodplain ordinances, including incorporation of updated model ordinance language
- Assist local governments, property owners, developers, others with application of local floodplain ordinances to specific projects (e.g. site review/assistance)

◇ **Community Assistance Visits and Contacts (CAVs/CACs)**

- Consistently perform CAVs and CACs
- Establish, with input from FEMA, criteria for placing Oregon communities on long-term CAV and CAC lists and create these master lists
- On an annual basis, select communities for CAVs/CACs based on established criteria/lists
- Continually work with FEMA and ISO to address CRS needs
- Develop a system to document and track CACs
- Develop alternative technical assistance approach for small communities with limited insurance base

◇ **Community Information System (CIS) Database**

- Learn how to better use the new FEMA CIS database
- Routinely enter CAV/CAC data into CIS in a timely manner
- Work with FEMA to correct historical data in CIS as necessary
- Work with FEMA to identify other information that should be input to CIS

◇ **General Technical Assistance**

- Develop a system to document technical assistance phone calls, e-mails, and other relevant efforts
- Using above-mentioned system, track types, locations of issues, etc.
- Promote local government participation in CRS through technical assistance
- Assist local governments with efforts to locally adopt higher regulatory standards or non-regulatory approaches to enhance local floodplain management programs
- Offer training to DLCD field staff regarding NFIP and related topics
- Maintain FEMA floodplain maps and flood insurance studies in the DLCD main office for public review/use
- Provide FEMA/other guidebooks, manuals, brochures, etc. to local governments, state agencies, citizens, and others upon request

◇ **Workshops and Other Training Opportunities**

- Provide annual training and meeting opportunities on various NFIP topics (e.g. NFIP basics, elevation certificates, CRS, obtaining floodplain manager certification) for emergency managers, building officials, land use planners and local government and tribal decision-makers.
- Seek opportunities to partner with regional organizations to provide technical sessions, Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM) exams, etc. at regional conferences and workshops that target local government planners, local building officials, realtors, etc.
- Ensure continuing education/training for state floodplain program coordinator
- Provide information on the CFM program to local floodplain administrators
- Work with ASFPM to establish continuing education credits for trainings
- Proctor CFM exams as needed

◇ **Public Education/Outreach**

- Publish the Natural Hazards Newsletter, including a Handout Page, 3-4 times annually
- Develop the in-house capability, including e-mail distribution lists, to distribute Newsletters and other information online through a list serve
- Scope, develop, and implement an outreach/education program to explain the natural functions of floodplains and to promote preservation of these functions.
- Scope, develop, and implement an outreach/education program to address:
    - voluntary, local adoption of higher regulatory standards (e.g., freeboard, no rise floodway, balanced cut/fill, floodway protection, etc.)
    - voluntary, local use of non-regulatory tools (e.g., tax incentives, land trusts, transfer of development rights, etc.)
- Scope, develop or adapt/adopt a pilot education program about floodplain management for use in Oregon's elementary and middle schools. Work with educators on implementation.
- Scope, develop, and implement an outreach/education program for map modernization, partnering with DAS Geospatial Enterprise Office, the Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup (ONHW), Dept. of Geology and Mineral Industries, and other appropriate agencies. (See Flood Map Modernization Business Plan for Oregon for more details.)
- Conduct an annual review of the DLCD hazards program website, enhancing and updating floodplain program information as necessary
- Conduct an annual review of the DLCD five-year plan, enhancing and updating the plan as appropriate

◇ **Mapping Assistance/Map Modernization**[2]

- Pursue a Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) agreement with FEMA Region X to establish the overall basis for cooperation and coordination between the state of Oregon and FEMA.
- Seek out local CTP partners with demonstrated capability to offer quality data, financial support, or other key resources to the map modernization program.

[2] See Public Education/Outreach and Interagency Coordination categories for education/outreach activities and Map Modernization coordinating workgroup associated with map modernization.

- Update Oregon's business plan on an annual basis to address developing information about new data sources, state in-kind contributions, and newly emerging or strengthened partnerships with local, state, or federal agencies
- Provide FEMA Region X with an updated list of recommended mapping priorities for Oregon on an annual basis
- Work with DAS-Geospatial Enterprise Office and other partners as appropriate to provide an inventory of base map data meeting FEMA specifications for NFIP communities
- Develop a systematic, tiered approach to mapping needs assessment and documentation
- Develop and employ, in cooperation with FEMA, a list of criteria for prioritizing mapping needs
- Coordinate with FEMA regarding pending updates to mapping methodology for Oregon's coastal areas and implementation of the methodology when finalized.
- Obtain information/other input about local floodplain hazards and floodplain mapping issues from community members and officials.
- Develop a statewide floodplain coverage supported by a geospatial database that is maintained at the state-level via partnerships among DLCD, DAS-Geospatial Enterprise Office, and others.
- Obtain the capability to distribute flood maps, through web-based printing and from in-house at DLCD.
- Work with FEMA and NFIP communities to address digital map use for regulatory purposes and other technical assistance issues.

◇ **Interagency Coordination to Ensure NFIP Compliance**

- Continue to participate on the state Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team
- Continue to participate with Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup/Oregon Showcase State Initiative
- In cooperation with OEM and other partners, provide assistance to local governments working on flood hazard mitigation plans, including those being developed as part of comprehensive, local all-hazard mitigation plans.
- Establish and conduct meetings of a "Goal 7" group to address new hazards information
- Establish and conduct meetings of a "Map Modernization Coordinating Workgroup", coordinated with other state GIS efforts
- Facilitate the participation of other state agencies in various floodplain program activities, such as CAVs/CACs, trainings, public outreach, etc.
- Work with OEM, local governments, and other partners to address repetitive loss properties where possible
- Support efforts by OEM, local governments, and others to document and communicate flood hazard mitigation success stories
- Continue to participate in regional coordination meetings (with FEMA, other state programs, regional organizations, etc.)
- Develop and enhance coordination and cooperation between the state floodplain program and federal programs impacting floodplain management

◇ **Legislative Coordination**
- Review state and federal legislation that may impact state and local floodplain programs
- Respond to legislative or public inquiries for factual information about proposed or adopted legislation
- Track DLCD rules/programs/budget actions for potential direct and indirect impacts to state and local floodplain programs

◇ **Post Disaster Assistance to Communities (when applicable)**
- Work with FEMA disaster field office and OEM to determine and provide appropriate services and technical assistance to local governments and the public

### C. Program Milestones

Broad milestones for the 5-year planning period are established here. More specific projects and targets will be identified in annual CAP-SSSE agreements and otherwise in coordination with FEMA Region X. DLCD's milestones for the floodplain management program over federal FYs 05-09 are as follows:

- *Provide a model ordinance for flood damage prevention that is a state-of-the-art tool for local floodplain programs*
- *Routinely and efficiently conducts CAVs and CACs, with priority given to CAVs*
- *Increase the scope and effectiveness of technical assistance efforts for local governments and others*
- *Increase program focus on assisting local governments with development of local floodplain programs that go beyond the NFIP minimums and are tailored to local conditions and needs*
- *Offer various NFIP-related trainings and meetings for local governments and others on an annual basis*
- *Maintain public education/outreach efforts and implement new efforts as feasible*
- *Support local government participation in the FEMA map modernization process*
- *Enhance interagency partnerships to better deliver floodplain management services*
- *Expand scope of program efforts to operate with a multi-hazard perspective*

# IV. Needs Analysis and Gap Assessment

## A. Cost Estimates and Gap Assessment

DLCD developed the cost estimates and gap assessment summarized in this plan based primarily on past work experiences of DLCD staff. DLCD recognizes that actual costs may vary based on numerous factors such as inflation, unanticipated events, etc. The person month (PM) figures found in this plan are estimates only. FEMA and DLCD should expect to see some variation between these estimated PM costs, associated costs and actual effort/costs incurred. DLCD also acknowledges that there is a greater potential for error where estimating the costs for activities/projects that are outside the realm of past DLCD work experiences (e.g., some map modernization activities, site reviews, development of documentation systems). Overall, the Department has been conservative in its cost estimates.

DLCD's gap analysis is based upon the following assumptions:

- CAP-SSSE annual funding level for 05-09 will remain at the current (04) level
- Map Modernization funding level for 05-06 anticipated to be $120,000 federal [FEMA 7/2004 notification of MMMS funds available to Oregon]
- Map Modernization funding level for 07-09 uncertain
- State general funding level for 05-07 and 07-09 biennium will remain at current (04) level [~$61,000 per biennium, provides 25% match to federal CAP-SSSE dollars]. Since we have limited information at this time about the 05-07 state budget and no information about the 07-09 state budget, this assumption may prove faulty over time.
- Oregon's work plan will need to be updated annually to address any unanticipated revenue changes or other variables that impact costs (such as inflation, employee compensation, etc.)
- Eligible activities under CAP-SSSE and Map Modernization programs will remain relatively status quo. But shifts in FEMA priorities for floodplain management activities may occur, thereby requiring reanalysis of DLCD priorities.
- The % of time spent by DLCD's floodplain specialist on CAP-SSSE activities will remain relatively status quo, with only slight variations year-to-year if funding remains level.
- If FEMA requests additional work by DLCD on Map Modernization without provision of resources identified in the Flood Map Modernization Business Plan for Oregon, then DLCD will likely need to reduce % time spent on other CAP-SSSE-eligible activities.
- In the event of a federally declared flood disaster, DLCD would divert staff time to disaster response activities and reduce other activities accordingly.

DLCD has generated a projected needs/effort chart for each category listed in Section II of this plan. These needs/effort charts show projected person months (PM), FTE (salary/benefits) costs for the floodplain coordinator, and travel costs for each activity/project identified under a given category. Miscellaneous costs (e.g., supplies, services, map storage, etc.) are not shown on an activity-by-activity basis but are captured elsewhere. Within these charts, the Department also indicates priorities and anticipated duration of activities/projects. For example, there is a needs/effort chart for Community Assistance Visits and Contacts that shows projected expenses and funding for CAVs, CACs, and related activities. That chart shows that CAVs are a high priority to the Department and an activity that would occur on an annual basis.

In addition to the charts for individual categories of activities, we have also included a summary chart that provides totals for each category. The summary chart illustrates how the individual categories compare in terms of the amount of effort/resources that would be necessary to fully implement the floodplain management program envisioned in this 5-year plan. Within the summary chart, we also show estimated annual (or recurring) costs vs. limited duration needs. The summary chart provides an indication of how the state floodplain coordinator's time is likely to be expended – regardless of actual funding levels – by comparing between categories the estimated PM effort and overall/annual PMs . For example, CAVs, CACs, general technical assistance, public education/outreach, and map modernization categories show up as the top four categories in terms of staff time/effort required.

DLCD developed its estimate of the gap between available resources and projected floodplain program needs by comparing anticipated funding for federal fiscal years 05-09 to potential costs for program efforts over that same time period. The overall cost estimate for implementing the floodplain program described in this plan was adjusted by a 20% rate to account for miscellaneous costs such as supplies/services, map storage, and personnel costs for administrative and management support of the floodplain management program. The 20% rate was crosschecked with CAP-SSSE grant budgets for federal fiscal years 02-04 and does not account for potential inflation.

***The conclusion that DLCD must draw from the gap assessment is that additional FTE and related resources are needed to accomplish the enhanced floodplain program described in this 5-year plan.*** At least one and more likely two additional, permanent FTE would be necessary to accomplish a more efficient and comprehensive floodplain management program for the State of Oregon. ***The projected minimum gap between implementation costs and anticipated funds is about $200,000 per year***. While the FTE need could be addressed through a combination of permanent FTE, limited duration FTE, and contractual services, the Department firmly believes that at least one, permanent additional FTE is needed in-house. The floodplain management program would then be a 2 FTE program instead of a 1 FTE program. ***Without additional resources, the program can continue to be successful but will be restricted in its ability to more fully serve the needs of local floodplain management programs and the citizens of Oregon.***

## ◇ Projected Needs/Effort By Category

| Category: State Model Ordinance Research and Development | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| Review for needed updates | 0.12 | 783.00 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Improve organization | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Add optional sections | 0.46 | 3,001.50 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Ordinance/Bldg. Codes Crosswalk | 0.46 | 3,001.50 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **1.27** | **8,286.75** | **0.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| Category: State Model/Local Government Ordinance Assistance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| Provide general technical assistance | 0.46 | 3,001.50 | 500.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Local adoption of revisions | 0.35 | 2,283.75 | 250.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Application to specific projects | 2.75 | 17,943.75 | 1,000.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **3.56** | **23,229.00** | **1,750.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| **Category: Community Assistance Visits and Contacts** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| Criteria/Master Lists - CAV/CAC | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| CAVs (20/year)* | 7.2 | 46,980.00 | 3,200.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| CACs (20/year)* | 2.6 | 16,965.00 | 800.00 | Low | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| CAV/CAC Work-CRS Related | 0.5 | 3,262.50 | 200.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| CAC Database | 0.5 | 3,262.50 | 0.00 | Medium | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| CAC "Alternative" Technical Assistance | 1 | 6,525.00 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **11.8** | **76,995.00** | **4,200.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |
| * Target number of CAVs or CACs/year to be identified in annual CAP-SSSE agreements. | | | | | |
| The target number may be less than 20/year. | | | | | |

| **Category: Community Information System Database** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| | | | | | |
| Training on new CIS database | 0.12 | 783.00 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Enter CAV/CAC data | 0.4 | 2,610.00 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Correct historical data | 0.17 | 1,109.25 | 0.00 | Low | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **0.69** | **4,502.25** | **0.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| **Category: General Technical Assistance** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| | | | | | |
| Documentation System | 1.5 | 9,787.50 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Track Technical Assistance | 0.77 | 5,024.25 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Local Programs (CRS/Other) | 1.5 | 9,787.50 | 500.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Internal Assistance/Training | 0.05 | 326.25 | 0.00 | Low | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Maintain Maps/Studies | 0.61 | 3,980.25 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Maintain Publications | 0.61 | 3,980.25 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **5.04** | **32,886.00** | **500.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| **Category: Workshops and Other Training Opportunities** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| | | | | | |
| Annual Direct Trainings | 1.25 | 8,156.25 | 2,700.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Participate in Regional Trainings | 0.75 | 4,893.75 | 1,000.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Coordinator Trainings | 0.5 | 3,262.50 | 1,000.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Miscellaneous CFM Support | 0.15 | 978.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **2.65** | **17,291.25** | **4,700.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| **Category: Public Education/Outreach** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| | | | | | |
| Publish Newsletter | 1.85 | 12,071.25 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Online Capability | 0.46 | 3,001.50 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Natural Floodplain Functions | 1 | 6,525.00 | 500.00 | High | 1-2 FY* |
| | | | | | |
| Higher Regulatory Standards | 2.56 | 16,704.00 | 500.00 | High | 1-2 FY* |
| | | | | | |
| Map Modernization | 2.56 | 16,704.00 | 500.00 | High | 1-2 FY* |
| | | | | | |
| Pilot Education Program | 2.56 | 16,704.00 | 0.00 | Medium | 1-2 FY* |
| | | | | | |
| Annual Website Review | 0.35 | 2,283.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Annual Workplan Review | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **11.6** | **75,494.25** | **1,500.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |
| *=1-2 FY to scope & develop, yearly implementation=1/2 PM listed | | | | | |

| **Category: Mapping Assistance/Map Modernization** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| | | | | | |
| CTP Agreement | 0.12 | 783.00 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Local CTPs | 0.92 | 6,003.00 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Annual Business Plan Review | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Annual Mapping Priorities | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Inventory Base Map Data | 2.64 | 17,226.00 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| System for Mapping Needs Assessment | 3.25 | 21,206.25 | 0.00 | High | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Conduct Mapping Needs Assessment | 3.25 | 21,206.25 | 500.00 | High | 1-2 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Priority Criteria for Mapping Projects | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | 1 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Coastal Mapping Methodology | 0.35 | 2,283.75 | 500.00 | Medium | 1-2 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Statewide Floodplain Coverage | 1.5 | 9,787.50 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Online Capability | 1.5 | 9,787.50 | 0.00 | Medium | 1-2 FY |
| | | | | | |
| Regulatory Technical Assistance | 0.6 | 3,915.00 | 750.00 | High | yearly |
| | | | | | |
| Map Modernization Public Education (SEE PUBLIC EDUCATION/OUTREACH CATEGORY) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Map Modernization Coordinating Group (SEE INTERAGENCY COORDINATION CATEGORY) | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **TOTALS:** | **14.8** | **96,700.50** | **1,750.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| Category: Interagency Coordination to Ensure NFIP Compliance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| ONHW/OR Showcase State | 0.35 | 2,283.75 | 500.00 | High | yearly |
| Flood Hazard Mitigation Plans | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 300.00 | Medium | yearly |
| "Goal 7" group | 0.12 | 783.00 | 0.00 | Low | yearly |
| "Map Modernization Coordinating" Group | 0.64 | 4,176.00 | 0.00 | High | 5 FY |
| State Agency Participation | 1.5 | 9,787.50 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| Repetitive Loss Coordination | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 200.00 | Medium | yearly |
| Mitigation Success Stories | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| Regional Coordination Meetings | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 800.00 | High | yearly |
| Federal Programs Coordination | 0.75 | 4,893.75 | 200.00 | Medium | yearly |
| **TOTALS:** | **4.51** | **29,427.75** | **2,000.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| Category: Legislative Coordination | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| Review State/Federal Legislation | 0.42 | 2,740.50 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| Legislative/Public Inquiries | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | High | yearly |
| Internal Tracking | 0.23 | 1,500.75 | 0.00 | Medium | yearly |
| **TOTALS:** | **0.88** | **5,742.00** | **0.00** | **N/A** | **N/A** |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | |

| Category: Post Disaster Assistance to Communities (when applicable) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activity/Project** | **PMs** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Priority Level** | **Duration** |
| To Be Determined | ? | ? | ? | High | TBD |
| **TOTALS:** | **?** | **?** | **?** | **N/A** | **N/A** |

## ◇ Summary of All Categories

| Needed Effort by Category - With Annual/Limited Duration Person Months (PM) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | PM | |
| **Category** | **PM** | **FTE $** | **Travel $** | **Annual** | **1-2 FY** | **5 FY** |
| State Model Ordinance Research/Development | 1.27 | 8,286.75 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 1.15 | 0 |
| State Model/Local Government Ordinance Assistance | 3.56 | 23,229.00 | 1,750.00 | 3.56 | 0 | 0 |
| Community Assistance Visits/Contacts | 11.8 | 76,995.00 | 4,200.00 | 10.5 | 0.73 | 0 |
| Community Information System (CIS) Database | 0.69 | 4,502.25 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.12 | 0 |
| General Technical Assistance | 5.04 | 32,886.00 | 500.00 | 3.54 | 1.5 | 0 |
| Workshops and Other Training Opportunities | 2.65 | 17,291.25 | 4,700.00 | 2.65 | 0 | 0 |
| Public Education/Outreach | 11.6 | 75,690.00 | 1,500.00 | 6.77 | 9.14 | 0 |
| Mapping Assistance/Map Modernization | 14.8 | 96,570.00 | 1,750.00 | 3.48 | 11.34 | 0 |
| Interagency Coordination to Ensure NFIP Compliance | 4.51 | 29,427.75 | 2,000.00 | 3.87 | 0 | 0.64 |
| Legislative Coordination | 0.88 | 5,742.00 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0 | 0 |
| Post Disaster Assistance to Communities | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| **COMBINED TOTAL:** | **56.8** | **370,620.00** | **16,400.00** | | | |
| **SPLIT TOTALS:** | | | ***PM*** | **35.94** | **23.98** | **0.64** |
| | | | ***FTE$*** | **234,508.50** | **156,469.50** | **4,176.00** |
| Based on 1 FTE, NRS 4/Range 30, S+B = 6525/month | | | | | | |

◇ **Gap Assessment Summary**

| *ANTICIPATED FUNDING VS. NEEDS (FY 05-09)* | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CAP-SSSE** | **AMOUNT** | **STATE MATCH** | **AMOUNT** | **ADD. FEDERAL** | **AMOUNT** | **TOTAL** |
| FY 05 | 90,461.00 | FY 05 | 30,154.00 | MMMS | 60,000.00 | 180,615.00 |
| FY 06 | 90,461.00 | FY 06 | 30,154.00 | MMMS | 60,000.00 | 180,615.00 |
| FY 07 | 90,461.00 | FY 07 | 30,154.00 | TBD | ? | 120,615.00 |
| FY 08 | 90,461.00 | FY 08 | 30,154.00 | TBD | ? | 120,615.00 |
| FY 09 | 90,461.00 | FY 09 | 30,154.00 | TBD | ? | 120,615.00 |
| **TOTALS:** | **452,305.00** | | **150,770.00** | | **120,000.00** | **713,075.00** |
| ANNUAL COSTS (Coordinator FTE): | | | 234,508.50 | multiply by 5 | | 1,172,542.50 |
| LIMITED DUR. COSTS (Coordinator FTE): | | | 156,469.50 | multiply by 1.5 | | 234,704.25 |
| 5 YEAR COSTS (Coordinator FTE) | | | 4,176.00 | multiply by 5 | | 20,880.00 |
| SUBTOTAL: | | | | | | 1,428,126.75 |
| ADJUST BY MISCELLANEOUS COSTS RATE OF 20% | | | | | | 285,625.35 |
| **TOTAL PROJECTED 5-YEAR COSTS:** | | | | | | **1,713,752.10** |
| ***PROJECTED 5-YEAR GAP (IMPLEMENTATION COSTS - ANTICIPATED FUNDS):*** | | | | | | ***1,000,677.10*** |
| ***PROJECTED GAP ANNUALIZED:*** | | | | | | ***200,135.42*** |

## V. Map Modernization Activities (See also Section III.)

DLCD supports the need for flood hazard maps that are accurate, easy to use, and readily available to all users. However, the Department does not currently have a sufficient program organization to fully support the FEMA Map Modernization Initiative as envisioned in the state business plan. DLCD receives annual FEMA funding under the CAP-SSSE program. CAP-SSSE funding supports DLCD's work as Oregon's NFIP coordinating agency but is not sufficient to also support the needed Map Modernization work. The CAP-SSSE funding has historically covered salary costs of the NFIP coordinator, basic technical assistance and outreach efforts, and the occasional small, special project. If the NFIP coordinator were to focus on map modernization, then fundamental tasks such as CAVs/CACs, publication of newsletters, training sessions for NFIP participants, local ordinance review and assistance, and other important NFIP tasks could not be accomplished by DLCD. The approach of supplemental federal funding for map modernization work, as reflected in FEMA's Map Modernization Management Support (MMMS) program, presents an opportunity for the state to continue with traditional

Within Oregon's business plan, DLCD proposed a minimal organization to:

- conduct map modernization support activities,
- ensure limited state participation in mapping projects (i.e., scoping, outreach),

- maintain digital floodplain data and maps at the state level

DLCD clearly indicated to FEMA that additional staff would be required to support the Map Modernization Initiative as proposed in the business plan. FEMA has proposed a level of funding (MMMS program) that will not allow DLCD to secure additional staff but will allow for the Department to obtain assistance through contractual services or partnering with other state agencies. The FEMA map modernization funding will allow Oregon to conduct map modernization work but not to the extent envisioned in the business plan. In addition, the state floodplain program may still need to scale back certain CAP-SSSE activities or find alternative means of performing those activities to accommodate the need for the floodplain coordinator to take on project and grant management for map modernization efforts.

## VI. Process for Evaluating Performance

DLCD has identified potential performance targets for the state floodplain program. These are provided as examples of what performance targets might look like. Actual targets will be negotiated with FEMA Region X and memorialized in annual CAP-SSSE and other grant agreements as appropriate. Performance targets established in grant agreements will be based upon the staff and other resources available to DLCD. DLCD does not anticipate needing to establish performance targets for every single grant task. Longer-term performance goals may be separately established by DLCD for use in gauging Oregon's progress in enhancing the existing floodplain management program, as envisioned within this 5-year plan.

On an ongoing basis, DLCD will solicit ideas from FEMA Region X, state agency partners, local governments, and others about floodplain management needs, priorities, annual performance targets, and long-term performance goals. Any input received will be considered during the annual process of updating this work plan.

**Potential Performance Targets by Category**

◇ **State Ordinance Research and Development**
- Complete review of model ordinance (and update as necessary) twice within 5 years
- Notify all local governments of updates to the model ordinance

◇ **State Model/Local Government Ordinance Assistance**
- One hundred percent (100%) response by DLCD to local government requests for input/assistance regarding revisions to local floodplain ordinances

◇ **Community Assistance Visits and Contacts (CAVs/CACs)**
- Conduct ten (10) CAVs per year*
- Conduct ten (10) CACs per year*
- Conduct timely CAV visits for jurisdictions requesting a CAV for CRS or other purposes

(*=#s could increase or decrease per year based on funding levels)

- **Community Information System (CIS) Database**
  - Input CAV/CAC data within one (1) month of visit/contact and closeout actions

- **General Technical Assistance**
  - Within the five (5) year period, create a database system to track types, locations, etc. of issues addressed through technical assistance
  - One hundred percent (100%) response by DLCD to local government requests for input/ assistance with local efforts to develop and/or adopt higher regulatory standards or non-regulatory approaches to enhance local floodplain management programs

- **Workshops and Other Training Opportunities**
  - Conduct two (2) to three (3) NFIP-related workshops or meetings during each fiscal year
  - One hundred percent (100%) response by DLCD to requests for information about the CFM program

- **Public Education/Outreach**
  - One (1) new education/outreach project completed each fiscal year
  - Develop online newsletter service, using list-serve email subscriptions, with a goal of 400 subscribers within 5 years
  - Create and distribute three (3) issues of the *Natural Hazards Planner* newsletter each fiscal year
  - Update the DLCD Natural Hazards website once each fiscal year
  - Conduct an annual review of the five (5)-year plan

- **Mapping Assistance/Map Modernization**
  - Maintain or improve the percentage of communities that adopt new maps by the FIRM effective dates
  - Increase the percentage of communities that adopt new maps prior to the 30-day letter being sent
  - Hold 2-3 meetings of the Map Modernization coordinating group per fiscal year
  - Conduct an annual review of the state's business plan

- **Interagency Coordination to Ensure NFIP Compliance**
  - One hundred percent (100%) attendance or other participation by DLCD in IHMT meetings relating to flooding or related hazards
  - Provide technical assistance, in cooperation with OEM, to one hundred percent (100%) of jurisdictions requesting assistance with local flood hazard mitigation plans
  - Hold one (1) meeting of the Goal 7 group per fiscal year

- **Legislative Coordination**
  - One hundred percent (100%) response by DLCD to legislative or agency requests for factual information associated with federal or state legislative initiatives