ASFPM NEWS&VIEWS

Vol. 16, No. 1
February 2004 ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, INC.

MITIGATION PLANNING AND THE NOVEMBER DEADLINE

by Rebecca Quinn, CFM
RCQuinn Consulting, Inc.

As time passes, people are starting to ask what will happen on November 1, 2004 . . . that magic date when certain consequences and limitations related to state and local mitigation planning go into effect. What will really happen?

There are two parts to the answer. The first is what happens if a community does not have a mitigation plan in place; the second concerns the consequences if a state has no approved mitigation plan in place by the deadline. Communities need to be aware of both.

In October 2002, FEMA issued an interim final rule regarding dates and related requirements for local mitigation plans. A subsequent rule, issued in October 2003, modified one of those dates. The current effective regulations are found at 44 *CFR* Parts 201 and 206 (be sure to use the most current version).

What happens if a community does not have a mitigation plan on November 1, 2004?

The November 1, 2004, deadline is not a "drop-dead" point in time. When that day has come and gone, planning won't come to a screeching halt—and the opportunity to seek mitigation funds will not be lost forever. Communities can and should continue to develop and adopt hazard mitigation plans after that date, and funds to support that planning will continue to be made available by FEMA.

But November 1, 2004, is a very important date to keep in mind because there are certain consequences and limitations that will go into effect then.

For the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program—After November 1, 2004, HMGP will only be available to communities in states that have approved mitigation plans (see section below). As set forth in the current federal regulations, there are two consequences or limitations if a community does not have an approved local mitigation plan and the community is included in a declaration of a major disaster. The limitations are distinguished by whether a community may apply for, or may receive grant funds:

1. For disasters declared before November 1, 2004, a community without a plan can apply for and receive an HMGP project grant, but must commit to developing the plan while implementing the project.
2. For disasters declared after November 1, 2004, a community without a plan CANNOT apply for HMGP project grants. It may, however, apply for planning grants from the 7% of HMGP funds available for planning.

For the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program (PDM)—The November 1, 2004, deadline does not affect eligibility for PDM funding (provided the state has an approved plan). From now on (i.e., for notices of funds availability issued after November 1, 2003), a community without an approved plan may apply for PDM funding—but communities must have an approved plan in order to RECEIVE a PDM project grant.

What happens if a state does not have a mitigation plan on November 1, 2004?

These consequences are much more significant—and communities would do well to check on the status of their state's plan. As of late January, FEMA reported that no state plans had been approved under this requirement.

What is at risk if a FEMA-approved state mitigation plan is not in place by November 1, 2004? Plenty. The federal regulation at Sec. 201.1 states that

> By November 1, 2004, States must have an approved Standard State Mitigation plan meeting the requirements of this section in order to receive

[continued on page 4]

from the Chair

Chad Berginnis

March 1, 2004, will be the one-year anniversary of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's becoming an entity within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). When it was proposed, many organizations and individuals, including the ASFPM, were concerned that the natural hazards mitigation focus of FEMA would be subsumed by the terrorism-oriented mission of DHS. Now, on the eve of the one-year mark, was that trepidation valid? Certainly there is a lot of transition still occurring, but should we be concerned? My assessment is that the situation is like the snowstorm that is happening just outside of my window—only a thin line separates a comfortable environment from a hostile one. Let me explain.

FEMA transformed itself into a nimble, effective organization and grew tremendously since its formation in 1979. In those days, 12 public laws and 19 unclassified Presidential directives were transferred into a newly formed FEMA. Executive Order 12148 authorized FEMA to coordinate all civil defense and civil emergency planning, management, mitigation, and assistance functions, and coordinate preparedness and planning activities to reduce the consequences of major terrorist incidents. Afterwards, as the concept of "comprehensive emergency management" emerged, FEMA's activities revolved around the four phases of emergency management that we are familiar with today: preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation.

In 1992, FEMA created the first Federal Response Plan. As the nation's disaster response agency, it was logical that FEMA would lead that effort. The Federal Response Plan (FRP) establishes a process and structure for the systematic, coordinated, and effective delivery of federal assistance to address the consequences of any major disaster or emergency declared under the Robert T. Stafford Act. It sets forth fundamental policies, concepts of operations, and federal agency responsibilities; describes the array of federal response/recovery/mitigation resources available, and describes the processes and method for implementing programs. In short, the FRP is a basic and fundamental strategic document for the agency, and it is constructed around the comprehensive emergency management framework—which includes mitigation.

So, what has changed? A Presidential directive required DHS to develop a National Response Plan. In October, DHS Secretary Tom Ridge released the Initial National Response Plan (INRP) *[see article on page 7]*. This plan is the precursor to the full National Response Plan, which will then supercede any existing plans and protocols—including the FRP. The problem is, the INRP doesn't mention mitigation; instead, it creates a new function called "prevention," which is not even in the context of mitigation. It will undoubtedly establish a new paradigm when it comes to the federal response to disasters, and shape future policies and programs.

Although most of us do not encounter the INRP in our day-to-day activities, you can bet that this document establishes the framework for how FEMA will operate. It sets the strategic vision of how programs may work, transform, or exist in the future. If this plan does not include one of the cornerstones of emergency management—mitigation—how will such programs fare? Will the new NRP justify the Office of Management and Budget's continuing effort to overlook the numerous benefits of an effective Hazard Mitigation Grant Program? FEMA's priorities seem to be losing ground to DHS priorities. The NRP's silence on mitigation is just one example. In the past year, FEMA program money has yielded to DHS organizational costs, and there has been pressure to reduce or eliminate training courses for emergency and floodplain managers at FEMA facilities. The new National Service Provider contract for the map modernization program is woefully late. True, flood map modernization is being funded—and this is an instance where an existing FEMA priority is being continued—we can only hope that these resources will not be diverted to other DHS programs.

Let's be blunt. FEMA's very existence could be at risk. Actually, I am grateful that Under Secretary Mike Brown was successful in retaining the name FEMA, because it doesn't exist in statute. In fact, Brown has been fighting hard to keep a focus on FEMA's traditional mission. Still, it seems that some of the actions over the past year are just what some members of Congress were concerned about. In July 2002, for example, the House Judiciary Committee's letter to the House Select Committee on Homeland Security warned that the transferring all of FEMA's functions to DHS would detract from the agency's core mission. At that time the ASFPM was concerned about how natural hazard programs would fare, and our concern has not lessened.

As a stakeholder organization and a long-time partner of FEMA, the ASFPM and its members must collectively let policymakers know that FEMA is essential to preparing for, responding to, recovering from, and *mitigating* against natural hazards. So, if you or your community have ever benefited from having floodplain regulations (especially in states that do not have standards that exceed those of the National Flood Insurance Program), flood insurance, a Hazard Mitigation Grant Program grant, a Flood Mitigation Assistance grant, Increased Cost of Compliance insurance claim, Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant, Project Impact grant, or a Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 planning grant, SPEAK OUT! Communicate how these programs have had a positive impact on you or your community and how they are integral to the way the United States addresses its natural hazards—especially flooding! ¤

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 **How can I incorporate NAI into planning for my community?**

ANSWER **We plan for things every day. From a community perspective, we may be planning a specific project, or we may be creating a 20-year comprehensive plan.** There are also more specific plans, like hazard mitigation plans, greenway plans, special area plans, and capital improvement plans. The point is, there are numerous opportunities in communities large and small, urban and rural, to incorporate concepts and principles such as No Adverse Impact Floodplain Management.

According to the ASFPM's forthcoming *No Adverse Impact: A Toolkit for Common Sense Floodplain Management,* the term "planning" covers a variety of activities that communities pursue to direct future development and publicly funded projects. If done right, planning can prevent many future flood problems. Good planning avoids development in the wrong places, and leads to more balanced use of floodplains and other sensitive lands. Planning is a key piece of any community's NAI effort, and can incorporate NAI in a multitude of ways—from individual project planning to comprehensive community planning.

Even in the absence of comprehensive plans or other planning/guidance documents, communities often are involved in planning for specific projects like new wastewater treatment facilities, community buildings, roads, or some other significant investment. In the early planning phase of a project, community leaders should insist on an NAI approach by ensuring that these questions are answered: Will there be an adverse impact on other properties if this development is located in the floodplain (in terms of increased flood height, velocity, etc.)? Does the development really need to be located in the floodplain, or can it be sited elsewhere? Will there be an adverse impact to the community if the development is impaired or out of service during a flood? Could there be adverse impacts on fire and rescue efforts and personnel if a flood occurs? What will the adverse impacts be on the community's finances if the development is designed or sited in a way that it will be damaged during a flood? Answering these questions—even for a single project—will help ensure that the investment in the project is a sensible and wise one but, more important over the long term, will foster the process of analyzing the broad impacts of specific community and property owner actions.

Project planning is a good start, but incorporating NAI into community or state planning documents will, in the long run, ensure a more consistent and comprehensive approach to floodplain management. Although there are numerous ways to do this, a first step would be to incorporate NAI into a community comprehensive plan and/or a community's hazard mitigation plan (which is needed for compliance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000). Community comprehensive plans, which define how communities are to grow and develop, often do not link intensive land development and the need for caution in high hazard areas such as floodplains. If NAI can be incorporated into such a plan, then the regulations, programs, and other tools implementing the "vision" set forth in the plan, can reflect a NAI approach. Plans created to meet the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 requirements generally do a better job making important connections between land use and hazard areas; however, it is

[continued on page 4]

Learn More about NAI

The ASFPM believes that rising flood losses can best be remedied by adopting a broad guiding principle of "no adverse impact" (or NAI) floodplain management. Under an NAI framework, the action of one property owner within a watershed is not allowed to adversely affect the flood risks for other properties, as measured by flood stages, flood velocities, flood flows, and the potential for erosion or sedimentation, unless community-approved mitigation occurs. A community pursues NAI floodplain management through development and management plans and programs that identify the levels of impact the community believes to be acceptable, specify appropriate mitigation measures that will prevent development activity from having a net adverse effect on the rest of the watershed, and ensure that the mitigation measures are carried out effectively.

Learn more about the concept of NAI and how it is being applied across the United States by clicking on "No Adverse Impact" at the ASFPM's website at http://www.floods.org.

No Adverse Impact (cont.)

important that such plans not merely identify mitigation "projects" as activities to implement, but also identify "no adverse impacts" as a goal, and specify as activities within the plan the review and update of land use programs to align with an NAI approach.

As an illustration, let's imagine a fictitious community named Waterville, which has just completed its hazard mitigation plan. In it, flooding was identified as the number-one hazard. The Waterville hazard mitigation planning committee included, among other goals in the plan, that future development be sustainable. As the committee discussed what "sustainable" meant, they developed a specific objective (under the sustainability goal) that all future development in flood hazard areas should have no adverse impact on the community. Under that objective, several activities were identified. The first was to review and update the Waterville zoning regulations to ensure that the zoning within flood hazard areas was appropriate (i.e., low density, open space, etc.). The second activity was to update the Waterville subdivision regulations to ensure that appropriate platting and open space requirements were in place (i.e., showing flood hazard areas on plats, identifying "priority conservation areas," etc.). The third activity was to ensure that the NAI principle was incorporated into Waterville's existing 5-year capital improvements plan. Finally, the committee identified a fourth activity, which involved creating a greenways and parks plan to take advantage of funding from mitigation programs and other funding mechanisms to create multi-purpose open spaces in flood hazard areas.

An NAI approach to planning should identify all of the impacts of the hazards and all of the alternative measures to address the impacts. To be effective, such plans should address as many concerns as possible and be proactive towards building a more sustainable community.

Planning Deadline (cont.)

> assistance under the Stafford Act . . . In any case, emergency assistance provided under [several Stafford Act sections cited] will not be affected.

The distinction, then, is whether disaster assistance is "emergency" in nature. The following emergency assistance WILL BE PROVIDED even if a state does not have an approved plan (section references are to the Stafford Act (as amended by DMA2000)):

- 5170a: General Federal Assistance
- 5170b: Essential Assistance
- 5173: Debris Removal
- 5174: Assistance to Individuals and Households (including Housing Assistance and Financial Assistance to Address Other Needs)
- 5177: Unemployment Assistance
- 5179: Food Coupons and Distribution
- 5180: Food Commodities
- 5182: Legal Services
- 5183: Crisis Counseling Assistance and Training
- 5184: Community Disaster Loans
- 5192: Federal Emergency Assistance.

Certain categories of Public Assistance are permanent restorative work and are not considered "emergency" in nature. Public Assistance WILL NOT BE PROVIDED for Category C (roads and bridges), Category D (water control facilities), Category E (public buildings), Category F (public utilities), or Category G (other facilities).

But the consequences don't stop there. Three more streams of federal disaster assistance will not be available unless a state has an approved plan: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds (HMGP); Pre-Disaster Mitigation grants (PDM); and Fire Management Assistance Grants (the non-emergency components).

It is clear that Congress, as expressed in the passage of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, expects states and communities to get serious about reducing the long-term impacts of disasters. How serious? Well, consider what the loss of the "non-emergency assistance" would mean to your state and community if the state's plan is not in place. Between 1989 and 1998 (the only period for which ASFPM has data), FEMA's disaster assistance provided

- $7.96 billion for Public Assistance (permanent restorative works categories only); and
- $1.47 billion for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

> > > Excerpts from the appropriate sections of the federal regulations, a list of emergency assistance vs. non-emergency assistance, and a pdf version of the information in this article are available on the ASFPM website at http://www.floods.org/policy/PlanningConsequences_Nov_1_2004.pdf.

Washington Report

No New Wetlands Rule, After All

In December the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers scrapped their plans to issue a new rule that was expected to reduce federal regulatory jurisdiction over so-called "isolated" wetlands—those that have no direct hydrologic connection to navigable interstate waters. The decision came after an extended public comment period beginning in January 2003, during which the two agencies sought input (through an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making) on whether there was any basis for protecting isolated wetlands, the extent to which wetlands would thus be eliminated from federal protection, and other issues associated with defining jurisdiction over wetlands under the Clean Water Act.

The idea for new rules was prompted by the 2001 decision by the Supreme Court in *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 531 U.S. 159 (2001), which overturned the Corps' long-standing assertion of federal jurisdiction over certain wetlands (which the Court called "isolated") based solely on the presence of migratory birds. Considerable debate followed over how broadly to read the Court's decision.

The ASFPM's position, outlined in comments provided pursuant to the proposed rulemaking, is one of concern about increased flood damage if isolated wetlands or other nonnavigable waters are allowed to be altered or developed, and on the consequences of dramatic changes in the federal regulatory approach, around which many state regulatory and permitting programs for wetlands are built *[see **News & Views**, February 2003, pp. 4–5]*. Numerous citizens, environmental groups, hunters, and anglers reportedly raised their concerns as well. A letter signed by 218 members of the House of Representatives (from both parties) likewise urged the President "not to . . . reduce the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act."

Although there will be no rule limiting federal jurisdiction over isolated wetlands, both the EPA and the Corps last January issued revised guidance to their field offices instructing employees to stop protecting isolated wetlands. That policy guidance was effective immediately, so some isolated wetlands remain threatened. Meanwhile, legislation (H.R. 962 and S. 473) is working its way through Congress that would amend the Clean Water Act to affirm federal protection for all waters of the United States.

> > > For background information, see the ASFPM website at http://www.floods.org or the EPA's at http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/swanccnav.html.

Legislative Report

The second session of the 108th Congress is in full swing and the President's budget request for FY 2005 has just been released. Budget Committee hearings are already being held and Appropriations Committee hearings will kick off shortly. Activity on authorizing legislation of interest to the ASFPM has largely shifted to the Senate side at this stage in the second session.

The FY 2005 Budget Request

FEMA

In the Department of Homeland Security's section of the President's budget, FEMA and programs related to natural hazards are mentioned under "Preparing and Responding to National Emergencies" and "Supporting Additional Responsibilities." But even those additional responsibilities are couched in terms of the war on terror: "And while we must be prepared to respond to terrorist attacks, we are more often called upon to respond to natural disasters."

The agency's complete budget, which has not been released, will contain considerably more detail, of course. For now, we can extract a few items of interest.

Notably, the budget proposes an overall decrease of $16.5 million for the DHS Preparedness, Mitigation, Response and Recovery Directorate (FEMA). Exactly where that reduction is to be taken and how other funds have been shifted is not clear. It appears, however, that an increasing number of Mitigation Division staff are being detailed to other DHS programs—leaving an already lean operation with even fewer staff. A few notes of interest:

- **Mitigation Grants** – a single account with a total of $170 million, combining $150 million for the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program and $20 million for the Flood Mitigation Assistance program; derived from the National Flood Insurance Fund, which is to be used for flood mitigation.

- **Flood Map Modernization:** $200 million (the $252 million in 2004 included transfer of $52 million from National Flood Insurance Fund). We have been told that the FY '05 funds of $200 million are in addition to fee income.

- **Disaster Relief Program:** $2.15 billion ($22 million to be transferred to the Office of Inspector General).

- **Administrative and Regional Operations**: $196,939,000 (an increase of almost $30 million).

[continued on page 6]

Washington Report (cont.)

- **Consolidation of DHS Headquarters** operations at Nebraska Avenue Complex, includes $26 million to move Navy offices to other locations and $39 million to improve existing structures.

Sometimes it is important to watch for what is NOT mentioned in the budget. Unlike the FY '03 and FY '04 budgets, in which the Administration requested termination of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program through the budget process, this budget is silent on the matter. In response to a question at a briefing by the Office of Management and Budget, officials said the program will continue at its currently authorized level of 7.5%. The ASFPM and other organizations continue to emphasize the number of opportunities that have been lost because of this reduction in mitigation funding. Had the percentage not been reduced from 15% to the current 7.5%, another $180 million in mitigation funds would have been available to states and communities to minimize flood losses across the nation.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
The construction program is down from $2.2 billion (from to $2.6 billion). Within this budget are funds for Section 205 Flood Control, emergency streambank and shoreline protection (Section 14), beach erosion control (Section 103), mitigation of shore damage (Section 111), aquatic ecosystem restoration (Section 206), and project modification for improvement of the environment (Section 1135). Budget documents available thus far are not specific as to amounts for each of these. Under the the General Investigations account, Flood Plain Management Services is funded at $4 million, down from $5 million in FY '04 and $6 million in FY '03.

Department of Agriculture
The USDA budget request for discretionary spending is down 8.1%, one of the most severe reductions among federal departments and agencies. Despite this, there are also substantial new initiatives related to mad cow disease and prevention and fighting of forest fires on federal lands. The good news is that the Natural Resources Conservation Service budget is enhanced because of increased spending of $385 million over FY '04 for Farm Bill programs—about an 11% increase. It includes an additional $76 million or a program level of $2 billion for the Conservation Reserve Programs and an additional $25 million for the EQIP program and a program level of $1 billion. The Wetlands Reserve Program will operate at a program level of $295 million, which will provide for inclusion of another 200,000 acres. The Grassland Reserve Program, Ground and Surface Water Conservation, Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, and the new Conservation Security Program are funded at $421 million.

Environmental Protection Agency
The overall EPA budget request is down 7.2% from FY '04, another of the most dramatic reductions. The largest cuts are in funds for wastewater treatment plants and for drinking water pipes and facilities. The science and technology research budget is down by $100 million. This includes a reduction from $217 million to $190 million for Clean Air and Global Climate Change, a reduction from $12 million to $9 million for Land Preservation and Restoration, and from $452 million to $365 million for Healthy Communities and Ecosystems. Those program areas, however, remain level or receive slight increases. The State and Tribal Assistance Grants (including capitalization grants for state revolving funds and performance partnership grants) are down to $3.24 billion (from $3.9 billion).

Department of the Interior, National Park Service
Although the overall NPS budget is up from $1.62 billion to $1.68 billion, funds for the National Recreation and Preservation programs are reduced. Requested funds for that account are $37.7 million, down from a funding level of $62.5 million in FY '04. The budget materials are not specific about most individual program levels within that amount.

Department of the Interior, USGS
The budget request for the U.S. Geological Survey is $919.7 million, down from $949.6 million in FY '04. Of this amount, $64 million is for cooperation with states or localities for water resources investigations, a decrease from the FY '04 level of $64.5 million. Funding requested for the Water Resources Investigations program is $207 million, the same as FY '03 but a decrease from $216 million in FY '04. The Mapping, Remote Sensing and Geographic Investigations program is funded at $127 million, down from $130 million in FY '04 and $133 million in FY '03. This includes funding for the National Map.

Other Legislation

NFIP Reauthorization
The Omnibus Appropriations bill for FY '04, which has passed both houses and been signed by the President, contains a six-month reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program until June 30th. At the end of the first session, a three-month extension (until March 31st) had passed. H.R. 253, the repetitive flood loss bill passed by the House, includes a five-year extension.

Repetitive Flood Losses
After H.R. 253 passed the House last fall, the Senate Banking Committee has been preparing to take up the issue of repetitive flood losses. A hearing scheduled for February 4th in the Economic Policy Subcommittee was postponed when the Senate Office Building was closed due to a toxin scare. ASFPM Chair Chad Berginnis will testify when the hearing is held. A summary of the ASFPM's legislative recommendations can be found at http://www.floods.org/Policy/RepLoss.asp.

It appears that the Senate Committee will use the framework of H.R. 253, but will recommend some changes to the House-passed bill. The ASFPM has advocated a number of changes, including efforts to streamline provisions for the purpose of making

implementation easier. Additionally, the ASFPM has urged some steps to improve access to funds collected from the ICC surcharge to policyholders.

The Senate Banking Committee had planned to mark up the bill by early March. The postponement of the hearing and the extension of NFIP authorization until June 30th may cause that schedule to slip.

HMGP/Disaster Mitigation Act

The House-passed bill (H.R. 3181) provides a three-year reauthorization for the pre-disaster mitigation grant program and restores the authorized level for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program to 15% from 7.5% of disaster relief. Since the DMA2000 expired on December 31st, a simple one-year reauthorization was included in the Omnibus Appropriations Bill for FY '04 signed by the President in January.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works may take up the House bill during this session. Other business before the committee and some concerns within the committee about restoring HMGP to 15% may stall consideration of the legislation.

A Stafford Act Coalition that includes the National Emergency Management Association, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Development Organizations, the American Public Works Association, the American Planning Association, and others is working to increase awareness of the importance of the bill and restoring the authorized HMGP level to 15%.

WRDA

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works is beginning to assemble the ingredients of its Water Resources Development Act for 2004. Indications are that at least one hearing will be held in March. The House passed its version of WRDA during the last session.

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

All referenced legislation and committee reports can be viewed at http://thomas.loc.gov.
Budget specifics available at present can be found at http://www.omb.gov.

TRANSPORTATION BILL HAS MITIGATION FUNDS

The legislation now in Congress to reauthorize funds for federal-aid highways through 2009 incorporates an important opportunity for mitigating flood damage. One portion of the bill (the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003, also known as the Highway Trust Fund Bill) (H.R. 2088 and S. 1072) addresses the Surface Transportation Program, which is the major authority by which the federal government provides money through the states for construction and repair of federal-aid highways. The bills now being considered create a new section within the Surface Transportation Program that provides for funding of "stormwater mitigation" of existing transportation facilities. Under the new provision, states must allocate 2% of the funds apportioned under STP (roughly $1 billion over the next six years) to eligible stormwater mitigation projects sponsored by local governments or the states. According to the Senate committee report, an eligible project is one that "improves stormwater discharge water quality, attains pre-construction hydrology, promotes infiltration of stormwater, recharges groundwater, minimizes stream bank erosion, promotes natural filters, otherwise mitigates the water quality impacts of stormwater discharges, or reduces flooding caused by highway stormwater discharge." This dedicated funding would make a significant contribution to efforts by state and local transportation authorities to address the stormwater runoff problems associated with highways and other transportation facilities. Additional language being considered by the House directs the Department of Transportation also to consider stormwater impacts when planning new facilities, which would help minimize future problems of flooding, water quality degradation, and erosion.

The ASFPM has sent letters to both the House and Senate supporting the need for dedicated stormwater mitigation funds for transportation facilities, and also encouraging the House to increase the funding provided for in its bill from 2% to 5% of the Surface Transportation Program funds. A floor vote is expected in the Senate in February.

FEDERAL RESPONSE PLAN EVOLVES

In October, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge approved an interim Initial National Response Plan (INRP) designed to promote a unified approach to domestic incident management across the nation. The department describes the INRP as a first step toward the overall federal goal of integrating the current set of federal domestic prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery plans into a single all-hazards plan. The INRP will be supported by the National Incident Management System, an arrangement under development that will have standardized incident management processes, protocols, and procedures. A final NRP will eventually replace the INRP.

The INRP was created by representatives of federal, state, territorial, local, and tribal government, as well as various professions involved in emergency management. The plan links the current Federal Response Plan, the U.S. Government Interagency Domestic Terrorism Concept of Operations Plan, the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan, the Mass Migration response plans, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan.

The INRP designates the National Homeland Security Operations Center in Washington, D.C., as the

[continued on page 8]

Washington Report (cont.)

primary national-level hub for operational communications and information pertaining to domestic incident management. It will provide threat monitoring and situational awareness for domestic incident management on a 24-hour basis. The plan also identifies an Interagency Incident Management Group, made up of senior representatives from federal departments and agencies, including DHS components, and non-governmental organizations to facilitate coordination. In addition, the secretary of DHS may designate a Principal Federal Official during a domestic incident to serve as the personal representative of DHS locally during an incident, working with local authorities to determine needs and provide federal assistance. Joint Field Offices (expected to incorporate existing entities such as joint operations centers, disaster field offices, and other federal offices and teams that provide on-scene support) will help coordinate federal, state, and local authorities.

> > > For more on the INRP, see http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=1936.

*[from **Natural Hazards Observer**, January 2004, p. 5]*

Restoration Grants

Applications again are being solicited for Five-Star Restoration Matching Grants, which provide modest financial assistance on a competitive basis for community-based wetland, riparian, and coastal habitat restoration projects. The grants are available to any public or private entity, but must involve partnerships of organizations that contribute funding, land, technical assistance, workforce support, and/or other in-kind services. The average award is $10,000. Projects must include a strong on-the-ground wetland, riparian, or coastal habitat restoration component and should also include training, education, outreach, monitoring, and community stewardship components.

The program is sponsored by the National Association of Counties, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and the Wildlife Habitat Council, in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Community-Based Restoration Program within NOAA Fisheries, and others.

> > > Applications for this year's awards must be postmarked by March 1, 2004. Find out more at http://www.nfwf.org/ programs/5star-rfp.htm.

Interest Sought in Testing Program for Flood Proofing/ Flood-Fighting Products

The Corps of Engineers' National Nonstructural/Flood Proofing Committee (NFPC) and the Association of State Floodpain Managers have been working for several months to develop a national program to test flood proofing and flood-fighting products that are marketed within the United States. The vision of this program is to ultimately provide an opportunity for standardized testing in a controlled laboratory setting for products considered temporary barriers, semi-permanent barriers, closures, or sealants. The program will consist of testing products by application of a standard testing protocol in a standard testing facility. The results of the tests will be made available to any and all entities on both a national and an international basis. The program will be funded by the vendors and manufacturers of flood proofing and flood-fighting products who wish to have their products tested through this means.

The first type of flood proofing/flood fighting product to be tested will be temporary barriers. The test program will evaluate such product-related parameters as

- time to assemble and disassemble,
- special equipment requirements,
- quantity of fill material (if needed),
- suitability of construction by unskilled labor,
- long-term durability and repairability,
- special equipment needed for deployment,
- environmental aspects of disposal of the product or related materials, and
- reusability of the product.

The standardized testing protocol will include tests to evaluate resistance to hydrostatic force, hydrodynamic force, overtopping, wave action, and debris impact. Performance criteria will include seepage rates, deflection, sustained damage, and others. The costs for participation in the phase of the program that tests temporary barrier-type products are expected to range between $50,000 and $80,000 per product.

The NFPC and the ASFPM are currently soliciting interest in this national testing program. Discussions with vendors and manufacturers of all types of flood proofing and flood-fighting products (temporary barriers, semi-permanent barriers, closures, and sealants) will be welcome. However, the priority at the moment is in locating temporary barrier vendors and manufacturers who would like to participate in the testing.

> > > Falcolm Hull of the NFPC is the Program Manager for this project. To express interest or to seek more infomation, contact him at (504) 862-2539 or falcolm.e.hull@usace.army.mil.

SAVE A TREE, SAVE SOME MONEY, SAVE SOME FLOOD DAMAGE

by **Ivy Frances**
FEMA Region I

As a Hazard Mitigation Specialist for FEMA, I have examined and inspected scores of roadside culvert and ditch drainage projects. These projects are extremely beneficial to the community's directing stormwater and floodwater away from infrastructure and development. However, in the construction of these projects, there is usually one benefit that goes unseen and may be "demolished" as a matter of course. Trees in the way of ditch lines and culvert placement are cut down and usually not replanted. Unfortunately, this action is usually not weighed against the benefits that trees are providing in reducing stormwater. If we examine how well trees reduce stormwater, then we might consider other options that may save trees from being cut down.

Keeping trees results in the construction of less infrastructure for stormwater conveyance, saving money and time. The average tree transpires 70 gallons of water per day. Additionally, some rainwater never reaches the ground because it is intercepted by leaves, limbs, and trunks. Multiply this by the number of trees along any roadside in New England and you begin to realize the magnitude of stormwater benefits trees provide. This is water that is no longer saturating the ground so that when rain falls on the soil there is capacity for it to be absorbed. This is water that does not have to channeled, ditched, directed, managed, or diverted. Without channeling, ditching, directing, managing or diverting this water, there are no construction costs, and no continuing maintenance costs. Over time costs can escalate into the millions for municipalities all over the country. Luckily, nature has provided stormwater management through trees, free of charge.

That's not all. Trees provide other benefits along roads such as reducing pollutants in stormwater. Shade reduces the amount of sunlight that reaches the pavement, reducing its temperature and the surrounding air temperature. Trees also act as wind barriers and can effectively reduce the amount of snow that falls or blows on the road, reducing plowing, sanding and salting costs. In New England we cannot forget the beautiful foliage that trees provide and the tourists it brings. A tree-lined road with arching branches is not only scenic but also provides important benefits.

It is also important to be aware that trees can be hazardous along roads if not properly maintained and inspected. The first step begins with selecting the proper tree for the proper place. Usually trees that grow naturally in the area are best. Once planted, native trees take little care. They may need to be watered through the first year and perhaps pruned lightly to ensure decades of a healthy tree. Planting trees directly below power lines will cause problems later on. Eventually the tree is removed either because of the cost and damage to the tree from constant pruning or damage to the power lines. Even when properly cared for, a tree becomes hazardous as it ages so it is important to inspect trees along roads so that the tree is removed before falling into the road.

When it is time to plan the next drainage project, it may not always be the best option to clear away the trees along the road to make way for a ditch. Look around; can the ditch be located on the other side of the road? Can the ditch be realigned to save some of the trees? If trees need to be removed, consider replanting trees along the ditch and road, taking care to ensure that trees are outside the conveyance area of the ditch. It may not be possible to change your project, but knowing more about the benefits trees provide can help all of us make better informed decisions about how best to manage stormwater. ¤

[reprinted from the newsletter of the New England Floodplain and Stormwater Managers Association, ***NEFSMA News*** *XI (2), p. 3]*

UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP IN DAM SAFETY

Again the Association of Dam Safety Officials (ASDSO) will award an undergraduate scholarship to a senior-level student for the the 2004/2005 school year. Students must be enrolled in an accredited civil engineering program or in a related field (as determined by ASDSO) and must demonstrate an interest in pursuing a career in hydraulics, hydrology, a geotechnical field, or in a discipline related to the design, construction, or operation of dams. Applications are due March 31, 2004.

>>> Complete information, including eligibility criteria, an on-line application, and the basis for selection can be found at http://www.damsafety.org. Send applications to ASDSO, 450 Old Vine St., Second Floor, Lexington KY 40507; (859) 247-5140; info@damsafety.org.

State and Local Report

New Louisiana Highway to Tiptoe through Floods, Wetlands

Construction will begin this year on a 17-mile stretch of elevated four-lane highway to replace the existing two-lane, ground-level road that is the only connection between the rest of Louisiana and the Gulf communities of Port Fourchon and Grand Isle (located on Louisiana's only inhabited barrier island). Louisiana Highway 1 is the area's primary hurricane evacuation route and an important commercial link for the nation, but is susceptible to severe flooding and the risk of washout during storms. The elevated design for the replacement road was developed by the Louisiana Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration in partnership with a large number of other interests as a way of avoiding impacts to the scenic, aesthetic, historic, and environmental resources of the unique marsh areas and sensitive wetlands the road crosses. During the planning, design, and impending construction phases, innovative techniques and technology also are being employed to further avoid adverse impacts, such as using airboats instead of marsh buggies, and employing "end-on" construction techniques (in which no heavy equipment is placed on the ground).

> > > See the full article in the January issue of the Federal Highway Administration's newsletter, *Success in Streamlining*, at http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/strmlng/newsletters/jan04nl.htm.

Mitigation Planning in Kane County, Illinois

Kane County's Multi Hazard Mitigation Plan is the first Illinois plan approved by the Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) and FEMA under the new Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 criteria. Partly funded by IEMA, it can be seen on Kane County's website, www.co.kane.il.us/hazards/ (link to "final plan" and the table of contents).

IEMA has recently funded similar planning efforts in Adams, Kankakee, and Lake counties and the City of Chicago. These plans are a prerequisite for mitigation funding under FEMA's Pre Disaster Mitigation grant program. After November 1, 2004, an all-hazards mitigation plan will be a prerequisite for the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. HMGP has been used by many Illinois communities to purchase and clear flooded properties, particularly after the floods of 1993 and 1996.

> > > For more information contact Ron Davis, IEMA, at (217) 782-8719 or rdavis@iema.state.il.us.

*[excerpted from the **IAFSM News** Winter 2003/2004, p. 5]*

OFMA Sponsors Poster Contest

Members of the Oklahoma Floodplain Managers Association are visiting fourth-grade classrooms this month to discuss the Turn Around, Don't Drown™ flood awareness campaign sponsored by the National Weather Service *[see **News & Views**, October 2003, p. 12]*. As part of the project, OFMA is challenging students to draw original posters using the Turn Around theme, and is providing prizes to winning students and their teachers.

> > > Information and outreach materials on Turn Around, Don't Drown™ are available at http://www.srh.noaa.gov/tadd/.

*[excerpted from **The B.F.E.**, December 2003, p. 4]*

New Jersey Gets Tough on Water Quality, Riparian Areas

Last month New Jersey adopted sweeping new stormwater rules that will protect water quality, aquifer recharge, riparian areas, and drinking water supplies. One of the most significant provisions of the new rules is the requirement of a 300-foot buffer around high-quality rivers and streams and their tributaries. In all, the buffers will impact 6,093 stream miles within the state. A second rule calls for no net loss of recharge into underground aquifers—setting a goal of maintaining 100% of the average annual groundwater recharge for new development, a major step toward mitigating future droughts and floods.

Environmental groups hailed New Jersey's new stormwater rules as among the most comprehensive and protective of any state. Several other states provide for protective buffers and groundwater recharge in certain areas, but no other state calls for a 300-foot buffer around all of its high-quality water bodies and no net loss of recharge. An additional benefit of the new rules will be minimization of sprawl by protecting riparian open space, a move that is expected to affect hundreds of new development projects.

> > > More information and links to the new rules can be found at http://www.state.nj.us/dep/newsrel/releases/04_0105gov.htm.

Alaska Native Villages Face Floods, Erosion

Flooding and erosion affect 86% of Alaska Native villages. Although many of the problems are long standing, studies indicate that coastal villages are becoming more susceptible to flooding and erosion due in part to rising temperatures. The Corps of Engineers

[continued on page 11]

and the Natural Resources Conservation Service administer key programs for constructing flooding and erosion control projects but, according to a report by the U.S. General Accounting Office, small and remote Alaska Native villages often fail to qualify for assistance under these programs—either because the projects cannot meet the agencies' cost/benefit standards or because the villages cannot contribute their portion of the cost sharing. Several villages are planning to relocate, but costs are expected to be high (in the hundreds of millions of dollars for one village), and the process may take several years to accomplish. GAO found instances in which federal agencies invested in infrastructure at the villages' existing sites without knowledge of their plans to relocate.

Among its recommendations for remedial action, GAO cited these possibilities:

- Direct federal agencies to consider social and environmental factors in cost/benefit analyses;
- Expand the role of the Denali Commission (established in 1998 to provide economic development services and infrastructure needs in rural Alaska communities);
- Waive the federal cost-sharing requirement for these projects; and
- Authorize the "bundling" of funds from various federal agencies.

> > > *Alaska Native Villages: Most Are Affected by Flooding and Erosion, but Few Qualify for Federal Assistance*, GAO-04-142, is online at http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-04-142.

Johnson County, Kansas, develops Diverse Stormwater Initiative

In 1988 the Kansas legislature authorized counties to adopt a one-tenth-of-1% sales tax to fund stormwater projects. Rapidly growing Johnson County recently became the first county to do so, creating a Stormwater Management Advisory Council to administer the new funding and develop plans to minimize flooding. Besides coordinating stormwater planning and management among the county's 21 incorporated cities and eight unincorporated townships, funding projects according to a tailored benefit rating system (based not solely on dollars), and helping with buyouts, the Council also is conducting watershed studies to remap the county's floodplains, helping municipalities adopt new stream ordinances to conform to Phase II NPDES requirements, and colloborating with the Mid-America Regional Council, which represents the governments and planning councils for the entire Kansas City region, crossing state lines.

> > > See the full article in *Stormwater* magazine at http://www.forester.net/sw_0401_johnson.html.

Localities Move up in CRS

Tulsa, Oklahoma, has become the first community in the country to achieve a Class 2 in the National Flood Insurance Program's Community Rating System, earning a 40% discount on flood insurance premiums for its policyholders. At the effective date of the new classifications (October 1, 2003), Tulsa was the only Class 2 community and there were no Class 3s. Fort Collins, Colorado, and King County, Washington, remained as the only Class 4 communities (30% discount) and two communities (Miami–Dade County, Florida, and Lincolnshire, Illinois, reached Class 5 (25% discount), joining 21 others already at that level.

> > > A current list of CRS communities and their ratings can be found at http://www.fema.gov/pdf/nfip/manual10_03/19cr1003.pdf.

Get Ready for BILOXI . . .

It's time to start making plans once again to attend the Association of State Floodplain Managers' annual conference, this year to be held in Biloxi, Mississippi, May 16–21. An informative technical program, centered on the theme, "Lighting the Way to Floodplain Management," is planned, and it will be complemented by numerous training opportunities, chances for professional networking, technical field trips, meetings, the Certified Floodplain Managers examination, social events, and more.

And, nominations are being accepted until March 1st for the national Awards for Excellence in Floodplain Management, which are conferred each year during the ASFPM annual conference. These awards, in several categories, recognize outstanding local or state programs, people, or other activities. Nomination forms and instructions can be found at http://www.floods.org/Awards/Nomination.asp, along with a description of each award category and past recipients.

> > > Information about the conference and a tentative program are available at the ASFPM website at http://www.floods.org. The registration form and full conference brochure will be posted there in mid February.

Munich Re's Annual Global Catastrophe Review

In its annual report on natural hazard events that have caused material or human losses anywhere in the world, Munich Re noted that, right up until the last days of the year, 2003 was marked by a series of severe events, with the number of fatalities far exceeding the long-term average.

- More than 50,000 people were killed in natural catastrophes worldwide, almost five times as many as in the previous year (11,000).
- The number of natural catastrophes in 2003 was about 700, the same level as in 2002.
- Economic losses rose to over $60 billion (U.S. dollars), up from $55 billion in 2002.
- Insured losses increased to about $15 billion, from $11.5 billion in 2002.
- The year 2003 was marked not only by natural catastrophes but also by other remarkable events: the power outages in the United States, the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Italy, for example; total losses involving two satellites; again numerous terrorist attacks; a major leak of poison gas in China shortly before the end of the year. However, the extent of the losses caused by these events was much smaller than that caused by the natural catastrophes and they claimed fewer lives.

Throughout the world for the year 2003, the highest number of fatalities was caused by the Iranian earthquake in December (estimated 22,000 fatalities), followed closely by the heat wave and drought faced by Europe during the late summer (blamed for 20,000 fatalities). The deadliest floods occurred in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh last January and accounted for "only" 1,400 fatalities.

Economic losses were highest for Europe's heat wave, estimated at $13 billion, followed by an $8 billion economic loss due to floods in China. Hurricane Isabel's economic impact on the United States and Canada was a bit further down the list, at about $5 billion.

Insured losses were a different story. A series of tornadoes and severe storms in the U.S. Midwest during May was the single event with the largest amount of insured losses, about $3.2 billion, followed closely by California's fall forest fires and drought ($2 billion in insured losses). The other flood-related events in the "top ten" were Hurricane Isabel, accounting for $1.6 billion in insured losses in the United States and Canada; floods in France in December ($1 billion insured losses); and Hurricane Fabian, which struck Bermuda in September, causing $400 million in insured losses.

Exceptional individual events of the past year, like the heat wave, again provided strong indications of climate change. They show that new types of weather risks and greater loss potentials must be reckoned with in the future. Munich Re warns that, in view of the deteriorating risk situation, the insurance industry must continue to act rigorously by, for example, agreeing on limits of liability and risk-adequate premiums.

> > > Munich Re's summary is available at http:// www.munichre.com/default_e.asp.

Roundtable on Floods

The Tenth Roundtable Workshop, sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences, will be held March 2, 2004, in Washington D.C., and will focus on "Reducing Future Flood Losses: The Role of Human Actions." The Disasters Roundtable was established to facilitate communication among scientists, practitioners, and policymakers to identify urgent issues in understanding and mitigating natural, technological, and other disasters. Roundtable workshops are held three times a year, and each is focused on a specific topic.

The upcoming workshop will be a forum for discussing the nature of the nation's current vulnerability to floods, the role that such factors as land use and government policy have played in this over the years, and what promising actions can be taken by various stakeholders—the scientific community, government, and the private sector—to reduce the future losses.

> > > The Roundtable is free and open to all, but advance registration is required by February 27. Get more information and register online at http://dels.nas.edu/dr/f10.html.

A Few NFIP Flood Facts

(as of September 30, 2003)

Policies in force:	4,423,505
Top 5 states	
Florida	1,807,479
Texas	461,201
Louisiana	377,324
California	263,468
New Jersey	182,976
Insurance in Force	$ 661,691,405,000
Written Premium	$ 1,805,951,374
Average Premium	$ 411
Average Coverage	$ 149,585
Number of Losses Paid	17,781
Average Paid Loss	$ 16,068

Publications, Software, AV & the Web

"Community-based Pre-Disaster Mitigation Curriculum" is a new online training module designed to help get community-based and faith-based organizations and emergency management groups involved in predisaster mitigation at the local level. The goals are to enable participants to discover the role that such organizations can play in mitigation, identify projects in which they might engage, and understand ways that the organizations and emergency managers can work together. Sections A, B, and E of the material are designed for members of community- and faith-based organizations and Sections C, D, E for emergency managers. Organizations can arrange the material to meet their particular needs. A resource guide includes materials and information to support each of the training modules. Produced by FEMA, Department of Homeland Security. Download from http://www.fema.gov/tab_education.shtm.

The website of the Natural Hazards Center, always a handy place to find solutions to floodplain management mysteries, has been redesigned to make it even more accessible. Best of all, HazLit, the online bibliographic database, now has expanded and accelerated search capabilities, making it a simpler matter to locate information in the annotated database records or the online documents. Users will find all the good old information intact (including back issues of the *Natural Hazards Observer* and *Disaster Research*), but will find it easier to navigate the site and the library, and take advantage of links to more resources, including other disaster-related libraries and information centers. Drop by http://www.colorado.edu/hazards.

Water for Life: Water Management and Environmental Policy reinforces the fundamental truth that floodplain managers know well—careful management of the world's water resources is crucial to the health of natural environmental systems and human society as well. Although the two are intrinsically linked, public policy is all too often made for one arena without consideration of the other. In this book the authors analyze how existing environmental conditions, water resources management, and public policy are related, and how that relationship evolved to its current state. Among the topics considered are floodplain management, integrated river basins, river channels, the use of groundwater, and decision making. James L. Wescoat, Jr., and Gilbert F. White. 2003. 342 pp. $20.00, paperback. Order from Cambridge University Press, 40 West 20th St., New York, NY 10011-4221; (212) 924-3900; http://www.cup.org.

In the Eye of Hurricane Andrew is the story of one of the most destructive natural disasters in American history. On August 24, 1992, Hurricane Andrew ravaged several communities on the south Florida coast, leaving 250,000 people homeless and close to $30 billion in damage. Through interviews with nearly 100 survivors and rescue workers, the psychological and social experiences, perceptions, and impacts of the disaster are explored. As context for the oral histories, the book draws upon published sources such as newspaper and documentary accounts, and a bibliography is included. Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., and A. Baker Provenzo. 2002. 204 pp. ISBN 0-8130-2566-4. 2002. $24.95 from the University Press of Florida, 15 Northwest 15th St., Gainesville, FL 32611; (800) 226-3822; http://www.upf.com.

The Construction Industry Compliance Assistance Center is a website to help contractors, builders, and developers comply with the environmental regulations and permit requirements of the myriad programs for the management of stormwater, solid waste, hazardous waste, air quality, wetlands, endangered species, and green building. Users can obtain straightforward explanations of what is required for compliance for different types of projects in every state. This is important because each state and locality has its own unique set of environmental regulations and permit requirements. The site has been developed by the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences, in cooperation with a number of builders organizations, and with funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The CICA website is continually being updated and suggestions are welcome. The page is at http://www.CICAcenter.org.

Maps showing the river basins with the greatest potential for producing mudslides as a result of the devastating October fires in Southern California have been released on the internet by the U.S. Geological Survey. The maps show the probability for debris flows and mudslides along with estimates of the peak discharge from drainage basins burned near San Bernardino, Simi Valley, and Fillmore. The maps and analysis have been provided to county flood control districts and the California Office of Emergency Services to help them identify risk potential and develop mitigation strategies. *Emergency Assessment of Debris-Flow Hazards from Basins Burned by the Grand Prix and Old Fires of 2003, Southern California*, by Susan H. Cannon, Joseph E. Gartner, Michael G. Rupert, John A. Michael, Dean Djokic, and Sreeresh Sreedhar, USGS Open-file Report 03-475 can be accessed at http://pubs. usgs.gov/of/2003/ofr-03-475/. *Emergency Assessment of Debris-Flow Hazards from Basins Burned by the Piru, Simi, and Verdale Fires of 2003, Southern California*, by Susan H. Cannon, Joseph E. Gartner, Michael G. Rupert, and John A. Michael, USGS Open-File Report 03-481, is posted at http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2003/ofr-03-481/.

"California Post-Fire Flood Hazard Mapping" is a new website displaying maps showing the increased flood hazard on streams in five California counties burned during last year's brush and forest fires. FEMA developed the maps, which show the approximate pre-burn and post-burn flood hazard area for the base flood. Where possible, data from existing Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) was used; in other cases, approximate study methods were employed. The maps give a general understanding of the approximate, increased flood risk for the five counties; they do not replace the current FIRMs for determining the flood insurance premium at a particular location. Find and download the maps (in pdf format) from http://www.capostfirefloods.net/.

The first annual update of the landmark report, *The State of the Nation's Ecosystems: Measuring the Lands, Waters, and Living Resources of the United States* has been released by The Heinz Center. The original report was published by Cambridge University Press in 2002 *[see **News & Views**, December 2002, p. 1]*, and laid out a blueprint for periodic reporting on the condition and use of all of the nation's ecosystems. The updated book lists the basic ecosystem traits that should be tracked through time and gives information on current conditions and historic trends. The second full edition is scheduled for publication in 2007. Both the 2002 report and the web-only "Update 2003" are available at http://www.heinzctr.org/ecosystems/report/html.

"GIS and Hazards" is a new website launched to encourage sharing of information about how hazards managers are (and could be) using geographic information systems (GISs). The site organizers encourage those interested in GIS to visit the web page and provide suggestions, pertinent links, comments, or anything else they consider useful to the effort to spread information about the applicability of GIS to flooding or other environmental hazards. Of specific interest is information on any available GIS resources for flood hazard-related data, and flood research or projects that are using GIS. Comments and questions should be directed to Lavanya Gandluru at lgand1@lsu.edu or John C. Pine, Department of Environmental Studies, 42 Atkinson Hall, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803; (225) 578-1075; jpine@lsu.edu. The website is at http://hazards.lsu.edu.

A Guide for Local Governments: Wetlands and Watershed Management was written to help local governments integrate water resources management, ecosystem protection, and land use. Engineers, biologists, botanists, planners, non-profit organizations, legislators, and others can use it to help guide a community to achievement of "smart growth" and sustainability. Drawing upon two decades of community experience in watershed management, riparian area protection, planning, water quality protection, and other locally based efforts, it makes recommendations for integrating wetlands into broad watershed management efforts and more specific water programs including those for floodplain management, stormwater management, source water protection, and point and nonpoint source pollution control. Case study examples are provided from throughout the nation. Jon A. Kusler. 2003. 183 pp. Publication No. 28. Institute of Science and Public Policy, Association of State Wetlands Managers. Download from http://www.aswm.org/propub/pubs/aswm/wetlandswatershed.pdf.

Calendar

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

February 16–20, 2004: EROSION CONTROL '04 CONFERENCE, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Sponsored by the International Erosion Control Association. Contact IECA, P.O. Box 774904, Steamboat Springs, CO 80477; (970) 879-3010; ecinfo@ieca.org or see http://www.ieca.org.

February 18–20, 2004: SLOPE STABILITY AND LANDSLIDES, Sunnyvale, California. Sponsored by the College of Engineering, University of Wisconsin. Contact C. Allen Wortley or Patricia Butler, (800) 462-0876; wortley@engr.wisc.edu; custserv@epd.engr.widc.edu or see http://www.epdweb.engr.wisc.edu/webF786.

March 2, 2004: REDUCING FUTURE FLOOD LOSSES: THE ROLE OF HUMAN ACTIONS, Washington, D.C. Sponsored by the Disasters Roundtable, Natonal Academy of Sciences. See http://dels.nas.edu/dr/f10.html.

March 3–4, 2004: ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF FLOODPLAIN AND STORMWATER MANAGERS, Tinley Park, Illinois. Contact Conference Chair Sally McConkey at (217) 333-5482 or sally@uiuc.edu or see http://www.illinoisfloods.org/.

March 3–5, 2004: PRACTICE, POLICY, AND NEW EMERGING MARKETS: 7TH NATIONAL MITIGATION BANKING CONFERENCE, New Orleans, Louisiana. Numerous public and private sponsors. Contact (800) 726-4853 or see http://www.mitigationbankingconference.com.

March 7–10, 2004: 7TH ANNUAL SCAHM CONFERENCE, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. Sponsored by the South Carolina Association for Hazard Mitigation. Contact Daryle Fontenot, (803) 734-9493 or fontenot@dnr.state.sc.us.

March 8–11, 2004: DIGITAL HAZARD DATA (E234), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.fema.gov/emi/.

March 15–18, 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/.

March 17–19, 2004: RIVER AND FLOODPLAIN MODELING WITH HEC-RAS 3.1.1, (NCES 8322), Denver, Colorado. Sponsored by the Continuing Engineering Education Program, University of Colorado at Denver. Contact Continuing Engineering Education Program, University of Colorado at Denver at (303) 556-4907 or see http://www.cudenver.edu/engineer/cont and click on Course Information.

March 22–25, 2004: 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/emi/.

March 29–30, 2004: OPEN CHANNEL DESIGN: STREAMS, DITCHES AND CHANNELS, Las Vegas Nevada. Sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Department of Engineering Professional Development. Contact Engineering Registration at (800) 462-0876 or see http://epdweb.engr.wisc.edu/.

March 29–31, 2004: DESIGNING BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR STORMWATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT, Madison, Wisconsin. Sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Department of Engineering Professional Development. Contact Engineering Registration at (800) 462-0876 or see http://epdweb.engr.wisc.edu/.

March 31—April 2 2004: TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE LOUISIANA FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Hammond, Louisiana. Contact Rodney Smith at rocket@bayou.com or Alyson Rodriguez at arodriguez@I-55.com.

April 5–9, 2004: 26TH ANNUAL NATIONAL HURRICANE CONFERENCE, Lake Buena Vista, Florida. Sponsored by the Florida Shore and Beach Preservation Association. Contact David Tait, NHC, 2952 Wellington Cir., Tallahassee, FL 32309; (850) 906-9224; mail@hurricanemeeting.com; or see http://www.hurricanemeeting.com.

April 15–16, 2004: DAM SAFETY AND REHABILITATION, Reno, Nevada. Sponsored by the American Society of Civil Engineers Continuing Education. Contact ASCE at (800) 548-2723 or conted@asce.org or see http://www.asce.org/conted/distancelearning/

April 20–22, 2004: XVTH GLOBAL WARMING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION, San Francisco, California. Sponsored by the Global Warming International Center. Contact GWXV Secretariat, P.O. Box 5275, Woodridge, IL 60517; (630) 910-1561; abstracts@globalwarming.net or see http://www.globalwarming.net.

April 22–23, 2004: SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON POST DISASTER RECONSTRUCTION: PLANNING FOR RECONSTRUCTION, Coventry, United Kingdom. Sponsored by Coventry University, Centre for Disaster Management and Universite de Montreal, I-Rec team. Contact Andrew Fox, Planning for Reconstruction, School of Science and the Environment, Coventry University, Priory St., Coventry, CV1 5FB, UK; 024 7688 7688; a.fox@coventry.ac.uk or see http://www.coventry.ac.uk/legacy/se/research/i_rec_call.htm.

April 23–24, 2004: WATERSHED STRATEGIC PLANNING, ACTION, AND SOCIAL CHANGE, Portland, Oregon. Sponsored by the Watershed Management Professional Program of Portland State University. See http://www.eli.pdx.edu/watershed.

April 24–28, 2004: NATIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE, Washington, D.C.. Sponsored by the American Planning Association. See http://www.planning.org.

April 26–27, 2004: OPEN CHANNEL DESIGN: STREAMS, DITCHES AND CHANNELS, Madison, Wisconsin. Sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Department of Engineering Professional Development. Contact Engineering Registration at (800) 462-0876 or see http://epdweb.engr.wisc.edu/.

April 26–30, 2004: RETROFITTING FLOODPRONE RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS (E279), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.fema.gov/emi/.

April 29–30, 2004: WATERSHED STRATEGIC PLANNING, ACTION, AND SOCIAL CHANGE, Portland, Oregon. Sponsored by the Watershed Management Professional Program of Portland State University. See http://www.eli.pdx.edu/watershed.

May 6–7, 2004: DAM SAFETY AND REHABILITATION, St. Louis, Missouri. Sponsored by the American Society of Civil Engineers Continuing Education. Contact ASCE at (800) 548-2723 or conted@asce.org or see http://www.asce.org/conted/distancelearning/.

May 14–15, 2004: NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ANIMALS IN DISASTER, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Sponsored by the Humane Society of the United States. See http://www.hsus.org/disaster.

May 16–21, 2004: LIGHTING THE WAY TO FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT: TWENTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, Biloxi, Mississippi. 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.

May 17–19, 2004: GIS AND WATER RESOURCES III, Nashville, Tennessee. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See http://www.awra.org/meetings/Nashville2004/index.html.

May 19, 2004: STORMWATER PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/BMPS, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. Sponsored by StormCon and Forester Communications, publisher of *Stormwater* magazine. Contact Steve Di Giorgi, Program Director at (805) 682-1300 x129 or stevedg@forester.net.

May 20–21, 2004: URBAN FLOOD CHANNEL DESIGN (NCES 8221), Broomfield, Colorado. Sponsored by the Continuing Engineering Education Program, University of Colorado at Denver. Contact Continuing Engineering Education Program, University of Colorado at Denver at (303) 556-4907 or see http://www.cudenver.edu/engineer/cont and click on Course Information.

May 21–22, 2004: FIFTH ANNUAL NATIONAL RIVER RALLY, Wintergreen, Virginia. Sponsored by The River Network. Contact the River Network at (503) 241-3506 or see http://www.rivernetwork.org/rally/.

May 27–28, 2004: THE CHALLENGES OF SOCIOECONOMIC RESEARCH IN COASTAL SYSTEMS: VALUATION, ANALYSES, AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Sponsored by the Center for Natural Resource Economics and Policy and the Louisiana State University Agricultural Center. Contact CNREP, c/o Richard F. Kazmierczak, Jr., Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness, 101 Agricultural Administration Bldg., Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5604; rkazmierczak@agcenter.lsu.edu or see http://www.agecon.lsu.edu/cnrep/.

June 14–17, 2004: 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/emi/.

June 14–18, 2004: RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION (E386), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.fema.gov/emi/.

June 20–23, 2004: THE CHANGING FACE OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT: ARE WE REALLY PREPARED? FOURTEENTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT, Toronto, Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Centre for Emergency Preparedness. See http://www.wcdm.org.

June 28–30, 2004: RIPARIAN ECOSYSTEMS AND BUFFERS: MULTI-SCALE STRUCTURE, FUNCTION, AND MANAGEMENT, Olympic Valley, California. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See http://www.awra.org/meetings/Olympic2004/summer2004.doc.

July 11–14, 2004: WATERSHED 2004, Dearborn, Michigan. Sponsored by the Water Environment Federation. See http://www.wef.org/Conferences/.

July 19–23, 2004: MULTI-HAZARD DESIGN SUMMER INSTITUTE: FLOOD, (E329), Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call (800) 238-3358 or see http://www.fema.gov/emi/.

July 26–29, 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/.

July 26–29, 2004: STORMCON 2004: THE NORTH AMERICAN SURFACE WATER QUALITY CONFERENCE AND EXPOSITION, Palm Desert, California. Sponsored by Forester Communications and *Stormwater* magazine. See http://www.StormCon.com or http://www.forester.net/sc_call.html.

August 16–19, 2004: 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/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 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 or see http://www.asce.org/conted/distancelearning/

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 or Steve Emmett-Mattox, Vice President and Program Director, (703) 524-0248; sem@estuaries.org or see http://www.estuaries.org.

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 26–29, 2004: DAM SAFETY 2004, Phoenix, Arizona. Sponsored by the Association of State Dam Safety Officials. Abstracts are due February 18, 2004. Contact ASDSO at (859) 257-5140 or 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/.

November 1–4, 2004: ANNUAL WATER RESOURCE CONFERENCE, Orlando, Florida. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See http://www.awra.org.

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 or see http://www.iaem.com.

June 12–17, 2005: TWENTY-NINTH 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.

NEWS & VIEWS

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.

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.
