



Vol. 16, No. 6
December 2004

ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, INC.

WHERE THE STATES STAND

THE ASFPM LOOKS AT FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT TODAY

The scope of state-level floodplain management programs has grown considerably over the past seven years, the number of activities states undertake has multiplied, and different approaches to perennial problems are emerging. States play a vital role in reducing flood losses by providing direct technical assistance to local governments; enforcing regulatory requirements; training local floodplain managers, insurance agents, engineers, surveyors, and others; managing or assisting with hazard mitigation activities; mapping flood hazards; managing protection and restoration projects and programs for floodplain resources and functions; and fostering state and regional floodplain management organizations. Furthermore, states have risen to the challenge of doing more floodplain management with fewer resources.

Those are among the conclusions of the ASFPM's newly released report, *Floodplain Management 2003: State and Local Programs*, which compiles data about all these factors and more. The document is one product of a multi-year project to gather and analyze information about state and local floodplain management throughout the United States. Data were obtained from many sources, but especially from each of the State National Flood Insurance Program Coordinators and their colleagues, resulting in the most complete picture available of the types and level of activities being undertaken nationwide to reduce flood losses and protect floodplain resources. For example,

- Almost all states (45) now have some geographic information system (GIS) capability (more than double the number in 1995) and 30 states have GIS data that meets NFIP standards.
- The professional development of floodplain managers is on a strong upswing. There are now 34 states with their own floodplain management associations. Certification programs for floodplain managers number 12, including the national program, and there are 1,604 certified floodplain managers in the United States.
- In 19 states the governor has issued an executive order for hazard mitigation; 15 states have a dedicated fund for mitigation. All-hazard mitigation planning is being done at state and local levels in more than 2/3 of all states.

An important companion document, *Effective State Floodplain Management Programs*, is also being released now. For the first time, there is available a definitive description of what is entailed in the best state floodplain management programs. Recognizing that there is no single "perfect model" for a state program, the ASFPM nevertheless presents in *Effective State Programs* the 10 basic principles that underlie effective state-level programs, and sets out a blueprint of the various policies, sub-programs, regulations, techniques, activities, and other components that are most successful at protecting floodplain resources and minimizing losses. It is intended to be a guide for national and state legislators and their staffs, for those who make policy decisions about state programs and priorities, and for state and local floodplain managers who are interested in improving their programs. The report includes checklists that can be used by those who wish to profile their programs' strengths and identify opportunities for enhancement and growth.

The two reports complement each other and numerous cross-references make it possible to track both the use of a given technique among the states and also find out why it is effective as part of an overall state program for reducing flood losses.

The project that produced both reports was funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the ASFPM Foundation. *Floodplain Management 2003* is one of a series of similar assessments conducted by the ASFPM in 1995, 1992, and 1989.

>>> Both of the ASFPM's new reports are available online. *Floodplain Management 2003* (79 pp.) is posted at http://www.floods.org/PDF/FPM_2003_Final.pdf. Its appendix, the tables of data (116 pp.), is at http://www.floods.org/PDF/FPM_2003_Appendix_Final.pdf. *Effective State Programs* (132 pp.) can be accessed at http://www.floods.org/PDF/Effective_State_Programs_Final.pdf.

from the Chair

Chad Berginnis, CFM

Happy holidays to each of you! I hope that you and your family had a great Thanksgiving and are feeling some of the seasonal spirit that makes this time of the year so magical. I, for one, am beginning to get into the holiday frame of mind, and will soon be looking for that perfect Christmas tree, spending time with friends and family at various holiday get-togethers, and yes, reflecting on the past year's events. In that vein, the ASFPM can be pleased with what we have accomplished as an organization this year. Below I reflect on some of the highlights.

First, the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 was passed at the end of June. The final legislation may not be perfect, but it advances policy positions that the ASFPM has held for some time, including the mitigation of flood-prone structures, and fostering individual responsibility by moving towards the actuarial rating of repetitive loss structures if mitigation is refused. As I have said many times, ASFPM involvement was critical; and our chapters really stepped up and helped make this happen.

Another significant event on the policy front was the ASFPM Foundation's successful inaugural Gilbert F. White National Flood Policy Forum, held this past fall in Washington, D.C. Experts from many sub-disciplines of floodplain management were pulled together, and two days were spent debating whether the 1% standard flood has served us well in the past and whether it should remain the standard in the future. I look forward to reading the report of the Forum, which should be published in early 2005.

Next, the ASFPM has made several key investments in itself. We are continuing our transformation from a small organization to one that is quickly morphing from medium to large. As we change, we must remain true to those things that have made us successful—credibility as an organization, passionate volunteers, supportive chapters, and the CFM program. So, investments have been made in our information technology and accounting systems, and we have added staff to handle the increasing demand from our members and programs. We continue to make progress on updating the strategic plan, and the ASFPM Board of Directors held a fall weekend meeting in Madison for the second year in a row to address many operational and policy issues.

Finally, another ASFPM annual conference came off splendidly. The 2004 conference in Biloxi reinforced the fact that we do put on the nation's premiere floodplain management gathering. Overall, the training and peer networking were excellent and it seemed like folks had a great time as we again had attendance near 1,000. Also, a successful conference is critically important to the finances of the ASFPM—it helps fund important ASFPM programs and activities.

In closing, I want to thank each of you for your volunteerism, your donations, and your membership in the ASFPM. I sincerely hope that you believe you get good value for what you put into the organization. Also, I challenge each of you to spend at least one hour volunteering for the ASFPM next year. If all ASFPM members did that, the organization would be receiving the equivalent of three full-time employees' worth of work. Just imagine what we could accomplish! □

MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN MAP MODERNIZATION

The ASFPM's Mapping & Engineering Standards Committee is urging ASFPM members to provide input on the Multi-Year Flood Hazard Identification Plan (MHIP), which has just been released for public comment by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The MHIP lays out FEMA's strategy for updating Flood Insurance Rate Maps through the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization (Map Mod) program. The MHIP lists goals for achieving Map Mod, describes the distribution of funds to the FEMA Regional Offices, gives a county-by-county schedule for studies and map production, and describes other processes and procedures to be used to modernize the nation's hazard maps and ultimately develop a "national flood layer." FEMA intends to update the plan annually.

Cooperating Technical Partners and local and regional agencies are especially encouraged to review the plan and give their suggestions. The M&ES Committee Co-Chairs would appreciate being copied on responses to FEMA about MHIP—this will allow both the Committee and other ASFPM leadership to better address common concerns in ongoing discussions with FEMA.

The Mapping & Engineering Standards Committee reviewed the plan and provided comments to FEMA (a copy of the Committee's letter is at http://www.floods.org/pdf/asfpm_mhip_response_comments.pdf). Chapter comments will also be posted as they are received.

>>> The MHIP can be viewed or downloaded at http://www.fema.gov/fhm/mh_main.shtm. The deadline for getting comments to FEMA is January 31, 2005. Address questions to the M&ES Committee Co-Chairs Jim Williams at jwilliams@dnr.state.ne.us or Bill Brown at Bill.Brown@dupageco.org.



NO ADVERSE IMPACT QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

This column provides details on and answers questions about the ASFPM's NAI approach to floodplain management. Questions about NAI are welcome, and should be sent to the editor at the address on the back page. This month's response was written by Doug Plasencia, P.E., CFM

QUESTION What is the relationship between the natural and beneficial values of floodplains and NAI floodplain management?

ANSWER For nearly 20 years floodplain management has considered reducing flood damage AND managing the natural functions of floodplains to be co-equal objectives. The ASFPM has promoted these dual objectives through its training, conferences, professional certification, and public testimony before the U.S. Congress.

The NAI approach was conceived as a means to advance comprehensive management of floodplains, meaning to protect both property and natural functions. NAI floodplain management is evolutionary in that floodplain management programs over time will adopt practices and standards that, in turn, will reduce adverse impacts over time. At the center of this progression, however, is the debate over what constitutes an adverse impact. Where people and property are concerned, an adverse impact is generally considered to be the transfer of the effect of flooding from one property to another. For natural and beneficial functions, however, this definition isn't a very good fit.

At the center of this challenge is the fact that human occupation owes its very existence to (and at the same time will exact some toll on) the natural environment. Even in today's high-tech society, a prosperous economy and lifestyle are grounded in stewardship of our natural resource base. The growth of the United States' economy and our 300 years of expansion in North America has been based on the use—and in some cases abuse—of our natural resources. The Dust Bowl of the 1930s was a testimonial to poor soil conservation practices during times of drought, which led to loss of agricultural productivity and contributed to the Depression. Today many fisheries are threatened by pollutant loading, stream blockages, and in some cases over-harvesting, leading to loss of their productivity as well.

From a floodplain management perspective we can draw linkages to these environmental problems in part to actions taken within floodplains. But our national policies manage floodplains primarily to reach only three principal outcomes: reduction in flood damage (Federal Emergency Management Agency); maximizing the "economic" use of floodplains (Corps of Engineers); and minimizing water pollution (Environmental Protection Agency).

Missing from this picture are programs of resource management within the floodplain. One challenge is that much of the land base of concern is in fact privately held. We are familiar with regulatory elements of the Clean Water Act (e.g., Section 404) that is administered by the Corps. These regulatory permits, which do protect some floodplain and wetland areas from the harmful effects of dredging and filling, typically are not based on a comprehensive strategy. The programs of the Natural Resource Conservation Service perhaps are the federal activities most closely aligned with conservation practices on privately held lands, but their connection to floodplain resource management often is only tangential—through various easement and preserve initiatives. The programs of the Corps are slowly evolving to incorporate restoration of natural floodplains as a legitimate project objective; the long-term success of this shift undoubtedly will be based on the Corps' ability to transform itself while still operating under the umbrella of the *Principles and Guidelines* and its own planning guidance documents.

The other missing piece is that in floodplain management we do not always view the floodplain as a complex ecosystem and as a resource with multiple potentials. So far, in the floodplain management community we have usually addressed natural and beneficial functions indirectly. That is, there is little case history demonstrating that protection of the resources and values was a primary objective of a given action or management strategy. For example, the creation of open space within a floodplain is usually undertaken for purposes of flood protection. It is commonly believed that conserving this open space also has secondary benefits for the natural and beneficial functions of the floodplain. But should this be a "secondary" benefit or a primary goal? And is the open space designed, used, and maintained in such a way that the most crucial floodplain functions are in fact well-managed for the future?

[continued on page 11]

IBHS and ACSP Land Use Planning Awards

Each year the Institute for Business & Home Safety (IBHS) and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) make a \$500 award to a student in recognition of scholarship in land use planning and natural hazards. The winner is chosen from among the authors of papers presented at the ACSP annual conference.

The 2004 Winner Is

Lorelei Juntunen, a recent graduate of the University of Oregon, received the 2004 award of \$500 for her work in land use planning and natural hazards. Through a case study in Clark County, Washington, the project explored the promise of geographic information system (GIS) mapping as a way to create mitigation strategies for groups that are more vulnerable to hazards, not only because of their geographic proximity to hazards, but because of decreased resources and/or capabilities arising from social-economic status and/or physical abilities.

Juntunen's paper hypothesizes that, although maps serve an important planning function, a collaborative approach to addressing social vulnerability may be more appropriate. It seeks both to map the physical locations of vulnerable populations and to bring stakeholders together to seek solutions to a recognized and growing problem.

Juntunen is now employed by ECONorthwest, an economic and land use consulting company in Portland, Oregon.

The Competition for 2005

For the fifth year, IBHS and ACSP are teaming up to offer the scholarship award, which is meant to encourage planners to include natural hazards loss reduction in their research and practice. Eligible papers must be accepted and presented at the ACSP conference in Charleston, South Carolina, to be held October 27-30, 2005. The winner will agree to first publication rights by IBHS in its quarterly publication *Disaster Safety Review*.

Papers should address land use or other types of planning that incorporate natural hazards, including, but not limited to flooding, coastal erosion, land subsidence, or other hazard impacts that can be minimized through community, regional, or state planning. The awardee will receive a prize of \$500, which will be presented at the ACSP 2005 conference. Undergraduate, graduate, and joint faculty/student papers are eligible. For joint faculty/student papers, the student must be the first author and designated presenter of the paper.

Abstracts should be submitted directly to the ACSP conference organizers between January 17 and February 28, 2005, according to submission procedures at <http://www.acsp.org>. Be sure to enter "IBHS Award Submission" in one of the key word boxes of the submission form on the website.

At the same time, copies of the abstracts should be sent by e-mail to the ACSP-IBHS committee chair, Dr. Ann-Margaret Esnard of Cornell University, at ame7@cornell.edu, with a cover memo indicating intent to submit a paper for the ACSP-IBHS award.

Only papers accepted for presentation at the ACSP Conference are eligible for the award. Authors whose abstracts are accepted for presentation at the conference should submit their final papers electronically to the ACSP-IBHS committee chair by May 25, 2005 with full student author information, including name, institutional affiliation, name of faculty advisor or co-author (indicate clearly if faculty member is co-author), degree program (undergraduate, masters, Ph.D.), degree status (in progress or awarded), mailing address, phone, fax, and e-mail. Papers are not to exceed 20 pages.

Papers will be reviewed during summer 2005, with notification in September.

THE IRS SAYS MITIGATION IS TAXABLE

The ASFPM, Congress, and Federal Emergency Management Agency are working toward a remedy to a recent Internal Revenue Service ruling that requires people to count funds they receive for flood mitigation as part of their gross income for tax purposes. On June 28, 2004, the Office of the Chief Counsel, IRS, Department of the Treasury, concluded that payments made under three FEMA-assisted mitigation programs (Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Flood Mitigation Assistance, and Pre-Disaster Mitigation) are includable as gross income under Section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code.

This means that if a property owner participates in a FEMA-assisted mitigation project that directly affects his or her property, such as foundation elevation, relocation, or retrofitting, then the property owner must include in his or her gross income for the year that cash portion of the grant received as reimbursement for the mitigation, or that was paid by the local government to the contractor that performed the work.

States and localities who act as subgrantees for such mitigation projects must file information returns with the IRS each year for payments made to property owners or contractors, if they exceed \$600.

This ruling has ominous implications for mitigation, and as a policy can only be counterproductive.

- Floodplain managers in the field know that even mentioning to property owners that they may have to claim mitigation grants as taxable income is enough to discourage them from even considering mitigation opportunities.
- The record shows clearly the long-term benefits of mitigation. Mitigation saves repetitive government investment in recovery and in NFIP claims payments.
- It is inconsistent to have a taxation policy that acknowledges the burden of disaster losses (by allowing “victims” to qualify for a casualty loss tax deduction for uninsured losses—a 100% loss to the Treasury) but then ignores the benefit to the Treasury of investment in measures to reduce future damage.
- When mitigation projects meet their rigorous benefit/cost requirements, they are understood to be cost-effective to the nation as a whole and to the NFIP. It is contradictory to tax individual property owners for a “benefit” that extends far beyond them.

A legislative remedy to the situation was sought (unsuccessfully) during the last Congressional session. The Treasury Department has been asked by Congressional leaders to have IRS review the ruling [*see article on page 10*].

NOW THAT THE COASTAL ZONE IS FULL . . .

The old joke about buying some swampland in Florida is a joke no longer. The latest real estate trend in the southeastern United States—especially for retired people—is development of marsh-side properties, targeted especially toward retirees with an eye for the environmental amenities offered by such locations. According to experts on real estate and development, there is almost nothing left for prospective homeowners to buy on the Atlantic Ocean beach except high-rise condominiums or multi-million dollar homes, and the same can be said of lakefront and riverfront land in the Southeast, although prices for those settings tend to be somewhat lower.

According to an article by Robert Johnson in the *New York Times*, marshlands have emerged as a desirable location, and developments in South Carolina and Florida offer upper-end homes and homesites and boast of their visual treats, wide variety of wildlife, and access to the water. The real estate brochures don't use the word “swamp,” characterizing the landscape instead as “bayou,” bird sanctuary,” savannah,” or “lowland.” Homeowners are enthusiastic about the setting and the demand for such residential communities appears to be growing.

Environmental regulators and activists are watching the filling and development of swampland carefully but, according to Johnson, the willingness of developers to set aside thousands of acres of pristine land as open space so far is satisfying concerns about habitat. No mention is made by Johnson of the impacts of such development on drainage patterns or other natural functions or about the provisions made for protecting the homes from flooding.

>>> See the full article, which appeared October 31, 2004, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/31/realestate/31NATI.html?ex=1102136400&en=82c9910c416e3cfd&ei=5070&ex=1100364554&ei=1&en&oref=regi>.

Community Planning Fellowships for 2005–2006

The Mitigation Division of the Federal Emergency Management Agency sponsors Community Planning Fellowships to help graduate students learn to incorporate hazard mitigation into community planning practices. For the 2005-06 academic year, the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds has joined with FEMA to provide funding to support the fellows' exploration of how floodplain management and watershed planning can better be integrated at the local level. The fellowship program is managed by the Multihazard Mitigation Council of the National Institute of Building Sciences.

Students selected to receive a fellowship will be provided with funding sufficient to support one year of field research focusing on local and state hazard mitigation and community planning issues. The fellowships will involve eight weeks of orientation work at FEMA and EPA headquarters and other federal agencies in Washington, D.C., during the summer of 2005; extensive fieldwork within communities to be selected jointly by the student, FEMA, and EPA; and follow-up independent study during the 2005-2006 academic year. The fellowship will conclude with the fellows' presentation of their research at the 2006 Natural Hazards Center conference in Boulder, Colorado.

Field projects will focus on hazard mitigation and community planning issues within the study communities, such as

- Integration of mitigation into ongoing community planning and development processes;
- Economic development and mitigation;
- Sustainable development practices in general and/or sustainable post-disaster recovery practices;
- Integration of floodplain management and environmental planning for restoring wetlands and floodplains for hazard mitigation, integration of floodplain management plans into multiobjective watershed plans, and community watershed projects and hazard mitigation;
- Planning for post-disaster recovery and reconstruction;
- Hazard identification and risk assessment as the basis for planning; or
- Planning implementation tools for hazard mitigation.

Each fellow will receive a stipend for the eight-week orientation in Washington, D.C.; a stipend and tuition/fees to cover the credit hours (not to exceed six credit hours for the entire academic year) earned for fellowship independent study over two semesters; reimbursement for travel costs and other expenses incurred for fieldwork; and housing for the eight weeks spent in Washington (to be arranged by FEMA and the MMC).

The program is for second-year Masters students in accredited planning degree programs, who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

Applications and supporting materials are due January 31, 2005. An MMC Selection Committee will evaluate and rank completed applications and recommend finalists to FEMA and EPA. In early March 2005, FEMA and EPA staff will conduct telephone interviews with applicants who become finalists.

>>> Details about eligibility and the application instructions are available at <http://www.nibs.org/MMC/mmcactiv4.html>. Descriptions of the three fellowships awarded for the current year can also be read at that site.

REIMBURSEMENT NEEDED FOR POST-DISASTER BUILDING INSPECTIONS

The ASFPM has asked the Federal Emergency Management Agency to change its policy of not reimbursing localities for the expense of bringing in additional help to inspect buildings to make substantial damage determinations after a flood disaster. Under Policy Guidance RR9523.2—Eligibility of Building Inspections in a Post-Disaster Environment, building inspections as “emergency protective measures” are reimbursable from Public Assistance disaster funds but it states that “increased code enforcement activity as a result of a disaster is not considered essential to meeting the immediate threats to life and property . . . but instead reflects the normal rebuilding process.” Until 1998, FEMA considered the cost of additional building inspections to be a legitimate disaster cost, but the policy was revised that year.

The ASFPM believes that substantial damage determinations after a flood disaster are directly related to public health and safety and thus are within the realm of activities contemplated by the Stafford Act. A substantial damage determination is a prerequisite to obtaining a permit to repair, rebuild, or reconstruct a building after a flood, and unrepaired buildings clearly pose a threat to life and property.

Further, the sooner the determination is made, the better, because property owners eventually tire of waiting for the inspection and eventually proceed on their own, resulting in unsafe repairs and enforcement problems. But because by definition the locality’s capabilities have been exceeded (hence the disaster declaration), rapid inspection of all damaged structures is generally impossible without outside help.

States and communities have been working to mobilize third-party groups to help do post-flood inspections and substantial damage determinations. The group could be a state or regional building officials association, an architectural or engineering association, a state floodplain management group, or a contractor. Even if such people donate their time, which they often do, their travel expenses are significant. Reimbursement remains a hurdle to making mutual aid agreements or compacts completely successful in this arena.

This issue has been at the forefront with the literally thousands of damaged structures left in the wake of this fall’s hurricanes and related storms and flooding. □

PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION PROGRAM FOR FY 2005

The application period is imminent for the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM), which will make available about \$255 million in competitive grants, technical assistance, and program support for fiscal year 2005. The PDM grants will be awarded on a nation-wide competitive basis, with a 75%/25% federal/non-federal cost sharing formula. Eligible activities include mitigation planning and projects and information dissemination. Not eligible are warning systems, residential floodproofing, generators and other equipment, flood control projects, or ecological management of land or forests.

The major prerequisites are: floodprone communities must be in good standing in the National Flood Insurance Program; communities and states must have a FEMA-approved mitigation plan in place before a grant is awarded; and a benefit-cost analysis must have been done for the proposed project (with a ratio of at least 1.0). All the applications will receive technical review by FEMA and be ranked. After that, national panels will evaluate the applications on the basis of other predetermined factors. Awards are expected to be made in May 2005.

Applications must be made by the state agency with emergency management responsibility; localities, tribes, and public colleges and universities work through the state to apply. FEMA requests that the electronic grants system (e-Grant) be used once the application period is officially open. The deadline for receipt of the applications in the FEMA Regional Office is February 28, 2005, but each state will have its own schedule for receiving and processing sub-applications from within its jurisdiction.

>>> Check <http://www.fema.gov/fima/pdm> for notice of the opening of the application period, or to get detailed information about eligibility, help available, application procedures, the review criteria and process, and related matters.

Washington Report

NEW NATIONAL PROGRAM ON WIND HAZARDS

The reauthorization of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (H.R. 2608, signed into law on October 25), provides for a new program to address windstorm hazards. Modeled after the NEHRP program and under the leadership of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the new wind hazards program will establish an interagency working group to study the impact of wind on structures and develop cost-effective ways to mitigate the property damage and loss of life brought about by high winds, such as those accompanying the hurricanes of the past year. The working group will include representatives from FEMA, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the National Science Foundation. The legislation authorizes \$72.5 million over three years for the program.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Congress has still not quite adjourned the session. At present, most of the government is operating under a third Continuing Resolution, allowing continued expenditure of funds at the FY 2004 level until December 8th.

Consolidated Appropriations for 2005

The huge omnibus appropriations bill, being called the "Consolidated Appropriations Bill" for FY 2005 has not yet been sent to the President for signature. The document contains several thousand pages and is a foot high. A provision, apparently inserted by a House staffer, would allow appropriations committee members and staff to review individual tax returns. When discovered before Senate passage, it was removed along with an agreement from the House leadership that the entire measure would not go to the President until the House acted to remove the tax return review provision. It is expected that the House will take care of this remaining business when it reconvenes on December 6th and that the bill providing FY 2005 appropriations for most of the federal government will be signed by the President.

Because of the urgency of dealing with certain unfinished business, the Consolidated Appropriations Bill does contain some authorizing legislation. Generally, authorizing on an appropriations bill is not permitted, but there are often exceptions.

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant program is reauthorized for one year. Without this action, the program would have expired December 31st. An unsuccessful attempt was made to add the provisions of the Water Resources Development Act. Another unsuccessful effort was to include authorizing language clarifying that disaster mitigation funds should not be subject to taxation as individual or business income (see below). Also unsuccessful was an effort to add funding for the new repetitive flood loss programs authorized by legislation passed and signed in June 2004.

Intelligence Reform

The other outstanding business for the rest of the lame duck Congressional session is the intelligence reform bill introduced pursuant to the recommendations of the 911 Commission. The Senate version of this legislation had included an amendment attaching a Homeland Security Grant Bill, creating a sort of homeland security block grant. It is notable that, during House-Senate Conference deliberations, that provision was dropped.

In the Consolidated Appropriations Bill

The Consolidated Appropriations Bill (H.R. 4818; H. Rept. 108-792) covers FY 2005 appropriations for Agriculture, Commerce/Justice/State & Judiciary, Energy and Water, Foreign Operations, Interior, Legislative Branch, Transportation/Treasury, and VA/HUD. The document itself is available at <http://thomas.loc.gov>. Summarized here are some items of particular interest. The Conference Report notes that items funded at the same levels in both House and Senate bills are not specifically addressed in the consolidated bill.

Agriculture

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is funded at \$837 million. This is about \$8 million less than the Senate bill and \$17 million less than the House bill. The measure also makes the funds

[continued on page 9]

Washington Report (cont.)

available only until June 30, 2006 rather than until expended. There is language about apparent misuse of conservation discretionary funds. Additionally, there is language directing that the earmarks funded should not be counted as a part of a state's allocation.

The Watershed Surveys and Planning account is funded at \$7 million, a level below both the House and Senate bills. Language expresses concern that additional surveys are being initiated when the backlog is growing. The Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations account is funded at \$75.5 million, which splits the difference between the House and Senate numbers. The Watershed Rehabilitation Program is funded at \$27.5 million, also splitting the difference between the House and Senate numbers. For Resource Conservation and Development, the amount is \$51.6 million. This is the House number and is higher than the Senate figure. Bill language "directs the Secretary to enter into an agreement with a national association related to the Resource Conservation and Development Program."

Energy and Water

Under the Army Corps of Engineers, Flood Plain Management Services is funded at \$6.8 million. This amount includes earmarks of \$776,000 for GIS work in East Baton Rouge, Louisiana; \$200,000 for hydrological analysis of Blind Brook in Rye, New York; and \$1 million for hurricane prediction studies for Hawaii and the U.S. Territories in the Pacific and Caribbean. Other Coordination Programs is funded at \$4.3 million and includes the funds for Planning Assistance to States (PAS). Under PAS, there are 12 earmarks, one for \$500,000 and the rest fall in the \$100,000 to \$250,000 range.

Interior

Under the National Park Service, funding for Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance is increased by \$300,000 over the amount in the House bill. (There was no Senate bill.) Language states that the committees expect that reforms to the strategic plan will be strictly followed, reiterating that this is a technical assistance program. Direct grants are not permitted.

The U.S. Geological Survey is funded at a level \$2.3 million below the House figure for mapping, remote sensing, and geographic investigations. Language states the expectation that the decrease for the National Map will be partially offset by anticipated buyout savings. The Water Resources programs have seven earmarks totaling \$3.8 million, although two earmarks totaling \$800,000 were removed.

VA/HUD/Independent Agencies

The Environmental Protection Agency is funded in this section, at a little over \$8 billion, an increase of \$335 million over the House amount and a decrease of \$42 million from the Senate amount. The Non-point Source Program (Section 319) is funded at \$209 million (\$6 million less than the Senate bill and \$26 million less than the House bill). Wetlands Program Development is funded at \$15 million (the Senate figure and \$500,000 higher than the House's amount). Targeted Watersheds are funded at \$18 million, more than that from either the House or Senate bills. For State and Tribal Assistance Grants overall, the consolidated appropriations provide \$3.6 billion, which splits the difference between the lower House figure and the higher Senate figure.

Looking toward a New Congress

The new Congress will convene in January. Matters requiring close attention in the first two months will be the President's budget for FY 2006 and the need for early action on legislation to clarify that disaster mitigation funds should not be subject to taxation as income. Additionally, internal Congressional reorganization of its homeland security jurisdiction could affect the attention that is and will be given to natural disaster matters and, therefore, will require monitoring.

Senate Reorganization

Towards the end of the current Congress, the Senate passed a resolution providing for committee reorganization to better accommodate homeland security issues. The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee will be expanded to incorporate programs of the Department of Homeland Security now under the jurisdiction of many other committees and subcommittees. Under an amendment to the resolution, the National Flood Insurance Program will remain under the jurisdiction of the Senate Banking Committee. The Stafford Act programs, however, will move to the expanded Governmental Affairs Committee. There is reason for concern that it will be more

[continued on page 10]

Washington Report (cont.)

difficult to get proper attention for FEMA, natural disasters, and specifically, natural disaster mitigation. It will be important to pay attention to the manner in which new subcommittees are established to be sure there continues to be an appropriate focus on natural hazards.

House Reorganization

The House has not yet taken steps to reorganize for homeland security issues. Although many thought that, pursuant to a number of exploratory hearings held, there might be a decision not to reorganize, the Speaker has just this past week stated that he favors creating a permanent committee for homeland security. Whether that becomes a new standing committee or a new permanent select committee will have a major impact on how much reorganization would be necessary.

FY 2006 Budget

The budget is expected to be released in early February. This will then kick off several months of hearings by the Appropriations subcommittees to examine the budget requests. A particular interest will be funding for the newly authorized repetitive flood loss programs.

Internal Revenue Service and Mitigation Funds

Since April 15th is tax filing day, it will be important to have legislative action before then stating that disaster mitigation monies are not taxable. Considerable effort was made by many Members of Congress and Senators as well as by the Treasury Department and FEMA to get such legislation attached to the Consolidated Appropriations Bill. Apparently the staff of the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee were investigating the issue, so the request was not made by their chairmen to have it included. The chairmen and ranking minority members of both committees have asked the Treasury Department to have IRS review the ruling [see article on page 5].

HMGP and another PDM Reauthorization

When the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant program (PDM) was reauthorized in the Consolidated Appropriations Bill, it was for a one-year period. When the Stafford Coalition wrote to the relevant Congressional committees urging reauthorization of the PDM program, it also urged that the committees take up the matter of restoring the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) to 15% in the next Congressional session. The House Transportation Committee's Subcommittee on Emergency Management has indicated that it plans to do so. It is hoped that the Senate will also, but this will be complicated by the reorganization of the Senate committee.

Water Resources Development Act

Since the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) was not attached to the consolidated appropriations bill, the process of enacting a WRDA will have to begin again. This presents a new opportunity for including adjustments and improvements to policy.

Highway Bill

The programs under this long-stalled bill were temporarily reauthorized until May 2005. The bill has not emerged from conference because of resistance to meeting the reduced budget being insisted upon by the Administration.

FEMA/Department of Homeland Security

With a change in the leadership of the Department of Homeland Security, there could be implications for FEMA's place in the larger department. It will be important to be aware of planned changes and to offer advice when appropriate to ensure that natural disaster programs can continue to function well.

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

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

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT APPLIES TO NFIP, COURT SAYS

The U.S. District Court for Western Washington (in Seattle), ruled on November 17 that the Federal Emergency Management Agency is in violation of the Endangered Species Act because it has ignored the impacts of the National Flood Insurance Program on threatened chinook salmon in Puget Sound. The ruling came in response to a lawsuit brought by the National Wildlife Federation and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility.

The court agreed with the plaintiffs that, first, FEMA is required to comply with the Endangered Species Act and second, that the NFIP helps fuel development and floodplain damage in some of the most sensitive and important salmon habitat in the region.

For example, the judge agreed that “FEMA is in effect encouraging filling” in floodplains, an activity that “is highly likely to have negative effects on habitat of listed and endangered species.” Calling federal flood insurance a “prerequisite” to floodplain development, the judge ruled that FEMA’s regulations and the sale of insurance “enable development in the floodplain that negatively impacts salmon.” Plaintiffs claimed that development in floodplains “reduces the amount of habitat available to chinook salmon and creates additional impermeable surfaces in the floodplain that produce polluting runoff.”

The court ordered FEMA to engage in a “Section 7 consultation” with the National Marine Fisheries Service. This process is required under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act and ensures that a federal agency intending to undertake an action coordinates with the federal agency charged with protecting an endangered or threatened species (in this case, the NMFS has jurisdiction over anadromous salmon). The purpose of the consultation is to ensure that the action is carried out in such a way that it is “not likely to jeopardize” the species in question. This consultation is the same procedure followed for other federal activities such as timber sales and dam operations.

FEMA was ordered specifically to address in its consultation with NMFS the minimum NFIP eligibility criteria, the mapping of floodplains and the revision of the maps, and provisions of the Community Rating System that could encourage local activities detrimental to salmon. The actual sale of flood insurance policies was excluded from the consultation.

>>> A copy of the decision can be viewed at <http://www.nwf.org/wherewework>. Scroll down to “Northwestern Natural Resource Center” and click on “Salmon.”

NAI Natural and Beneficial Functions (cont.)

The NAI umbrella offers an opportunity for the floodplain management community to meet the challenge of truly managing floodplains to protect and enhance their natural and beneficial functions, while continuing to work to reduce damage from flooding.

Some factors to consider addressing include

- Planning—NAI suggests creating an “NAI plan” within a community. We need to develop and uncover examples of how natural and beneficial function management can be meshed into this plan.
- Program/agency authorities—Authorities at all levels of government were crafted for flood-control-oriented outcomes. We need to learn from those agencies that have broadened their authorities, and understand the limitation that traditional authorities might place on an agency.
- Floodplain mapping and management standards—These standards were crafted to reflect large flooding events, and to manage flooding. There has been limited consideration of channel geomorphology, low-flow events, and other factors that affect the natural and beneficial functions of a floodplain.
- Multi-objective planning and outcomes—The ASFPM has been a staunch advocate of an inclusive planning approach that considers multiple needs. We need to refocus and align multi-objective management and NAI so that the linkages are clear.

The power of the NAI initiative is that it is encouraging outcome-based floodplain management, and that it communicates these outcomes in a way that is simple for citizens, community decisionmakers, developers, and others to understand. It is time to investigate how total management of the floodplain resource can be better integrated into NAI and into the floodplain management community. □

FELLOWSHIPS FROM THE AAAS

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) invites applications for its 2005–2006 Science and Technology Policy Fellowship Programs. AAAS sponsors these programs to provide opportunities for accomplished and socially aware scientists and engineers to learn more about the policy-making process of the federal government. Fellows serve for one year in Congress or in executive branch agencies and are valued for their external perspectives and critical thinking skills, as well as for their technical expertise. The deadline for application to all AAAS programs is January 10, 2005.

>>> A booklet that fully explains each of 10 different policy fellowship programs that AAAS sponsors is available at http://fellowships.aaas.org/2005.06_booklet.pdf. Candidates may apply to a maximum of three programs. Address questions to the AAAS fellowship staff at (202) 326-6700; fellowships@aaas.org or see <http://fellowships.aaas.org/>.

Make a Note

It's good to remember that, in a major flood disaster, state and community officials can get expert help in fielding the victims' queries about their legal rights and obligations. When a Presidential disaster declaration is made, the American Bar Association's Young Lawyers Division can mobilize volunteer lawyers to answer legal questions through toll-free hotlines or by staffing disaster recovery centers in the hardest-hit counties. The help comes pursuant to a 1978 agreement between the ABA and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Legal questions that confront victims of a major flood range from whether they need to make the mortgage payments on a house that was destroyed to finding out what damage is covered under their insurance policies. Most callers ask for help with landlord/tenant problems and insurance claims, but volunteers can help with home repair contracts, consumer protection issues, replacement of legal documents, and other matters. For more complex situations arising from the disaster, legal services are available to low-income individuals; callers who have the ability to pay are referred to appropriate local entities.

In Florida alone during 2004's summer and fall hurricanes, more than 700 lawyers participated in the program. In the first several days after Hurricane Charley, they took more than 5,000 calls. Other states also had volunteers to help sort out problems. In Puerto Rico, the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico provided free counsel where warranted.

Members of the ABA Young Lawyers Division have provided legal assistance to victims of numerous disasters since 1978, including hurricanes Andrew and Isabel, the Oklahoma City bombing, the San Francisco earthquakes, and the wildfires in California.

>>> For more information see <http://www.abanet.org/media/releases/news091004.html> or contact Barbara Sharpley at (312) 988-5671 or sharpieb@staff.abanet.org.

UPDATE ON NFIP EVALUATION

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) has issued its third annual progress report on its project, funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to evaluate the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Ten separate studies are underway, each addressing one or more of the evaluation's primary questions. AIR and its subcontractors are writing final reports for some work that began in FY 2002-03, and some other investigations are just beginning. Four new studies commenced this past year: (1) the costs and consequences of flooding, (2) state activities in support of the NFIP, (3) the NFIP's actuarial soundness, and (4) the 1% annual chance flood standard. To help in the effort, the ASFPM has shared with AIR information it has developed on state floodplain management activities [*see article on page 1*] and on the 1% standard [*see News & Views, October 2004, p. 1*].

Work continues on a comprehensive chronology of floodplain management and a searchable annotated bibliography of the NFIP. AIR has updated the 2003 versions of both documents and plans to make them available on FEMA's website shortly. Over 150 citations were added to bibliography, including many related to international floodplain management. Also, each of the existing citations was reviewed and websites added to them where available.

>>> Read the update at <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/nfip/nfipeval04.pdf>. The chronology and bibliography are posted at <http://www.fema.gov/nfip/nfipeval.shtm>.

Publications, Software, AV & the Web

“Toward Ecological Cities: Adapting to the 21st Century Metropolis” traces past and current initiatives to make urban—and suburban—places more habitable and “ecological,” with an eye toward the quality of life that can be expected in the wake of metropolitan sprawl that has far outpaced population growth in the United States. A model of an “ecological city” is presented, incorporating attributes that, if realized, can re-instill a connection between humans and nature, protect resources, foster a sense of place and belonging, promote cultural activities, and minimize pollution. Among the components of the model city are attention to floodplains, storm drainage, and wetlands; environmental education; civic spaces and public art; urban forestry and wildlife; urban greenways and trails; smart growth initiatives; green infrastructure and design; and outdoor recreation. Examples of current successes in these areas are given from Chicago; New York City; New Haven, Connecticut; Riverside-San Bernardino, California, and other sites. Rutherford H. Platt. *Environment* 36 (5):10–27. Reprints can be ordered for \$3.95 from Heldref Publications at <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/heldref/>.

Design Guide for Improving School Safety in Earthquakes, Floods, and High Winds is for design professionals and officials involved in school construction, repair, and renovation. It explores the safety of school buildings and their occupants and the economic losses and social disruption caused by building damage or destruction in the wake of a natural disaster. New grade schools are the main focus, but the repair, renovation, and expansion of existing school buildings are also addressed. 2004. 361 pp. Risk Management Series. FEMA 424. Free from the Federal Emergency Management Agency Distribution Center, P.O. Box 2013, Jessup, MD 20794; (800) 480-2520 or online at <http://www.fema.gov/fima/rmsp424.shtm>.

Valuing Ecosystem Services: Toward Better Environmental Decision-Making identifies methods for assigning economic value to ecosystem functions—even intangible ones—and calls for greater collaboration between ecologists and economists in such efforts. Such functions (termed “services” in this report) include flood control, nutrient recycling, providing habitat for plants and animals, and water supply. In making decisions about human activities, such as draining a wetland for a housing development, it is essential to consider both the value of the development and the value of the ecosystem services that could be lost. To do that, the value of the functions must be expressed in terms that economists and economic models can use. In other words, “the output from ecological modeling must be in a form that can be used as an input to economic analysis,” the report states. The report’s recommendations should be useful to many agencies that do cost-benefit analyses of projects and make decisions about policies affecting the environment. Committee on Assessing and Valuing the the Services of Aquatic and Related Terrestrial Ecosystems, National Research Council. 2004. 313 pages (approximate). Ordering information can be obtained at the National Academies website and a pre-publication copy can be read free online at <http://www.nap.edu/books/030909318X/html/>.

Field Manual: Safety Evaluation of Buildings After Wind Storms and Floods is an easy-to-use, pocket-sized field manual for evaluating the safety of buildings after windstorms and floods. Its guidelines and procedures help building officials, building inspectors, engineers, and others determine whether damaged or potentially damaged buildings are safe for use or if entry should be restricted or prohibited. Included are steps for rapid and detailed safety evaluations; advice on evaluating structural, geotechnical, and nonstructural risks; field safety tips; and guidance on how to deal with owners and occupants of damaged buildings. ATC-45. 2004. 132 pp. \$34.25. Available from the Applied Technology Council, 201 Redwood Shores Parkway, Suite 240, Redwood City, CA 94065; (650) 595-1542; atc@atcouncil.org; <http://www.atcouncil.org/>. The evaluation forms and placards featured in the manual can be downloaded free at <http://www.atcouncil.org/ATC45.shtml>.

A new page at the National Shoreline Management Study website details coastal initiatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, with an eye toward clarifying for the public and Congressional staff the similarities and differences between various coastal programs and studies, reports, and other products currently under development. The coordination among the many partner agencies and how they interrelate on coastal challenges are evident. Visit at <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/NSMS/nsmshomeframeset.html> and click on Related National Coastal Initiatives.

Calendar

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

December 13–14, 2004: INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON WATER AND DISASTERS, London, Ontario, Canada. Sponsored by the Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction. See <http://www.icir.org>.

January 17–20, 2005: MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E273), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/EMIWeb/>.

February 3–6, 2005: PREPARING FREEDOM'S LIFELINES . . . 26TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, Orlando, Florida. Sponsored by the Emergency Medicine Learning & Resources Center and others. Contact EMLRC at 3717 So. Conway Rd., Orlando, FL 32812; 1-800-766-6335 or see <http://www.emlrc.org>.

February 7–10, 2005: INTRODUCTION TO ARC/GIS FOR HAZUS MITIGATION USERS (E190), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/EMIWeb/>.

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.

February 20–23, 2005: ENVIRONMENTAL CONNECTION '05, Dallas, Texas. Sponsored by the International Erosion Control Association. Contact IEDA, 3001 S. Lincoln Ave., Ste. A, Steamboat Springs, CO 80487; (970) 879-3010 or see <http://www.ieca.org>.

February 23–24, 2005: PARTNERSHIPS—WORKING TOGETHER TO IMPROVE FLOODPLAIN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, Peoria, Illinois. Sponsored by the Illinois Association of Floodplain and Stormwater Management. Contact IAFSM at (708) 747-5273 or IAFSM@aol.com or see <http://www.illinoisfloods.org>.

March 13–16, 2005: EIGHTH ANNUAL EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION FOR HAZARD MITIGATION, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. Contact Joni Rennhack at (843) 202-6940 or jrennhack@charlestoncounty.org.

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/EMIWeb/>.

March 21–25, 2005: RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION (E386), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/EMIWeb/>.

April 18–21, 2005: MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E273), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/EMIWeb/>.

April 19–21, 2005: SIXTEENTH GLOBAL WARMING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, New York, New York. sponsored by the Global Warming International Center. Contact James A. Roberts, P.O. Box 5275, Woodridge, IL 60517; jroberts@globalwarming.net or see <http://www.globalwarming.net/>.

April 25–27, 2005: 2005 WEST REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE DAM SAFETY OFFICIALS, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Deadline for abstracts is January 20, 2005. Contact ASDSO, 450 Old Vine St., Lexington, KY 40507 or see <http://www.damsafety.org>.

- May 5–6, 2005:** SPRING MEETING OF THE ARIZONA FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Safford, Arizona. Contact AZFMA, P.O. Box 18102, Phoenix, AZ 85005-8102 or see <http://www.azfma.org>.
- 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 16–18, 2005:** 2005 NORTHEAST REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE DAM SAFETY OFFICIALS, Cape May, New Jersey. Contact ASDSO, 450 Old Vine St., Lexington, KY 40507 or see <http://www.damsafety.org>.
- 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>; 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. Contact Dan Siebert at (405) 627-0670 or nwchdqtrs@sbcglobal.net or visit <http://www.watershedcoalition.org/PaperCall.htm>.
- May 24–27, 2005:** TWELFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SOCIETY (TIEMS), Torhavn, Faroe Islands. See <http://www.tiems.org>.
- May 31—June 3, 2005:** NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM NATIONAL FLOOD CONFERENCE, Marco Island, Florida. Contact Catherine King at (301) 918-1439; fax: (301) 918-1498.
- May 31—June 3, 2005:** ETHICS AND QUALITY IN IMPACT ASSESSMENT, Boston, Massachusetts. Sponsored by the International Association for Impact Assessment. See <http://www.iaia.org>.
- 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 or see <http://www.floods.org>.
- June 27–30, 2005:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM (E273), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact (800) 238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/EMIWeb/>.
- July 10–13, 2005:** THE CHANGING FACE OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT, 15TH WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Centre for Emergency Preparedness. Abstracts are due December 4, 2004. Contact Adrian Gordon at (905) 331-2552 or agordon@ccep.ca or see <http://www.wcdm.org>.
- July 11–15, 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/EMIWeb/>.
- September 12–15, 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/EMIWeb/>.
- September 19–21, 2005:** FIFTEENTH ANNUAL FALL CONFERENCE OF THE OKLAHOMA FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS ASSOCIATION, Lone Wolf, Oklahoma. Contact OFMA, P.O. Box 8101, Tulsa, OK 74101-8101; or see <http://www.okflood.org>.
- September 25–28, 2005:** DAM SAFETY 2005, New Orleans, Louisiana. Sponsored by the Association of State Dam Safety Officials. Contact ASDSO, 450 Old Vine St., Lexington, KY 40507 or see <http://www.damsafety.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

<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.

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Larry Larson, CFM
ASFPM Executive Office
larry@floods.org