



Vol. 16, No. 4  
August 2004

ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, INC.

## CONNECTICUT PASSES NAI-BASED FLOODPLAIN LEGISLATION

by Diane Ifkovic  
*Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection*

Scott Choquette, CFM  
*Dewberry Companies*

On May 21, 2004, Connecticut's Governor Rowland signed into law House Bill 5045, "An Act Concerning Floodplain Management and Hazard Mitigation." State Representative Steve Fontana (D), serving North Haven's 87th Assembly District, introduced the legislation. Fontana serves on both the Planning and Development and Insurance Committees of the Connecticut General Assembly.

The new legislation covers many different aspects of floodplain management. It will require municipalities to revise their current floodplain zoning regulations or ordinances to include new standards for compensatory storage and equal conveyance of floodwater. Towns will not have to make such changes until they revise their regulations for another purpose. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP) will develop model regulation language. The legislation will require the state to incorporate a natural hazards element into the next revision of its plan of conservation and development. Elements contained in the state's plan of conservation and development are required to be addressed in local plans of conservation and development, which are updated on a 10-year cycle. The legislation will also enable municipalities to use local capital improvement funds from the state to conduct floodplain management and hazard mitigation activities.

The new law will require the Commissioner of Consumer Protection to revise the real estate property disclosure form to make minor changes regarding the disclosure of flood hazard information to prospective buyers of residential real estate.

The law includes a provision to impose an additional \$10 increase to a current land use fee in order to fund a new state hazard mitigation and floodplain management grant program. These funds can be accessed by municipalities to (1) prepare hazard mitigation plans; (2) prepare applications to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program's Community Rating System; or (3) complete hazard mitigation projects in accordance with approved hazard mitigation plans. The grant will reimburse 90% of the costs of these activities. Grant requirements will be developed by the CTDEP over the next two years.

### Genesis of the New Law

The idea for the legislation was developed after Representative Fontana's attendance at a National Conference of Insurance Legislators meeting in Chicago, where he heard about the No Adverse Impact (NAI) initiative of the Association of State Floodplain Managers. Fontana worked with former Connecticut NFIP State Coordinator, Scott Choquette, (current Vice-Chairman of the New England Floodplain and Stormwater Managers Association and ASFPM Region I Director and NAI Steering Committee member) to draft the legislation, and formed an advisory committee to provide input and begin consensus building. NEFSMA Board Members Peter Richardson, Diane Ifkovic, and Michele Steinberg participated on the committee, which invited input from such groups as the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, Association of Realtors<sup>®</sup>, Home Builders Association, and the Governor's Office of Policy and Management.

*[continued on page 11]*

# ASDSO CALLS FOR ACTION ON UNSAFE DAMS

In the wake of July's disastrous dam failures in New Jersey and recent failures in Michigan and Mississippi, the Association of State Dam Safety Officials (ASDSO) has called for all states and the federal government to recognize the importance of strengthening dam safety regulation and other programs to improve dam safety.

In the early hours of July 13, more than a dozen dams in New Jersey failed, after record rainfall. No one was killed by the dam breaks, and no serious injuries were reported. All of the failed dams were low- or significant-hazard-potential structures, which, in case of failure, are not expected to cause loss of human life.

But the failures of July 13 serve as a reminder that strong dam safety programs can and do mitigate the effects of these types of incidents. New Jersey maintains one of the best programs in the nation and was therefore able to lessen the effects of the extraordinary rainfall by implementing plans and procedures developed to deal with such an event. Yet, even with a strong program in place, the dam failures occurred. New Jersey and all state dam safety programs still face an uphill battle to see that dams are maintained, upgraded, or repaired to avoid future failure. Had about \$5 million in needed repairs to several of the failed dams been carried out before July 12, the estimated \$50 million flood damage figure might have been significantly reduced.

Financing repairs of private dams is a major issue in the United States. About 58% of the nation's 79,000 dams are privately owned. Dam ownership in New Jersey reflects this national statistic.

New Jersey is far ahead of most states in its efforts to eliminate excuses for deficient dams. The state's dam rehabilitation funding program, put into effect just months before the July 13 floods, provides \$15 million to pay for state projects and \$95 million in low-interest loans to private and municipal dam owners. Many groups and individuals in New Jersey—including the governor, state legislators, the regional Council for Safe Dams, the New Jersey Dam Safety Section, and the state's voters—were instrumental in seeing this program put into place. New Jersey joins only a handful of states that offer any type of financial assistance for dam owners. Most private dam owners are unable to obtain ready funding for dam repairs.

ASDSO has long recognized that financial constraints on dam owners delay maintenance and prevent necessary repairs, increasing the probability of tragic dam failures. Consequently, ASDSO has called for the creation of a national program to fund rehabilitation of high-risk dams, and is seeking a sponsor for drafted federal legislation. ASDSO has determined that the cost of upgrading or repairing all U.S. non-federal dams that pose risk to human life exceeds \$10 billion.

Increased support for state dam safety programs is also essential. Historically, most dam safety programs have been under-budgeted and under-staffed. The current trend of decreased support for state programs, coupled with unchecked development downstream of aging, neglected dams, is an invitation for future dam failures.

>>> For more, see ASDSO's website at <http://www.asdso.org>.

---

## WORLD FLOOD VULNERABILITY TO DOUBLE

The number of people vulnerable to floods worldwide is expected to double to 2 billion by 2050. The dramatic increase will be due to global warming, deforestation, rising sea levels, and population growth in flood-prone areas, researchers from the United Nations University have warned. One billion people, roughly a sixth of the world's population, now live in the potential path of a worst-case flood, and most of these are among the planet's poorest. The greatest potential flood hazard is in Asia, where for the last two decades an average of over 400 million people have been directly exposed to a flood each year. Floods already kill up to 25,000 people a year and, along with other weather-related disasters, cost the world economy up to \$60 billion a year, much of it in developing nations ill-equipped to cope with such huge costs.

The Tokyo-based university made the study public in June as it prepared to open a new institute in Bonn, Germany, to study the impact of the environment on human security and help governments better cope with natural disasters. The world will be warmer and wetter by mid-century, and the northern part of the Northern Hemisphere will likely see more storms, said Dr. Janos Bogardi, founding director of the new institute. Sea levels could rise, fed by melting glaciers and ice caps, and extreme high-water levels could become more common, menacing small islands and coastal lowlands, he said.

Among the most urgent needs to adapt to the growing risk of flood disasters is greater global capacity to monitor and forecast extreme events, according to Bogardi. Better information, superior early warning systems, and infrastructure can be installed and new planning strategies devised.

The U.N. University was established by the 191-nation General Assembly in 1973 to foster an international community of scientists looking into global problems.

>>> For the full statement about future floods or more information about UNU, see <http://www.unu.edu>.



# NO ADVERSE IMPACT QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

*This column gives details and answers questions about the ASFPM's "no adverse impact" approach to floodplain management. Questions about NAI are welcome, and can be sent to the Editor at the email address on the last page.*

## **QUESTION** What can be done to help people understand NAI and what it can do?

### **ANSWER** One of the most important state roles in advancing NAI floodplain management is providing information to local governments, officials, and staff about the wisdom of this approach.

Floodplain managers understand the situation: most current floodplain management practices (unfortunately, the ones most communities have put in their ordinances to meet NFIP criteria) deal with *how* communities *build* in flood hazard areas, but generally ignore how such activities *create and transfer flood impacts* onto other properties. The minimum standards allow floodwaters to be diverted onto other properties and conveyance areas to be reduced, result in the filling of essential valley storage, and increase water velocities. And some traditional floodplain management places undue burdens on those who are adversely affected, and is economically unsustainable.

These are complex realities that may have little immediate meaning to those outside the profession. As a first step in convincing local officials, it is smart to realize that different explanations and arguments appeal to different people. Try some of these "sound bite" ideas for persuasion.

- The traditional approach to local floodplain management (meeting minimum standards and thereby ignoring most transference of impacts) increases liability for community officials and design professionals—even though they comply with "the standards."
- NAI is a "good neighbor" approach that does not preclude development; instead it identifies the impact of development and finds ways to minimize its negative consequences.
- NAI floodplain management is not a rigid rule. It is a general guide that can be used in different ways.
  - It can be the default approach for community planning.
  - It can be an overall goal for a community that is developing a comprehensive watershed and floodplain management program.
  - It can be a basis for local evaluation of whether current standards are really providing sufficient mitigation of flood hazards or adequately protecting the community's floodplain resources.
- NAI floodplain management helps communities promote responsible, fair, and legally sound development through community-based decisionmaking.
- Some officials worry that denying a permit based on potential flood impacts may lead to a lawsuit based on property rights. In truth, these officials are more likely to be liable for damage to property that is adversely affected by development for which they issued a permit without considering all the consequences.

Once local officials are convinced of the soundness of NAI floodplain management, they can educate their residents and property owners by using any of a large number of standard outreach techniques—newsletters and brochures, contests, displays, special programs, videos, and others—and simply incorporating NAI information and the good neighbor philosophy into them.

Orange County, Florida, for example, has been using education and outreach for more than 20 years to ensure public support for its comprehensive floodplain and stormwater management programs that seek to avoid adverse impacts on other properties and the environment. Among other activities that spread the word, the county sponsors

- Meet-the-County days at a local mall;
- Earth Day celebrations at elementary and middle schools; and
- Seminars for the engineering community.

Likewise, the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District

- Formed stakeholder groups to contribute to the planning, design, and construction of projects;
- Created a Citizens Advisory Council to develop goals and objectives for the long-range plan; and
- Developed educational videos and CDs about flooding and flood prevention for homeowners.

All of these activities, and many others, help build citizen understanding and support that, in turn, enables the local government to undertake innovative solutions to flooding—solutions they might otherwise be unable to initiate.

>>> Learn more about NAI floodplain management at the ASFPM website at <http://www.floods.org>.

*[excerpted from the Natural Hazards Observer XXVIII (6): 11]*

# NFIP NOTES

## Rate Increases

Effective May 1, 2004, premium rates under the National Flood Insurance Program were increased an average of 3%, varying by zone. The rate changes are detailed in the *Flood Insurance Manual*.

### V Zones (coastal high-velocity zones)

Larger rate increases were implemented again this year as a result of the erosion study conducted by the H. John Heinz, III, Center, which indicated that previous rates significantly underestimated the increasing hazard presented by steadily eroding coastlines.

- Post-FIRM V Zone premiums have increased about 8%—slightly less than last year's increase.
- Pre-FIRM V Zone premiums have increased 6%.

### A Zones (non-velocity, primarily riverine zones)

Modest increases will keep Post-FIRM rates at actuarial levels and slightly decrease the pre-FIRM rate subsidy.

- Post-FIRM A Zone premiums have increased about 3%.
- Pre-FIRM AE Zone premiums have increased about 3%.
- AO, AH, AOB, AHB Zones have had no rate change because the loss experience has been favorable.
- Unnumbered A Zone premiums have increased approximately 3%.
- AR Zone rates have changed slightly, but here is no overall change to the average premium.

[excerpted from *NFIP Watermark 2004 (2)*, p. 3]

## Improvements to the Preferred Risk Policy

The Preferred Risk Policy (PRP) was introduced in 1989 to offer an inexpensive flood insurance policy for low- to moderate-risk properties. The new flood coverage was a success, and in the 15 years since it was first offered, the PRP has been the NFIP's fastest growing insurance product, with a 90% retention rate. Effective May 1, 2004, changes were made to the PRP to broaden its availability and expand the coverage.

As before, PRP policies are available only for properties in currently mapped B, C, or X Zones (with a few exceptions). They are not available for most condominium units. Contents that are located entirely in a basement are not eligible for contents-only coverage under the PRP. In addition, the building to be insured must not have a history of repeated flood claims or flood disaster assistance. But all PRP policies carry premiums substantially lower than those for buildings in the SFHA and also include Increased Cost of Compliance coverage, a payment from which could go a long way toward paying for mitigation measures in a shallow-flooding zone.

- For residential buildings, contents coverage has been raised to an amount equal to 40% of the building coverage. The maximum coverage combination under the PRP for 1- to 4-family occupancies is now \$250,000 building and \$100,000 contents.
- PRP coverage now is available to owners of non-residential properties such as businesses, schools, and farms. For these property owners, the maximum coverage combination under the PRP is \$500,000 building and \$500,000 contents.
- PRP contents-only coverage is now available for renters of apartments and homes.

>>> A more complete description of the PRP, and references to appropriate sections of the *Flood Insurance Manual*, can be found in the most recent *Watermark* at [http://www.fema.gov/pdf/nfip/wm2004\\_2.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/nfip/wm2004_2.pdf).

## FloodSmart

The National Flood Insurance Program's new consumer campaign, FloodSmart, is aimed at educating homeowners and renters about how to prepare for flooding and protect their property from flood damage. The campaign includes new television spots scheduled to be broadcast on 16 cable channels, a toll-free consumer telephone hotline, a website, direct mail, and a public education initiative through the insurance industry, Realtors<sup>®</sup>, and lenders. The new website, <http://www.FloodSmart.gov>, provides information on preparing homes for flooding, tools for assessing one's risk of flooding and estimating the cost of flood insurance premiums, listings of local insurance agents, and links to other community-based information and flood hazard resources.

# Washington Report

## EPA AWARDS WATERSHED GRANTS

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has selected 14 watersheds in 17 states as eligible for \$15 million from the Targeted Watersheds Grant Program. The competitive grant program provides funds to watershed organizations whose protection and restoration plans set clear goals with special consideration to water quality monitoring, a public education component, and strong community support.

>>> Detailed information about these projects and the Targeted Watersheds Grant Program is available at <http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/initiative/>.

## MAURSTAD NAMED AT FEMA

David I. Maurstad, Director of FEMA's Region VIII, has been named Acting Federal Insurance Administrator and Head of the Mitigation Directorate at DHS/FEMA, the position vacated by Anthony Lowe in July. Maurstad joined FEMA's Denver office in 2001, after serving as Lieutenant Governor of Nebraska, a member of the Nebraska State Legislature, and Mayor of Beatrice, Nebraska.

## USDA TO ASSESS ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is beginning a five-year study of the collective environmental benefits of government conservation programs on agricultural land. The Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) will examine the environmental benefits of conservation practices implemented through six 2002 Farm Bill programs: the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, Conservation Reserve Program, Conservation Security Program, and Conservation Technical Assistance. These programs are significant to floodplain management because they can help protect and preserve open floodplain spaces, mitigate erosion and runoff problems, and conserve habitat and natural functions provided by riparian areas and wetlands.

The CEAP will have two parts: a nationwide assessment of conservation benefits and more in-depth studies of these benefits in 20 selected watersheds, located in California, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas. Each was selected for a specific concern, such as drainage management, wildlife habitat, riparian restoration, manure management on animal feeding operations, or water use on irrigated cropland. The watershed studies also should help develop performance measures for estimating soil quality, water quality, and wildlife habitat benefits for specific conservation practices.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service's National Resources Inventory will be used as the sampling basis for estimating environmental benefits, along with surveys of farmers and existing USDA computer models.

>>> Reports on the study will be issued annually starting in 2005. More information about CEAP can be found at <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/nri/ceap>.

## OCEAN POLICY REPORT APPROVED

The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy voted in July to approve its Draft Final Report and send it to the President, as called for under the Ocean Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-256). The President then has 90 days to consult with governors and issue recommendations to Congress.

- Among the changes to the preliminary report (issued in April) that are of particular note to the states are
- Increased focus on supporting coastal and watershed management, including calling for a watershed clearinghouse and integrated grants programs.
  - Support for expanded monitoring programs, including impacts to sensitive habitats.
  - Stronger recommendations to increase support for the National Sea Grant Program and extension and technical assistance programs.

*[continued on page 6]*

## Washington Report (cont.)

- Clarification and strengthening of suggested state roles in Regional Ocean Councils, and emphasis that Councils should build on current efforts and be driven by needs identified at the state and local level.
- A stronger recommended state role in managing federal waters and new off-shore management regimes.
- Regional information programs would be supported by the states, not just federal agencies.

When ready, the final report will be sent to the states and posted on the Commission's website at <http://www.oceancommission.gov/>. Copies of the preliminary report and other information are available there now.  
*[excerpted from CSO Weekly Report July 23, 2004]*

## COMPREHENSIVE OCEANS BILL INTRODUCED

A comprehensive ocean policy reform bill has been introduced in the House as The Oceans Conservation, Education, and National Strategy for the 21st Century Act (known as Oceans-21). The bill (H.R. 4900, sponsored by Jim Greenwood (R-PA), Sam Farr (D-CA), Curt Weldon (R-PA), and Tom Allen (D-ME)), incorporates many of the recommendations of two recent ocean commissions (see article above), and would establish a national ocean policy to protect, maintain, and restore the health of marine ecosystems. It would make ecosystem-based management a top priority of ocean policy. Oceans-21 contains an organic act for NOAA: it would maintain NOAA's position in Commerce but call for an executive branch report to look into establishing a new department of natural resources. The bill would also establish regional oceans councils to enhance inter-jurisdictional decisionmaking and establish a permanent source of funding, called the Ocean and Great Lakes Conservation Trust Fund, for regional ocean councils and state ecosystem-based management.

## CORPS COMPLETES INVENTORY OF NONSTRUCTURAL PROJECTS

In cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers National Nonstructural Flood Proofing Committee, the Institute for Water Resources (IWR) recently completed a survey on nonstructural flood reduction control projects in all Corps districts, to update a survey completed in 1999. Based on data received, there are over 110 projects that either are of a nonstructural nature (65 projects) or have a nonstructural component to a traditional structural project (45 projects). Ten Corps districts reported no nonstructural projects. Types of nonstructural measures, according to the survey, included floodproofing, raising and demolition of structures, acquisitions/buyouts, relocation of structures, and flood warning systems. The latter was by far the most popular type, accounting for about 60% of all such features reported.

About 45 of the 110 projects are in the planning stage, another 12 under construction, with 26 already implemented. The costs for nonstructural features ranged from \$194 million for acquisition and raising of 800 homes in the Passaic River floodway (New York) to a small flood warning system costing about \$40,000.

*[excerpted from Planning Ahead, July 2004]*

## A CONGRESSIONAL HIATUS FOLLOWS LOTS OF ACTIVITY

Congress recessed on July 23rd in time for the Democratic National Convention and will not return until September 6th, after the Republican National Convention. Due to the recent release of the 9/11 Report, there will be some hearings during the recess to avoid delay in implementing its recommendations.

So, after particularly active periods this summer, there will be a long spell of focusing on campaigns and, for some, vacations. When Congress reconvenes, floor activity likely will be dominated by appropriations bills, although the manner in which the bills will be considered is unclear. They could be dealt with individually or combined (again) into a major omnibus appropriations bill. Of the 13 regular appropriations bills, Only the Defense bill has been completed as a stand-alone bill. The Homeland Security appropriations bill has passed the House and a different version has been reported out of committee in the Senate, but it has not been brought to the Senate floor.

Since Memorial Day, work was finally finished on the Flood Insurance Reform Act (previously known as the repetitive loss bill) and it is now Public Law 108- 264. Steps to implement provisions of the new law are being sorted out at FEMA. Funding of the repetitive loss provisions is questionable in Fiscal Year 2005, as discussed below. Many other provisions require prompt action, including a number of consumer information and assistance provisions. Also, the new law makes the new digital flood maps usable as the official flood maps.

*[continued on page 7]*

## Washington Report (cont.)

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has reported out a Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), more appropriations bills have been reported out of committee or passed by the House, and the Cox-Turner legislation to improve assistance to first responders has progressed. An effort is being made to get a WRDA bill and a First Responder bill through the Congress this session, but with few legislative days remaining and action on appropriations needed, there may not be floor time available to deal with these other bills. There has even been talk of a lame duck session in November, primarily to deal with appropriations, but to finalize action on other matters as well.

### Appropriations

As of the beginning of the August recess, the House has passed 10 of the 13 regular appropriations bills. The Senate, however, has passed only 1 (Defense) and has reported only 3 others out of committee. Homeland Security is one of those. As mentioned above, the Senate leadership and Committee leadership chose not to bring the bill to the floor in July, but it does seem clear that there will be some kind of House-Senate Conference to resolve differences between the House and Senate bills.

**Homeland Security**—Funding for mapping is one important distinction. The Senate bill provides the budget request of \$200 million while the House provides only \$150 million, stating in its accompanying report that the reason for the reduction is unobligated balances. Of course, the service provider contract was only signed in March and, since that time, apparently most of the previously appropriated map modernization funds have been obligated. This would be an unfortunate time to slow down the momentum of the map modernization effort.

Funding for the Pre-disaster Mitigation Grant (PDM) program was funded at the budget request of \$150 million in the Senate, but at \$100 million in the House, again due to unobligated balances, the report explains. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program would be funded at 7.5% in both.

Funding for the newly authorized repetitive loss programs is another issue. Since the bill was not signed until June 30th, there was no FY 2005 budget request for the initiative. Even though the funds are to be transferred from the National Flood Insurance Fund, the transaction must be provided for in an appropriations bill. The ASFPM is hopeful that the House and Senate conferees will consider providing the transfer in FY 2005 in order to begin this effort to stop the drain from the Fund due to repetitive losses.

The House bill provides no funding for the DHS Office of Legislative Affairs. The report explains that this is an indication of concern about unsatisfactory communications between DHS and the House Appropriations Committee, which has oversight responsibility. The Senate bill does fund the Office of Legislative Affairs.

The DHS appropriations bills (H.R. 4567; H. Rept 108-541 and S. 2537; S.Rept. 108-280) also provide for the transfer of several grant programs to the “one stop shop” operated under the Office of State and Local Coordination. The budget request sought this change, which it states will increase efficiency. Although many House and Senate committee members expressed concern about shifting primarily natural disaster programs from Emergency Preparedness and Response (EPR), they were persuaded by the Administration to accept the change with assurances that the programs themselves would continue to be administered by EPR.

Interestingly, DHS has just announced the merger of the Office of State and Local Coordination into the Office of Disaster Preparedness (ODP). Sue Mencer is now the Executive Director, Office of State and Local Government Coordination & Preparedness, the consolidation of the two offices.

DHS now claims to have a “one-stop shop” for federal homeland security assistance. The new Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness consolidates and coordinates the delivery of funding, training, exercise planning and execution, equipment support, and other assistance to help state and local first responders prepare for, prevent, and respond to acts of terrorism. The ASFPM continues to be concerned that the focus on fighting terrorism is being supported at the expense of the nation’s ability to mitigate natural hazards. We believe both are important, especially in light of the fact that over 80% of disasters are flood related.

**Energy and Water**—The Energy and Water appropriations bill passed the House on June 25th, but has not yet been marked up in the Senate. The accompanying report makes clear that there is a major difference between the Administration and the House Appropriations Committee views on the role of the Corps of Engineers and its commitment to protect economic infrastructure, property, and environment. The Committee thought that the budget request significantly underfunded the Corps.

For Planning Assistance to States, the Administration had requested only \$4.6 million, but the House bill (H.R. 4614; H.Rept 108-554) provides \$6 million. It provides the requested \$600,000 for the Corps’ contribution to U.S. Geological Survey streamgages and \$375,000 for the national shoreline study. It also provides the budget request of \$5.6 million for Flood Plain Management Services, which is a significant reduction for that small but effective program.

*[continued on page 8]*

## Washington Report (cont.)

**Interior**—The Interior Appropriations bill passed the House on June 17th (H.R. 4568; H.Rept. 108-542) and has not yet been marked up in the Senate. The mapping programs of the USGS were funded at slightly higher levels than the budget request, but Water Resources programs, while also increased above the request, are still funded at about \$4 million under the FY 2004 level. The Streamflow Information Program, while funded at the requested level, is \$161,000 below FY 2004. The ASFPM has expressed concern about the loss of cooperative gages and has urged a federally funded network of critical gages to ensure the availability of long-term data.

**Other**—The House passed the Agriculture Appropriations bill on July 13th (H.R. 4766; H.Rept. 108-584). The House Committee marked up its VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill (which includes funding for EPA) on July 22, but has not reported the bill, so no bill or report number is available.

### Active Legislation

Other pieces of legislation will bear watching when Congress returns in September. The Water Resources Development Act (S. 2554) was marked up in the Senate in June, but has not been brought to the floor. The House had passed its WRDA bill during the last session. If action is not completed during this session, the process will have to start over again in a new Congress.

The status of natural hazards programs within DHS is of interest to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which has jurisdiction over the Stafford Act and to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, which also has Stafford Act authority. There could be a hearing(s) on this subject during the fall.

The release of the 9/11 Report will provide impetus for further Congressional consideration of its own organization to deal with homeland security. At present, the appropriations for DHS have been consolidated into the Homeland Security subcommittees. For authorizing legislation, the House established a Select Committee on Homeland Security, which has some authorizing responsibilities, but most programs have remained under the jurisdiction of their regular committees. The Senate has used its Governmental Affairs Committee for much of the homeland security legislative authority, but has also left most programs with their original committees. Hearings have already been held on whether authorizing authority for all programs under DHS should be consolidated. Since the 9/11 Report recommends this, it is very likely that the subject will receive more attention in the fall. This is significant, since natural hazard programs could be removed from the committees that have historically been involved with them and who understand the issues facing natural hazards.

### Map Modernization

The major first 180-day deliverable in the map modernization contract is due in September. That will include an up-to-date assessment of mapping needs, which should make possible a reassessment of the metrics used to evaluate and guide the progress of the initiative.

After an opportunity for comment on the Multi-hazard Implementation Plan (MHIP), it is expected to be finalized in September. There could be some delay since it will need to be reviewed by DHS. When available for review, it will be found at <http://hazards.fema.gov>.

The Map Modernization (MOD) staff welcomes comments on their website as well as on any aspect of their work and any ideas for better coordination with stakeholders. The website is <http://hazards.fema.gov>. Ideas and suggestions can be sent to the MOD staff at [case@mapmodteam.com](mailto:case@mapmodteam.com).

### Coalitions

The Flood Map Coalition continues to meet regularly and to receive briefings from the FEMA and MOD staff involved with the map modernization initiative. The Coalition met in July and will meet again in early September to discuss the MHIP with FEMA and MOD staff and to cooperate in the dissemination of information to the represented stakeholder groups.

The USGS Coalition, which works to highlight the importance of USGS programs and data, met in June to talk with the USGS Budget Officer and to discuss plans for activities related to the 125th anniversary of the USGS. The ASFPM leadership has initiated discussions with other groups about re-establishment of a Streamgages Coalition to specifically focus on the importance of that data network.

—Meredith R. Inderfurth, Washington Liaison  
Rebecca Quinn, CFM, Legislative Officer

All referenced legislation and committee reports  
can be viewed at <http://thomas.loc.gov>.



# State and Local Report

## ALASKA VILLAGE FLOODING, EROSION TOPICS OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS HEARING

The U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee held a field hearing in Anchorage in late June and heard from and queried 11 invited witnesses on the issue of Alaska Native villages affected by severe flooding and erosion. The hearing was a followup to a U.S. General Accounting Office study that found that “flooding and erosion affect 184 out of 213, or 86%, of Alaska Native villages to some extent” [see *News & Views*, February 2004, p. 10].

The Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Community and Economic Development (the state coordinating agency for the NFIP) was one of only two state agencies to testify. DCED testified that the state’s floodplain management efforts have tried to integrate sound erosion management policies with the state’s floodplain management program, but have found this difficult without federal guidance or policy on erosion.

FEMA’s Map Modernization initiative was praised, as was the Senate Appropriations Committee’s funding of it, but it was noted that FEMA flood mapping dollars cannot be used for delineating an erosion risk. Sound identification of risks is vital to avoid the many problems of the past, notably locating community infrastructure in harm’s way. In its written testimony, DCED urged increasing support for better statewide hydrologic information and cautioned that Alaska’s meager stream gauging system needs bolstering to better define flood events.

FEMA Region X Director John Pennington testified and answered Senators’ questions about the shortcomings of the NFIP in serving rural Alaska villages because of the high cost of flood insurance.

>>> Testimony from the hearing is posted on the Appropriations Committee website at <http://appropriations.senate.gov/>. The GAO report is on the web at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04142.pdf>.

## GURNEE, ILLINOIS, CLEARS OWN FLOODPLAIN BUILDING

Trustees of the Village of Gurnee, Illinois, voted in July to take bids on razing the old police department building instead of selling it, as evidence of the Village Board’s commitment to acquire and demolish properties in the floodplain. The village had planned to sell the building, which was vacated when the police department moved into a new facility last fall, but it was not seriously damaged in the May 2004 floods (its basement had been filled with water as a precaution).

“If we want to continue relocation and acquisition in the floodplain, we need to set that example,” said Mayor Don Rudny. “Before the [2004] flood, I was hoping to sell the police station and use that revenue for the Village. But serious flooding raises great concern about having people and property in the floodplain area.” City officials cited the ASFPM, FEMA, and the National Weather Service as having recommended clearance of floodplain areas as the best way to prevent future damage.

*[excerpted from the Waukegan News Sun, July 13, 2004]*

## ABILENE, TEXAS, RESIDENTS SUE OVER 2002 FLOOD

Residents of about 40 homes in Abilene, Texas, filed a lawsuit July 1 against the city, state, and some businesses, seeking unspecified compensation for property lost in a 2002 flood. The lawsuit alleges that Abilene, the Texas Department of Transportation, Wal-Mart, Home Depot, and Dunaway Associates were negligent for developing commercial properties in a way that exacerbated flood conditions. The 2002 flood caused about \$15 million in damage to more than 600 homes and businesses. Some residents say flooding in 1994 and 1995—before Wal-Mart and Home Depot were built—did not cause as much damage.

But city officials said that drainage patterns had nothing to do with the 2002 flooding and that “it was going to flood whether Wal-Mart or Home Depot were there or not.” The city plans to file a response disputing the allegations and saying that the flooding was an act of God.

>>> A story in the *Abilene Reporter-News* gives more details, at [http://www.reporternews.com/abil/nw\\_local/article/0.1874.ABIL\\_7959\\_3027768.00.html](http://www.reporternews.com/abil/nw_local/article/0.1874.ABIL_7959_3027768.00.html)

# NEWS ON WETLANDS

## Reunion of National Wetlands Policy Forum Held

On June 25, 2004, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reconvened the participants and organizations involved in the National Wetlands Policy Forum from 1987-1989. William K. Reilly, who convened the original Wetlands Forum as Chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, chaired the reunion. Many of the participants represented the same organizations that participated in the first forum, which published a report 15 years ago with more than 100 recommendations that included the national goal of “no overall net loss of wetlands.”

The group discussed the state of the nation’s wetlands and programs to protect them. A number of areas were named that warrant additional attention, including better information on wetland losses, gains, and condition; improving regulatory programs to avoid wetland losses and provide quick approval for environmentally sound projects; and developing more opportunities for states, tribes, and private landowners to protect and restore wetlands.

A growing awareness of the importance of wetlands to the nation’s economic and environmental health has been reflected in commitments made by recent Administrations. President George H.W. Bush adopted the National Wetlands Policy Forum’s goal of no net loss of wetlands, President Clinton established the target of an annual net gain in the nation’s wetlands, and President George W. Bush set a goal of gaining 3 million acres of wetlands by 2009. Wetland losses in the U.S. have declined from a net annual figure of nearly 460,000 acres per year through the mid-1970s to less than 60,000 acres per year today.

>>> For more information contact John Meagher at [meagher.john@epa.gov](mailto:meagher.john@epa.gov).

*[excerpted from WaterNews, June 29, 2004]*

## Supreme Court Declines to Review Three Wetland Cases

The U.S. Supreme Court decision not to review three lower court decisions asserting Clean Water Act protection for waterways that are connected only through ditches or intermittently “is a major setback for industry efforts to strip Clean Water Act protection for many of the nation’s waters,” said National Wildlife Federation Counsel Jim Murphy. The U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear two decisions by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (*United States v. Deaton* and *Treacy v. Newdunn*) and one decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (*United States v. Rapanos*). All three decisions held that Clean Water Act protections can appropriately be extended to waters connected to navigable waters through ditches or intermittent surface flow.

>>> Get more information at <http://www.nwf.org/news/>.

## Clean Water Act Now Protects Some Northwest Canals and Ditches

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ regional office covering Oregon and Washington state agreed this spring to extend Clean Water Act protections to irrigation canals and drainage ditches that are connected to navigable or interstate waterways. As part of a settlement resolving a legal challenge by an environmental group, the wetlands and streams that flow into these artificial channels also will be granted protection from being polluted or filled by developers. The settlement follows the Supreme Court’s earlier rejection of developers’ appeals to the decisions by Corps districts to assert Clean Water Act jurisdiction over ditches leading to larger waterways.

>>> See the full article at <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-wetlands-9apr09.1.3422051.story?coll=la-home-nation>.

# NICK WINTER MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP AWARDED

Joshua F. Briggs, a graduate student in Water Resources Engineering at the University of New Hampshire, has been named the recipient of the first Nick Winter Memorial Scholarship. The New England Floodplain and Stormwater Managers Association, Inc. (NEFSMA), the Association of State Floodplain Managers, and the ASFPM Foundation are granting Briggs a \$3,000 scholarship for the 2004-2005 academic year.

The Scholarship Review Committee, representing NEFSMA, ASFPM, the ASFPM Foundation, and the Winter family, scored the 13 applicants on established criteria and the applicant with the highest cumulative score was selected as the recipient. No preference was given to students at New England schools. Although Briggs had the highest cumulative score, the committee was impressed with all the applicants' interest in and knowledge of stormwater and floodplain management. Also, many of the applicants demonstrated extensive civic/volunteer service, something to which Winter dedicated much of his time.

The scholarship has been established in honor of Nick Winter, Director of Flood Control for the Metropolitan District Commission (now Department of Resource Conservation) at the Charles River Dam, who died suddenly early in 2003. He was treasurer of the ASFPM and a long-time member of NEFSMA, serving two terms as its chair. Winter acted as the Town Moderator for Bellingham, Massachusetts, and had served his country in the military. He worked hard but also had a wonderful sense of humor.

The interest in the scholarship evidenced by the number of applicants in this first year is gratifying to those who remember Winter. It is hoped that this scholarship will help perpetuate the goals he worked to achieve in floodplain and stormwater management.

>>> Check the NEFSMA website at <http://www.nefsma.org> or the ASFPM website at <http://www.floods.org> soon for more about Briggs, the first scholarship recipient. The scholarship will be offered again for the 2005-2006 academic year.

[*excerpted from NEFSMA News XII (2):1*]

---

## CONNECTICUT'S NAI LEGISLATION (cont.)

### Planning and Natural Hazards

In addition to exploring the importance of no adverse impact policies in the development of this legislation, Fontana and his committee also considered the results of a nationwide survey of planners regarding how well community plans include natural hazards considerations [*see News & Views, October 2002, p. 8*]. The *Community Land Use Evaluation for Natural Hazards*, administered by the nonprofit Institute for Business & Home Safety in 2001 to more than 500 planners nationally, used the state of Connecticut as a sample. Results of the survey showed that local plans in Connecticut communities, like many communities nationally, typically addressed only half the elements that contribute to a safe, hazard-resistant community. Communities in six states where hazards information was required in local plans had safety ratings 50% higher than communities in other states.

The legislation was introduced in both the 2002 and 2003 legislative sessions but was not passed due in large part to its perceived fiscal impact in sessions dominated by budget woes. Fontana, who has become an advocate of NAI floodplain management and disaster mitigation, persisted, and his commitment to the vision in the bill reigned victorious.

>>> For more information, go to the Connecticut General Assembly website at [http://www.cga.state.ct.us/asp/CGABillStatus/CGAbillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill\\_num=HB5045](http://www.cga.state.ct.us/asp/CGABillStatus/CGAbillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&bill_num=HB5045) or contact Diane Ifkovic at [diane.ifkovic@po.state.ct.us](mailto:diane.ifkovic@po.state.ct.us) or Scott Choquette at [schoquette@dewberry.com](mailto:schoquette@dewberry.com)

[*excerpted from NEFSMA News XII (2):1*]

### ASFPM Special Election Update

The newly elected ASFPM Region 7 Director is Steve McMaster of Nebraska. McMaster is the State Coordinator for the Flood Mitigation Assistance program and all mitigation planning activities. He recently served as Program Chair for the 2004 ASFPM conference in Biloxi and is Chair of the Regulations Subcommittee of the Mitigation Committee. McMaster will complete the second year of the two-year term vacated by the previous regional director. He can be reached at [smcmaster@dnr.state.ne.us](mailto:smcmaster@dnr.state.ne.us).

# Publications, Software, AV & the Web

“U.S. Stream Flow Measurement and Data Dissemination Improve” points out where the nation stands with regard to streamgaging, and what potential exists for future streamgaging advancements, as well as the vulnerability of relying on partner funding to maintain a critical national network of stream gages. A solid system of stream gaging is important not only to mapping the nation’s floodplains and managing stormwater, but also as part of the emergency warning systems on which we rely for evacuation and employing flood protection measures. The article describe some recent developments in streamgaging technology and some future technical concerns. John Costa and Robert M. Hirsch. *Eos* (May 18, 2004). Download from <http://water.usgs.gov/osw/pubs/EOS-Streamflow.pdf>

*Protecting Water Resources with Smart Growth* is a new publication from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that will help communities protect water resources and achieve smart growth. Smart growth is development that is good for the economy, public health, and the environment. Some of the adverse effects of not-so-smart growth and development can include loss of wetlands, riparian habitat, floodplain functions, woodlands, and other natural features, as well as increasingly polluted run-off. The report documents 75 innovative approaches—including redeveloping abandoned properties, encouraging rooftop gardens, creating shared parking, and promoting tree planting—that state and local governments and water resource managers can use to achieve smart growth and water quality goals. The report can be obtained free by sending an email to [ncepimal@one.net](mailto:ncepimal@one.net) or calling 1-800-490-9198; ask for EPA publication 231-R-04-002. The report and more information about smart growth are also available at <http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth>.

*Designing Educational Opportunities for the Hazards Manager of the 21st Century* is the report of a workshop held last October to (1) to identify core competencies for skills and knowledge, (2) begin to create a sample interdisciplinary curriculum, and (3) identify opportunities and challenges for incorporating basic hazard management principles into a curriculum. It was a cooperative effort of the National Science Foundation, the Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, the University of Colorado at Denver, and FEMA’s Education Project. The report identifies emerging trends and issues in emergency management, presents consensus views on core competencies for hazard managers of the future, outlines a sample interdisciplinary core curriculum, and suggests ways to build hazards management concepts into existing curricula of related disciplines. Available at [http://www.colorado.edu/hazards/higher\\_ed/Haz%20Mgmt%20Workshop%20Report.pdf](http://www.colorado.edu/hazards/higher_ed/Haz%20Mgmt%20Workshop%20Report.pdf).  
[from *Disaster Research* 408 (June 29, 2004)]

“EnviroMapper for Water,” a web-based mapping connection to a range of water data, has been released in a new version (Version 3.0). The tool can be used to view and map data, such as the uses assigned to local waters by the state (fishing, swimming, etc.), waters that are impaired and the reasons for it, water quality monitoring information, closures of swimming beaches, and the location of dischargers. Maps can be viewed at the national, regional, state or local levels. This latest release features several new layers of water data including EPA’s national water quality database STORET, National Estuary Program study areas, and the location of nonpoint source projects. Other enhancements make it easier to locate and view these data, and instructions are included describing how to incorporate the resulting map into an existing website. EnviroMapper, a description of the new version’s features, and a training exercise, can be accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/waters/enviromapper/>.

## Elevation Certificate Bulletin Released

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Floodplain Management Bulletin on the Elevation Certificate is now available from FEMA. The bulletin addresses frequently asked questions about the FEMA Elevation Certificate (FEMA Form 81-31). It is intended to help local floodplain management officials who have responsibility for administering floodplain management regulations and the land surveyors, architects, and engineers who are authorized by law to certify elevation information on the Elevation Certificate.

>>> Copies of the *Floodplain Management Bulletin, Elevation Certificate* are available from the FEMA Distribution Facility at 1-800-480-2520. Please refer to FEMA number 467-1, and give the full name of the publication. Note that the bulletin does not include a copy of the FEMA Elevation Certificate form, which must be ordered separately. The bulletin will also be posted on FEMA’s website.

The Coastal States Organization has a new website featuring information about the group’s mission, vision, and membership. It also gives the latest CSO policies and resolutions, publications, special projects, upcoming meetings and events, and links to state coastal management programs. Additional pages and features are being added in the coming months. Visit at <http://www.coastalstates.org>.

A new Urban Subwatershed Restoration Manual series offers practical, comprehensive information on watershed restoration techniques. Together, the USRM manuals introduce an integrated framework for urban watershed restoration, outline effective techniques for assessing urban watersheds, and give a comprehensive review of watershed restoration techniques. Each manual includes color photos, graphics, and data, including detailed field methods, practice specifications, costs, applicability, and tips on implementation. The four volumes are (numbers are not consecutive) *An Integrated Framework to Restore Small Urban Watersheds* (Manual 1), *Pollution Prevention Practices* (Manual 8), *Unified Stream Assessment: A User's Manual* (Manual 10), and *Unified Subwatershed and Site Reconnaissance: A User's Manual* (Manual 11). All four manuals were published in 2004 by the Center for Watershed Protection. Hard copies can be purchased individually or as a set via <http://www.cwp.org/>. Thanks to a grant from the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Water, they can be downloaded free from [http://www.cwp.org/USRM\\_verify.htm](http://www.cwp.org/USRM_verify.htm).

The National Estuaries Restoration Inventory (NERI) is now online as a tool to monitor Estuary Restoration Act projects and other estuary restoration projects implemented around the country. NERI serves as a restoration information clearinghouse, providing details on techniques and monitoring results. Projects can be submitted to the inventory from federal, state, local, and private sources, provided that the project goal is to restore ecosystem benefits to estuaries and associated habitats. Project managers can use the inventory to produce on-demand reports, find new partnership opportunities, and locate regional restoration efforts that may assist in future restoration planning and design. A main purpose of the NERI is to track progress made toward the goals of the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000, that is, the restoration of one million acres of estuary habitat by 2010. The Act is implemented by an interagency council consisting of representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Check it out at <https://neri.noaa.gov/>.

"Fundamentals of the Rosgen Stream Classification System" is a training module recently added to the Environmental Protection Agency's Watershed Academy on-line training program. This module introduces the basics of the Rosgen classification system, a widely used method for classifying streams and rivers based on common patterns of channel morphology. The module is a significantly abbreviated version of Chapters 4 and 5 from the 1996 manual, *Applied River Morphology*, by D.L. Rosgen and H.L. Silvey. It summarizes the basic Level 1 and Level 2 techniques for classifying stream channel types according to the Rosgen system, and readers are referred to the original text for more detail. The popularity of the Rosgen system is due to its basis in fluvial geomorphology and natural stream formative processes, its use of common geomorphic principles and field measurement techniques, its relationship to stability or instability of the stream channel and channel evolution, and relating all of the above to stream restoration principles and practices. Go through the module at [http://www.epa.gov/watertrain/stream\\_class/](http://www.epa.gov/watertrain/stream_class/). Other on-line training at the Watershed Academy can be accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/watertrain>.

---

# Calendar

*The Association of State Floodplain Managers maintains a list of flood-related meetings, conferences, and training at <http://www.floods.org/calendar.htm>.*

**August 16–19, 2004:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.

**August 29—September 1, 2004:** GOOD WATER GOVERNANCE FOR PEOPLE & NATURE: WHAT ROLES FOR LAW, INSTITUTIONS & FINANCE? Dundee, Scotland. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See <http://www.awra.org/meetings/Dundee2004/index.html>.

**September 7–10, 2004:** YOU CAN PAY ME NOW OR YOU CAN PAY ME LATER: BENEFITS OF DISASTER PLANNING, Monterey, California. Sponsored by the Floodplain Management Association. Contact FMA at <http://www.floodplain.org>.

- September 9–10, 2004:** DAM SAFETY AND REHABILITATION, Charlotte, North Carolina. Sponsored by the American Society of Civil Engineers Continuing Education. Contact ASCE at (800) 548-2723 or [conted@asce.org](mailto:conted@asce.org) or see <http://www.asce.org/conted/distancelearning/>.
- September 12–15, 2004:** SELF-SUSTAINING SOLUTIONS FOR STREAMS, WETLANDS, AND WATERSHEDS RESTORATION, St. Paul, Minnesota. Sponsored by the American Society for Agricultural Engineers. Contact Barbara Snowden at [snowden@asae.org](mailto:snowden@asae.org) or see <http://www.asae.org>.
- September 12–15, 2004:** SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COASTAL AND ESTUARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, Seattle, Washington. Sponsored by Restore America's Estuaries. Contact Nicole Maylett, Conference Coordinator, (703) 524-0248; [nmaylett@estuaries.org](mailto:nmaylett@estuaries.org) or Steve Emmett-Mattox, Vice President and Program Director, (703) 524-0248 or [sem@estuaries.org](mailto:sem@estuaries.org) or see <http://www.estuaries.org>.
- September 20–22, 2004:** LIGHTING THE WAY TO FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT, Wagoner, Oklahoma. Sponsored by the Oklahoma Floodplain Managers Association. Contact Carolyn Schultz at (918) 669-4919, fax: (918) 669-7546.
- September 20–23, 2004:** ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FLOOD AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES, Monterey, California. See <http://www.nafsma.org/Meetings/04AMBroch.pdf>.
- September 20–23, 2004:** THE COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E278), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- September 22–24, 2004:** ANNUAL CASFM CONFERENCE, Glenwood Springs, Colorado. Sponsored by the Colorado Association of Stormwater and Floodplain Managers. Contact Robert Krehbiel, Conference Chair at (303) 572-0200.
- September 26–29, 2004:** GETTING BETTER ALL THE TIME: DAM SAFETY 2004, Phoenix, Arizona. Sponsored by the Association of State Dam Safety Officials. Contact ASDSO at (859) 257-5140 or [info@damsafety.org](mailto:info@damsafety.org).
- September 27–30, 2004:** DIGITAL HAZARD DATA (E234), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- October 7–8, 2004:** GEOSYNTHETICS FOR BEGINNERS, Sunnyvale, California. Sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Department of Engineering Professional Development. Contact 1-800-462-0876 or see <http://epdweb.engr.wisc.edu/webG148>.
- October 12–15, 2004:** FALL CONFERENCE OF THE NEW MEXICO FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS ASSOCIATION, Deming, New Mexico. Contact Phil Butz at (505) 543-6625 or see <http://www.nmfma.org>.
- October 13–5, 2004:** INAFSM CONFERENCE 2004, Pokagon State Park, Indiana. Sponsored by the Indiana Association for Floodplain and Stormwater Management. Contact Marta Moody at (765) 747-7740 or see <http://www.inafsm.net>.
- October 19–20, 2004:** PROTECTING WETLANDS OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE, Kansas City, Missouri. Sponsored by the Association of State Wetland Managers. Contact Sharon Weaver at (518) 872-1804 or [sharon.weaver@aswm.org](mailto:sharon.weaver@aswm.org) or see <http://www.aswm.org/calendar/wetlands2004/agenda2004.htm>.
- October 20–29, 2004:** GULF OF MAINE SUMMIT: COMMITTING TO CHANGE, St. Andrews, New Brunswick. Sponsored by the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment, Coalition for the Gulf of Maine, Environment Canada, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Contact Patty King at (902) 876-1160; fax: (902) 876-1320; [pattyfsrs@auracom.com](mailto:pattyfsrs@auracom.com) or see <http://www.gulfofmainesummit.org>.
- November 1–4, 2004:** ANNUAL WATER RESOURCE CONFERENCE, Orlando, Florida. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See <http://www.awra.org>.

- November 4–5, 2004:** ANNUAL UFSMA CONFERENCE, Washington Village, Utah. Sponsored by the Utah Floodplain and Stormwater Management Association. Contact Judy Watanabe at (801) 538-3750 or [judywatanabe@utah.gov](mailto:judywatanabe@utah.gov).
- November 6–10, 2004:** ANNUAL CONFERENCE AND EXHIBIT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS, Dallas, Texas. Contact IAEM, 111 Park Place, Falls Church, VA 22046; (703) 538-1795; fax: (703) 241-5603; [info@iaem.com](mailto:info@iaem.com) or see <http://www.iaem.com>.
- November 11–12, 2004:** WAFSCAM CONFERENCE, LaCrosse, Wisconsin. Sponsored by the Wisconsin Association for Floodplain, Stormwater, and Coastal Management. Contact Dave Fowler at (414) 277-6368 or [dfowler@mmsd.com](mailto:dfowler@mmsd.com).
- November 15–18, 2004:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E273), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- November 16–19, 2004:** RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT OF ARID WATERCOURSES: ARID REGIONS 10TH BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, Mesa, Arizona. Sponsored by the Association of State Floodplain Managers, the Arizona Floodplain Management Association, the Floodplain Management Association, and the New Mexico Floodplain Managers Association. Contact Tom Loomis at (602) 506-4767 or [trl@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:trl@mail.maricopa.gov).
- January 17–20, 2005:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E273), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- February 10–11, 2005:** STORM WATER DETENTION SYSTEM DESIGN (NCES 8224), Denver, Colorado. Sponsored by the University of Colorado at Denver, Continuing Engineering Education. Contact (303) 556-4907 or visit <http://www.cudenver.edu/engineer/cont> and click on Course Information.
- March 21–24, 2005:** THE COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E278), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- March 21–25, 2005:** RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION (E386), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- May 8–11, 2005:** SOLUTIONS TO COASTAL DISASTERS 2005, Charleston, South Carolina. Sponsored by the Coasts, Oceans, Ports and Rivers Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers. See <http://www.asce.org/conferences/cd05/>.
- May 19–20, 2005:** URBAN FLOOD CHANNEL DESIGN AND CULVERT HYDRAULICS (NCES 8221), Denver, Colorado. Sponsored by the University of Colorado at Denver, Continuing Engineering Education. Contact (303) 556-4907 or visit <http://www.cudenver.edu/engineer/cont> and click on Course Information.
- May 22–25, 2005:** THE WATERSHED PROGRAM AT 50: REFLECTIONS ON THE PAST, AND FORECASTS FOR THE FUTURE, NINTH NATIONAL WATERSHED CONFERENCE, Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky. Sponsored by the National Watershed Coalition. Abstracts are due December 1, 2004. Contact Dan Siebert at (405) 627-0670 or [nwchdqtrs@sbcglobal.net](mailto:nwchdqtrs@sbcglobal.net) or visit <http://www.watershedcoalition.org/PaperCall.htm>.
- June 12–17, 2005:** NO ADVERSE IMPACT: PARTNERING FOR SUSTAINABLE FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT, 29TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, Madison, Wisconsin. Contact the ASFPM Executive Office, 2809 Fish Hatchery Rd., Ste. 204, Madison, WI 53713-3120; (608) 274-0123; fax: (608) 274-0696; [asfpm@floods.org](mailto:asfpm@floods.org) or see <http://www.floods.org>.



**ASSOCIATION of STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS**

**2809 Fish Hatchery Road, Suite 204**

**Madison, WI 53713**

**(608) 274-0123 fax: (608) 274-0696**

[asfpm@floods.org](mailto:asfpm@floods.org)

<http://www.floods.org>

*News & Views* is published six times each year by the Association of State Floodplain Managers, Inc., and is paid for by membership dues.

Copyright ©2004 by the ASFPM. Reproduction with credit permitted.

Information and opinions contained herein do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Directors.

Items for publication and other editorial matters should be directed to:

Jacquelyn L. Monday

Editor, *News & Views*

1026 So. Johnson St.

Lakewood, CO 80226

(303) 985-3141 fax: 303-985-5181

email: [jacki.JLM@comcast.net](mailto:jacki.JLM@comcast.net)

Deadline is the 18th day of odd-numbered months.

For address changes and member services, contact the ASFPM Executive Office at the address in the box.

---

**ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**CHAIR**

Chad Berginnis, CFM  
Department of Natural Resources,

Division of Water  
1939 Fountain Square, Bldg. E-3

Columbus, OH 43224

(614) 265-6715

fax: 614-447-9503

[chad.berginnis@dnr.state.oh.us](mailto:chad.berginnis@dnr.state.oh.us)

**VICE CHAIR**

Pam Pogue

NFIP Coordinator

Rhode Island Emergency Management  
Agency

645 New London Ave.

Cranston, RI 02920

(401) 946-9996

fax: 401-944-1891

[pam.pogue@ri.ngb.army.mil](mailto:pam.pogue@ri.ngb.army.mil)

**SECRETARY**

Rhonda Montgomery, CFM

109 SW 9th St., 2nd Floor

Topeka, KS 66612-1283

(785) 296-4622

fax: 785-296-4835

[rmontgomery@kda.state.ks.us](mailto:rmontgomery@kda.state.ks.us)

**TREASURER**

William Nechamen, CFM

NFIP Coordinator

New York Dept. of Environmental  
Conservation

625 Broadway, 4th Floor

Albany, NY 12233

(518) 402-8146

fax: 518-402-9029

[wsnecham@gw.dec.state.ny.us](mailto:wsnecham@gw.dec.state.ny.us)

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Larry Larson, CFM

ASFPM Executive Office

[larry@floods.org](mailto:larry@floods.org)