



Vol. 15, No. 3
June 2003

ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, INC.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE ASSEMBLES FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT EXPERTS

The St. Louis Arch provided a symbolic and literal setting for “Lessons Learned: Gateway to Flood Mitigation,” the annual conference of the Association of State Floodplain Managers, held May 10–16, 2003, in St. Louis, Missouri. Over 900 attendees (including 25 people from outside the United States) and 75 exhibitors participated in a week of technical presentations, lively discussion, training, field trips, exhibits, and social events.

In observance of the conference’s setting as one site of the pivotal Midwest Floods of 1993, the opening plenary session examined the changes in legislation, appropriations, and policy that came about as a result of that disaster. Larry Zensinger, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Gerry Galloway, formerly of the International Joint Commission; and Doug Plasencia, AMEC Earth & Environmental, observed that among the key shifts have been a sharper focus on the natural functions and resources of riverine areas, an emphasis on acquisition and relocation during post-disaster recovery, better public and media understanding of flood hazards, and more collaborative interdisciplinary work on flood problems nationwide.

The second plenary on Tuesday morning featured presentations by Anthony Lowe, Margaret Lawless, and Mike Grimm, all of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (now the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Department of Homeland Security). They outlined some of the ways in which FEMA works with its numerous partners to carry out flood-related activities, and described the agency’s plans for continuing with digital mapping, using a multi-hazard focus where possible, and implementing the new pre-disaster mitigation grant program.

A special luncheon that day featured Igor Nemeč, former Mayor of the City of Prague, Czech Republic, who shared slides of and insights on the ways in which that city coped with the aftermath of its recent devastating floods.

A diverse panel of speakers the next morning described to the assembly the barriers and successes their

different entities encountered in achieving wise land use, including innovative ways of identifying and addressing adverse impacts. They were Wilton Boyd and Jim Bodycott, both of the Floodplain Management Program of New South Wales, Australia; David Graham of the Bonita Bay Group (Florida); and Mike Rippey, Napa County (California) Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

“Liability and Enforcement Considerations for Communities” was the topic of discussion at the Wednesday morning plenary session. Public liability and violation enforcement are major concerns that elected officials and professionals face when they permit or allow actions in floodplain or watersheds. Jon Kusler, Association of State Wetland Managers, reviewed the last 12 years of case law on “takings” and common law liability as related to floodplain management. Thomas L. Dosch, Wisconsin Department of Justice, described the actions a local floodplain administrator can take in anticipation of taking an enforcement action to court.

The final plenary session on Thursday morning was entitled, “Solving Local Watershed Problems through Nationwide Program Integration,” and featured presentations by G. Tracy Mehan III, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Harry Slawter, Natural Resources Conservation Service; and Chris Brown, National Park Service. They identified the federal interest in and ability to foster an integrated, watershed-based approach to address not just flooding problems, but other water- and watershed-related concerns at the local level.

Small-group presentations and discussions occupied most participants for much of the conference, beginning Tuesday afternoon. This year’s break-out sessions covered long-term impacts of the 1993 Midwest Floods; repetitive flood losses; issues surrounding and techniques for the production of digital flood hazard maps; integrated water resource planning; monitoring and enforcement of local compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program; applicability of geographic

[continued on page 10]

from the Chair

Chad Berginnis

I hope June finds you all well and rested. For those of you who attended the ASFPM's annual conference in St. Louis, some relaxation has probably been necessary! Record-setting in terms of overall attendance, exhibitors, and numbers of local officials and international guests present, the St. Louis conference was loaded with sessions, workshops, meetings, and networking [see story on page 1]. For those who did not attend, it is not too early to think about next year's gathering, which will be held in Biloxi, Mississippi, May 17-21.

Many attendees have told me that they return home from the annual meeting feeling energized, eager to apply some new bit of knowledge or become more actively involved in the ASFPM. Right now, you have the opportunity to do both!

At the time of writing this column, I have asked the ASFPM membership to assist with educating their Congressional representatives about the Hazard Mitiga-

tion Grant Program (HMGP) and will soon be asking the same concerning map modernization [see article on page 5]. Under the budget request for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, HMGP is proposed to be eliminated and map modernization is proposed to receive an additional \$200 million. Don't Congressional officials already know about the importance of these programs? Not likely, because FEMA's inclusion into the new Department of Homeland Security has resulted in nearly all new faces on the Congressional appropriations subcommittees that will review FEMA's budget. Additionally, FEMA's proposed budget is likely to be considered this month, lending urgency to these "calls to action." Both programs are essential to reducing flood losses and both need strong support from the professionals who manage our nation's floodplains.

So, as many of you prepare for vacations, or persevere through the peak season for issuing floodplain development permits, please set aside a little time to contact your Congressional delegation about HMGP and map modernization.

For more information or assistance, you can contact your Chapter or Regional Director, the ASFPM Executive Office, or visit the ASFPM website at <http://www.floods.org> □

NOMINATIONS WANTED FOR NAI CASE STUDIES

The ASFPM will be featuring the "no adverse impact" activities of 12 communities in a collection of case studies aimed at providing floodplain managers with descriptions of tools and activities that can reduce flood losses and community liability through the use of NAI approaches. The publication will be distributed via the Internet, in addition to a limited number of hard copies, in May 2004. The *NAI Case Studies* publication, which is being produced with support from the Public Entity Risk Institute, will provide communities nationwide with information about what techniques have worked in implementing NAI approaches, allowing communities to select solutions to their flood problems from alternatives that have already been proven workable by communities elsewhere in the nation.

Your community would be recognized as one of the leaders in the industry by being showcased in *NAI Case Studies*. By sharing your community's experience, you will be providing both "successes" and "lessons learned" for the benefit of communities that are considering, but have not yet implemented, NAI actions.

Any community wanting to be included should submit a short nomination form (see below) by July 31, 2003. Those selected as case studies will be asked to provide additional materials, including maps and photographs; cooperate in the research interviews and possible site visit; help develop the "story;" and review the draft.

Communities selected for case studies will be notified in September; research will be done during the fall, and the draft reviewed in January 2004.

>>>> Nomination forms or additional information can be obtained from Mark Riebau, Project Manager, ASFPM Executive Office, (608) 274-0123, mark@floods.org.

Learn 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 checking the ASFPM's website at <http://www.floods.org>.

TACKLING REPETITIVE FLOOD LOSSES

Anthony S. Lowe
Director, Mitigation Division
Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

The Pacific Northwest, sadly, has had its “share” of floods over the years, and as a resident and community official of the State of Washington, I thought I had a fairly clear understanding of them. But I really did not fully appreciate what the phrase “flood-ravaged community” meant until last year when I walked through communities in West Virginia, Texas, and Louisiana overwhelmed by floods. Piles of ruined belongings at the curbs, heaps of debris, houses off their foundations and marked in red as “unsafe to enter or occupy,” and the faces of the people cleaning up—faces much older than their years—those images are still with me, and from that day forward, “flood-ravaged” has become something very real for me.

One of the first things I promised myself when I took the oath of office as Federal Insurance Administrator was that I would do all in my authority to address the problem of flood damage in America, and particularly the problem of repetitive flood losses.

My determination after almost a year is unchanged, and, in the process, I have learned a great deal from listening to those who have been working on this issue for years: state floodplain managers, the Federal Emergency Management Agency Regional Office staffs, my own floodplain management and mitigation staff, community officials, my insurance staff, and the National Flood Insurance Program’s insurance industry partners. Their collective wisdom has told me that there is no easy fix to the problem of repetitive flood losses. To suggest otherwise is folly. There are approaches, however, that hold promise.

Public policy has favored acquisition and relocation of repetitive loss properties as the remedy of choice. Our preference has been understandable because the success of buyouts and relocation from the floodplain is unmistakable. Once we remove a repetitive loss property from the floodplain and preserve the land for open space or recreational use, we permanently fix the problem. We avoid future losses to that structure. We avoid paying inevitable, future flood insurance claims payments on it. Communities avoid future emergency management burdens as well as the costs and disruption to critical infrastructure extended into the floodplain to support flood-prone buildings.

Study after study, including the Association of State Floodplain Managers’ *Mitigation Success Stories*, documents the savings in avoided flood damage resulting from acquisition and relocation projects. FEMA’s Region V’s success stories posted on their website, FEMA Region VII and the State of Missouri’s *Success Stories from the Missouri Buyout Program*, and FEMA Region VIII’s *Journeys* all have demonstrated the benefits from buyouts. Jim Cole, the City Manager of

Neosho, Missouri, best summarizes the value of a community buyout program when he says, “We’ve gone from buying sandbags to lawn mowers.”

If only that could be the case everywhere there are high-flood-risk structures. Buyouts, however, have limitations. Funding at every level of government is finite. States, localities, and FEMA have had to accomplish more with less, and all of us have faced a number of *human* obstacles in trying to move repetitive flood loss properties out of high-risk areas.

Our mitigation programs, first of all, are voluntary, so we have not always had the needed leverage for property owners to accept grant offers intended to reduce or eliminate the flood risk.

More importantly, there are financial constraints that sometimes prevent owners of repetitively flooded properties from accepting offers for buyouts. FEMA’s mitigation programs, by law, require a 25% non-federal cost share. In a number of cases, the responsibility for the match has devolved from the state and local government to the property owner. It can be a significant financial burden for many of these property owners to absorb that cost—25% of the fair market value of the property. Consider their position. If *we* had to absorb 25% of the market value of our house to relocate, many of us in policymaking roles would be hard pressed to come up with the match.

When there *is* a cost-share available from the state or local government, the owner of a repetitively flooded property often faces other legitimate problems that argue against accepting a mitigation grant offer. In some cases, the geography of the floodplain offers few, if any, flood-free, alternate living sites in the vicinity where affected property owners work or their children go to school. If there *is* alternate housing in the vicinity, it may not always be affordable, which again makes it difficult for some property owners to accept a buyout offer and make the move.

Community officials also have to consider buyouts in the total context of a community’s comprehensive floodplain management program. Repetitively flooded properties are parts of neighborhoods and subdivisions, and they have a relationship to the entire community. In some cases, relocation of only selected NFIP-insured properties can create a checkerboard effect and blight.

Those are realities and limitations of any buyout and relocation program, not just for repetitively flooded properties.

Buyouts, ideally, should always be a tool within easy reach for policymakers, and, whenever possible, the tool of first choice. But when buyouts are not practical or

[continued on page 4]

Repetitive Flood Losses (cont.)

desirable, we need to explore other remedies that will reduce the exposure of repetitively flooded properties to future damage. Grafton, Illinois, for example, has had a successful buyout and relocation program for its residents, but community officials also have successfully incorporated the elevation of repetitively flooded properties into their overall mitigation strategy. On a bluff high above this picturesque city is the site of a new subdivision for the owners of property flooded time and again, with the 1993 flood being the last straw for them. There are also structures adjacent to the Illinois River that were elevated above the floodplain after the 1993 flood. During a subsequent flood, these buildings were high and dry, each an island of security surrounded, but undamaged by, floodwaters.

I believe that all of us who are dedicated to eliminating the problem of repetitive flood losses need to refocus on elevation as a pre-disaster mitigation remedy, not to the exclusion of buyouts, but as an effective option that is often more readily implemented.

On May 1, 2003, we increased the benefit of Increased Cost of Compliance coverage (ICC) under the Standard Flood Insurance Policy to \$30,000. In many cases, this will pay for the cost of elevating a repetitively flooded property that has been substantially damaged in order to meet the minimum standards of the NFIP. In those communities that have adopted and are enforcing a cumulative or repetitive flood loss ordinance, this higher ICC benefit will fund the elevation, demolition, or floodproofing of a building after a qualifying repetitive flood loss.

This increase in ICC benefits honors a promise made to the ASFP and other stakeholders that we would increase the benefit when our actuarial and loss studies permitted us to do so. We will make adjustments to that benefit again when loss experience permits. State officials can use this benefit increase to their advantage and encourage local officials to adopt cumulative or repetitive flood loss ordinances that will give funding options to property owners who suffer a substantial loss or less costly but qualifying repetitive flood losses to become safe from future damage.

Our fiscal year 2003 budget provides \$150 million in pre-disaster mitigation funds. Granted, these funds are not specifically earmarked for repetitive flood losses. Nonetheless, in the award process, repetitively flooded properties should rank high in the competition for these funds. This amount, in addition to remaining Flood Mitigation Assistance funds and Hazard Mitigation Grant funds, and our increased ICC benefit, provides an array of resources to help all of us discharge our duty and help the owners of repetitively flooded properties get the help they need and become secure from floods.

So far in the 108th Congress, two bills have been introduced to address the problem of repetitive flood loss properties. I commend Representatives Bereuter, Blumenauer, and Baker for their leadership in introducing legislation that would attempt to address the problem of repetitive flood loss properties.

The Bush Administration has not taken a position on either H.R. 253, "Two Floods and You Are Out of the Taxpayers' Pocket Act of 2003," or H.R.670, "The Flood Mitigation Assistance Act of 2003." Those bills and the April 1st hearing on them sponsored by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Financial Services' Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, reflect a concern shared by Congress, the Administration, and state and local governments concerning repetitive flood losses.

Whatever course we follow, we must have certain tools to address the problem. Resources are clearly necessary. The more resources that are available to address repetitive loss properties, the quicker we can make significant progress.

Flexibility is also a key to determining the composition of repetitive loss projects and in defining our highest priority properties.

The involvement of state and local governments in the disposition of properties is essential in keeping control at the local level and not having the federal government become an owner of these properties.

And finally, there should be some consequence for a property owner who refuses a mitigation offer, without a justifiable reason.

As every member of the ASFP knows, mitigation projects are the most successful when state and local governments are involved in their development and implementation. Certainly where there is a non-federal cost-share requirement, states and localities have a stake in the process and the outcome. There will be instances, however, where in the interest of savings for the NFIP, we will need to address individual properties that are *not* part of a larger mitigation effort. And we must also be mindful that there may be individual circumstances where, with legitimate reason, property owners cannot take advantage of an offer of mitigation assistance. A broad effort with flexibility to recognize individual circumstances, when necessary, will give us the means to address the repetitive loss problem in ways that are based on what we learn, on the ground, about these properties. We can achieve results that are good for the state, the community, the property owner, and the NFIP.

Currently, FEMA is focusing on 10,000 repetitive flood loss properties as the highest priority for mitigation in our repetitive loss strategy. These 10,000 highest priority properties, which are currently insured under the NFIP, have had *four* or more flood losses, or two or three losses that cumulatively exceed the value of the building. These 10,000 are the more extreme cases, ones for which we have paid out close to \$1 billion in flood insurance claims over the last 21 years. We want to focus on these properties for mitigation that will remove them altogether from the floodplains, elevate them above the reach of floodwaters, or apply other measures that will reduce significantly their exposure to flood risk.

Additional measures with these characteristics would give us a complete set of tools to remove the costliest risks from the NFIP.

[continued on page 10]

Washington Report

CORPS ISSUES

ENVIRONMENTAL GUIDANCE

On May 1 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued an Engineer Circular (EC) that reaffirms its policy and provides procedures for formulating and evaluating civil works projects for their environmental sustainability. As defined in the Corps' Environmental Operating Principles, sustainability is "a synergistic process whereby environmental and economic considerations are effectively balanced through the life cycle of project planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance to improve the quality of life for present and future generations." The new guidance is the result of more than a year of study and repeated internal and external review. The procedures are meant to encourage project planning that effectively and reasonably balances national economic development benefits and national ecosystem restoration benefits. The EC emphasizes the *Principles and Guidelines* requirement to develop project plans that are consistent with protecting the nation's environment by avoiding, minimizing, or, if necessary, mitigating significant adverse impacts.

For plans that are formulated to produce a mix of economic and environmental benefits ("combined plans"), the procedures require that (1) a range of alternatives be developed, (2) cost-effective plans be identified, (3) trade-offs between plans be evaluated and documented, (4) a justified combined plan be identified, (5) an explicit comparison be made between the justified combined plan and a plan that yields solely national economic development benefits or one that yields solely national ecosystem restoration benefits, and (6) the rationale for selecting the combined plan be documented. The goal is finding the best reasonable mix of economic and environmental benefits at a reasonable cost.

The EC is the first step in a process to provide tools and procedures to formulate and evaluate environmentally sustainable projects. Soon the Corps will release an Engineer Pamphlet (EP) with an example application of the principles and procedures stated in the EC, along with a suggested trade-off analysis procedure. In addition, the Institute for Water Resources is developing a protocol for matching ecosystem assessment models and other techniques with the scale and type of planning study being evaluated. A draft protocol has been developed and is currently out for review.

>>>> The Engineer Circular (EC 1105-2-404) is posted on the Corps' website at <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-circulars/ec1105-2-404/toc.htm>.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

A Call to Action

All of the Federal Emergency Management Agency is now part of the Department of Homeland Security. Most of the FEMA programs fall under Emergency Preparedness and Response, one of four subdivisions in the new department. (Emergency Management Preparedness Grants, however, will be funded through the Border Protection and Immigration section.)

Most members and staff of the new appropriations subcommittees on homeland security in the House and Senate have not dealt directly with FEMA's budget in the past. They are new to the funding issues and subtleties associated with natural disaster programs, especially mitigation. There is a great need for educating these members and their staffs so that they can make properly informed decisions about the issues that face them. Two items in the FEMA budget for FY 2004 of great importance to floodplain managers fall into this category: (1) the request for \$200 million for multi-hazard flood map modernization, and (2) the plan to eliminate the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. *The ASFPM is urging all of its members to provide the Senators and Representatives from their states with information about the need for flood map modernization and about the value to their state of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.* A brief discussion of the situation with regard to the proposed budgets for these two activities is presented below, but more details, including suggestions about what to include in communicating with your state's Congressional delegation, are available on the ASFPM website at <http://www.floods.org>.

Appropriations

The appropriations process is moving along swiftly with most subcommittees having completed their hearings on the proposed budget for FY 2004, with markup of bills to begin soon.

The 2004 Budget Resolution approves \$3.3 billion less than the President requested. Because of the likelihood of majority party add-ons for a number of programs including education for disabled students, veterans' medical care, and Army Corps of Engineers projects, some are projecting that the appropriations subcommittees will have to find more than \$7 billion in reductions from the President's budget. Budget resolutions are used to provide guidance to Congress on overall numbers and include assumptions about what will and will not be funded. While the appropriations committees are not bound by those assumptions, they are somewhat bound by the numbers arrived at pursuant to

[continued on page 6]

them. The full appropriations committees make budget ceiling allocations to their subcommittees accordingly.

Some House and Senate subcommittees may get their allocations soon and begin marking up. It is not likely that the new homeland security subcommittees will be among those, although there is pressure from the White House not to delay homeland security appropriations.

Multi-Hazard Map Modernization

The Administration has requested \$200 million for the second funding year of the Map Modernization initiative. Last year, \$300 million was requested and \$150 million was appropriated in a compromise between the House and Senate.

Given the tight budget situation, it was gratifying that the Administration requested funds for map modernization and that the Congress provided a substantial appropriation. This was in a year when any new initiative was examined rigorously. Now that FEMA has moved into the much larger Department of Homeland Security, the map modernization request is less visible, and new members of the appropriations subcommittees need to be informed about the reasons for funding a major map modernization project.

- Modern, up-to-date flood risk maps are essential for mitigating loss of life and property and for guiding development away from the most hazardous areas.
- Most of the nation's flood maps—required for use under the National Flood Insurance Program—have flood data over 10 years old.
- With so many maps so very out of date, re-studies must be done. Unmapped areas must be mapped. These flood studies are expensive, but critical.
- Technology can make the modernized maps digital and allow for convenient, frequent updating of data; make them available on the internet; and reduce storage and distribution costs.
- The need to update such a large number of maps and to convert them to a digital format requires a major, multi-year investment, the cost of which will approach \$1 billion and take about seven years. Once completed, however, maps will be accurate, accessible and readily up-datable.
- It is appropriate that map modernization be funded by taxpayer dollars because the maps are used for many planning, development and construction activities that serve the general public, not just for flood insurance purposes. The GIS format will be usable by the Department of Homeland Security for overlaying other hazard data.
- Funding at least the \$200 million requested for FY '04 is essential to keep this investment on schedule, but more would enable FEMA to get the job done more quickly.

Elimination of HMGP

Again this year, the Administration's budget request seeks to eliminate HMGP, replacing it with a nationwide competitive pre-disaster mitigation grant program. After this was proposed for FY 2003, several crucial

differences between the two approaches were identified, along with some potential problems with the proposed competitive grants. Then-Director of FEMA Joe Allbaugh testified before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that, having listened to many concerned parties, he instead supported a "balance" between pre- and post-disaster mitigation. The final version of the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriation for last fiscal year (part of the Omnibus Appropriations Bill that was only signed into law on February 20) included half the funds sought for the new competitive grant program and half the percentage of disaster costs that could be provided in mitigation funds (\$150 million for the grants and 7½% for HMGP) [*see News & Views, April 2003, p. 3*].

FEMA's General Counsel has determined that the elimination of HMGP could be achieved without any Congressional action. This is because the Stafford Act says simply that FEMA *may* provide mitigation funds equivalent to up to 15% of the disaster costs. Therefore, if the Congress determines that HMGP should continue, the Homeland Security Appropriations Bill must say so.

Members of Congress need to be advised of how much their states have received in recent years in HMGP funds so that they can evaluate whether or not the Administration's proposal would be good policy for their states. Other important factors include the following.

- The two mitigation programs (pre-disaster competitive and post-disaster formula) should not be seen as substitutes for each other. They would fund different types of projects and in different areas.
- Many parts of the country are not likely to qualify for the competitive grants, which force types of disasters and different geographical areas to compete against each other. The use of strict cost-benefit criteria in a competitive grant program would tend to favor certain types of disasters (earthquakes) and certain geographic areas (coastal high hazard). Under HMGP, every Presidentially declared disaster area can qualify for mitigation funds if a mitigation plan is in place.
- Competitive grant cycles would not be likely to coincide with the incidence of disasters.
- Loss of HMGP would miss the "window of opportunity" after a disaster when perception of risk is high and local support of mitigation and cost-sharing is most likely.
- Proponents of the competitive grants say this would assure that funds are well spent. However, the Disaster Mitigation Act 2000 mandated that mitigation plans be in place in order to qualify for HMGP post-disaster funds. The planning process is underway with deadlines coming up in November 2003 and November 2004. These plans will make a big difference in assuring that mitigation funds are well spent.
- A coalition of groups concerned about the possible loss of the HMGP program has formed. The coalition includes ASFPM, NEMA (state

[continued on page 7]

emergency managers), IAEM (local emergency managers), NADO (regional governing entities), National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, American Society of Civil Engineers, National Association of Realtors®, American Planning Association, American Public Works Association, National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies, and others.

Repetitive Losses

It is increasingly likely that there will finally be legislative action this year to address the problem of repetitive losses in the National Flood Insurance Program.

A hearing was held in the House Committee on Financial Services' Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity on April 1, at which Chad Berginnis, then Vice Chair, testified for ASFPM, making observations and recommendations related to the two bills under consideration (H.R. 253, introduced by Doug Bereuter (R-NE) and Earl Blumenauer (D-OR), and H.R. 670, introduced by Richard Baker (R-LA)). The ASFPM testimony is on the website at <http://www.floods.org>. A compromise draft is being developed and it appears likely that the bill will be marked up towards the end of June.

Other Legislation

Other bills being followed by ASFPM are:

H.R. 1816, The National Flood Insurance Program Fairness Act—Introduced by Fortney “Pete” Stark (D-CA), the bill would “ensure homeowners are provided adequate notice of flood map changes and a fair opportunity to appeal such changes.” It was referred to the House Committee on Financial Services and no action has been scheduled at this time.

H.R. 268, United States Weather Research Program Act of 2003—Introduced by Vernon Ehlers (R-MI), the bill would make improvements in weather forecasting and specifically lists as priorities hurricanes, heavy precipitation, and floods. It has been referred to the House Committee on Science.

H.R. 1552, Homeowners’ Insurance Availability Act of 2003—Introduced by Dave Weldon (R-FL), the bill would “establish a federal program to provide reinsurance to improve the availability of homeowners’ insurance.” It has been referred to the House Committee on Financial Services and the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

H.R. 2020, Hurricane, Tornado and Related Hazards Research Act—Introduced by Dennis Moore (D-KS), the bill would “reduce the impacts of hurricanes, tornadoes and related hazards through a program of research and development and technology transfer.” It was referred to the House Committee on Science and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 962/S. 473, Clean Water Authority Restoration Act of 2003—Introduced by James Oberstar (D-MN) and Russell Feingold (D-WI), respectively, the identical bills would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the United States over “waters of the United States.” The bills have been referred to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment and to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

S. 910, Non-Homeland Security Mission Performance Act of 2003—Introduced by Daniel Akaka (D-HI), the bill would “ensure the continuation of non-homeland security functions of federal agencies transferred to the Department of Homeland Security.” It was referred to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.

The ASFPM is also following the development of appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Park Service (Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance), the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Weather Service, and others. In addition, the ASFPM participates with other concerned groups, including the Flood Map Coalition, the NFIP Coalition, the Stafford Coalition, the USGS Coalition, and the Congressional Natural Hazards Caucus.

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

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

SBA LOANS AVAILABLE FOR PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION

In the June 4 *Federal Register* (Vol. 68, No. 107, p. 33563), the U.S. Small Business Administration announced a pilot program for the availability of Pre-Disaster Mitigation Loans. Beginning June 16, 2003, small businesses in eligible participating communities determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency may apply for low-interest, fixed-rate loans in order to implement mitigation measures to protect their commercial building, leasehold improvements, or contents from disaster-related damage. The interest rate is 2.953%. Applications for Pre-Disaster Mitigation Loans may be obtained from and filed at the appropriate SBA Disaster Area Office.

>>>> The full notice, which includes addresses for the SBA offices, can be accessed at [http://frwebgate4.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate.cgi?WAIISdocID=90998130944+24+0+0&WAISaction=trieve](http://frwebgate4.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate.cgi?WAIISdocID=90998130944+24+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve).

ACHIEVEMENTS IN FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

At its annual meeting in St Louis, Missouri, the ASFPM recognized these outstanding individuals, projects, and programs in floodplain management.

The Goddard-White Award

David R. Conrad, of the National Wildlife Federation, received the ASFPM's highest honor for floodplain management accomplishment. Conrad's background is in the environmental sciences, and he has worked primarily for non-profit organizations for the past 25 years. A long-standing partner of the ASFPM, he helped attain passage of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994, has led legislative efforts on the various Water Resource Development Acts, and has been a respected analyst of the wide range of laws and policies that shape the nation's use of its water and other natural resources. Conrad was the primary author of *Higher Ground*, the 1998 NWF report that gave a thorough, well-documented analysis of the problem of repetitively flooded properties and of the nonstructural measures (particularly buyout and relocation) that can be permanent solutions. His continuous, knowledgeable input over the last few decades has made it possible for Congress, the federal agencies, and others to better address wise management of the nation's floodplains.

The James Lee Witt Award for Local Excellence in Floodplain Management

The **Gold Award** was presented to St. Charles County, Missouri, in recognition of its self-reliance in solving its flood problems and its movement from "response planning" to "mitigation planning" since the 1993 Midwest floods. Over the past 10 years the County removed about 1,000 structures from its floodplain and established a parks department to administer many of the bought-out properties, wetlands, and floodplain lands as open space. In 1999 the County adopted both a unified development ordinance and a flood risk mitigation plan.

A **Platinum Award** was presented to the Lake County (Illinois) Stormwater Management Commission, which, after being established in 1990, has successfully coordinated a comprehensive stormwater management program involving more than 90 local jurisdictions. The Commission is made up of six county board members and six mayors/village presidents, and has developed numerous partnerships within the county, leveraged millions of dollars in grants and cost-sharing to stretch a limited property tax-based budget, and started a public outreach campaign to promote flood awareness.

A **Platinum Award** was presented to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District for its project, completed in 2001, to restore the Lincoln Creek, identified as a significant source of pollutants to the Milwaukee River.

The \$111 million project protects over 2,000 property owners and along its 8.5 stream miles included removal of concrete channel liners, restoration of creek banks with natural vegetation, stormwater detention facilities, enhancement of aquatic habitat, channel deepening and lowering of the floodplain, and replacement of several bridges. Innovative approaches were used to preserve historically significant bridges built by the Works Project Administration in the 1930s.

The Tom Lee State Award for Excellence in Floodplain Management

The **Gold Award** went to the New Mexico Floodplain Managers Association, whose 2002 publication, *Floodplain Management in New Mexico: A Call for Action*, prompted passage of state legislation requiring all New Mexico communities to have floodplain development permits reviewed by a Certified Floodplain Manager. The NMFMA this spring adopted a strategic plan for its future, including increased training for floodplain managers and improvements to statewide standards, hydrology, and mapping.

The recipient of the **Platinum Award** was the Iowa Department of Natural Resources. With a special state appropriation earmarked for training, DNR produced the *Floodplain Management Desk Reference*, a 430-page encyclopedia of everything a local official in Iowa needs to know about the NFIP, mapping, state programs, regulatory requirements, program administration, enforcement, and post-disaster operations. That manual, and a companion 30-page *Floodplain Management Ready Reference*, are being put on compact disks.

The Larry R. Johnston Local Floodplain Manager Award

Mayor Cornelia Dettmer of Manchester, Ohio, received the Local Floodplain Manager Award. In 1997, as a volunteer, she formed the Manchester Floodplain Commission and networked with other communities to benefit from their experiences. In 1999 she was elected mayor and retained her position as Floodplain Administrator. During her tenure Manchester restored the magistrate's court and begun using it as an enforcement tool, developed a mitigation plan and a Hazard Mitigation Grant Program project to address 63 substantially damaged structures, and is working on a comprehensive all-hazards mitigation plan as part of Ohio's Appalachian Flood Risk Reduction Initiative.

The John R. Sheaffer Award for Excellence in Floodproofing

This year's Sheaffer Floodproofing Award was given to the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District. After completing a stormwater system master plan, the District identified sites where traditional flood protection techniques would not be appropriate or cost-effective. For places where floodproofing would be useful, it developed step-by-step procedures for implementing floodproofing, from initial contact with the property owner through design, construction, and operation and maintenance.

The Media Award

The 2003 Media Award went to the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, in recognition of its continuing coverage of the Midwest Floods of 1993. Not only did the paper demonstrate excellent reporting of floodplain management and mitigation approaches during and after the flood, but it also is running a series of articles commemorating the 10th anniversary of the flood this summer and examining lessons learned (both good and bad) since the disaster.

HISTORIC BRIDGE GOES HOME

**JoAnne Castagna
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

The Doty Road Bridge carried people, horses, wagons, and automobiles over New Jersey's Ramapo River for over a century. Recently, the New York District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers found a new home for the historic landmark, preserving it as a floodplain-related cultural and historic resource.

The Doty Road Bridge was named after the Doty family, early settlers to Oakland Borough in Bergen County, New Jersey. The single lane, 80-foot-long bridge was constructed in 1891 in an area traditionally called "The Ponds," after winter floods on the Ramapo swept away the previous bridge. The County purchased the new bridge, a 5-panel, wrought iron, Pratt Pony Truss Bridge with Phoenix Columns, from the Phoenixville Bridge Company, a subsidiary of the Phoenix Iron and Steel Company, located in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania.

Bergen County literally found the bridge by thumbing through a catalog. The Phoenixville Bridge Company sold hundreds of bridges, viaducts, and highway spans in the United States and Canada through its trade catalogue. Whole bridges were pre-fabricated by the company in an almost kit-like fashion. The customers ordered the parts they needed, which were shipped to local engineers who customized the designs for their particular location. The bridge panel sections were sent to the job site with all of the riveting work completed. The only thing that local engineers had to do was literally "pin" the bridge together.

Many of the bridges were constructed using the company's famous Phoenix columns and truss designs. The Phoenix Column is hollow and circular and made up of four, six, or eight wrought-iron segments that are flanged and riveted together, thus forming a column. Phoenix Column truss bridges were widely used in the late 1800s because the column facilitated the erection of tall structures eliminating the requirement for heavy, thick load-bearing walls and also because of its application to the construction of bridges, viaducts, and elevated rail lines.

After more than a hundred years of use, the Doty Road Bridge was condemned in 1983 because of its poor condition, and another bridge was inserted through the middle of the original structure to relieve the old bridge of carrying traffic. In 1989 the structure was determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Corps of Engineers' New York District has under construction at the Doty Road site its new Ramapo River at Oakland Flood Control Project. In the course of that project, it was determined several years ago that the Doty Road Bridge would be an obstruction during floods and that it should be removed and replaced by a new one. The New Jersey Historic Preservation Office stated that, if that happened, the loss of the cultural resource represented by the bridge needed to be mitigated.

Although the rest of the bridge had deteriorated, the Corps marketed the trusses nationwide through historical societies, state park managers, engineers, and *Preservation Magazine*. A wide range of people expressed interest and the Corps decided to work with the Phoenixville Area Economic Development Corporation (PATCH), a non-profit group working toward the economic revitalization of Phoenixville, Pennsylvania—the very town where the bridge was crafted over a century ago. In cooperation with the county and state, PATCH had purchased 27 acres along French Creek in Phoenixville to create a floodplain park, including walking and biking trails. Its plan was to place the trusses of the bridge over the creek as a decorative and historically significant connection between the park and the trails.

PATCH "purchased" the truss for a symbolic dollar. The Corps' New York District arranged for the bridge to be disassembled and trucked to PATCH's site. On a rainy day in December 2002, the Doty Road Bridge went home to Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, where it was originally constructed and where it will continue to serve the public. □

Repetitive Flood Losses (cont.)

Conclusion

After nearly a year as Federal Insurance Administrator, I have come to appreciate the deep commitment of FEMA and its partners within the ASFPM to address the problem of repetitive flood loss properties. I am even more committed to work with FEMA's partners and the NFIP's stakeholders to break the dismal cycle of repetitive flood losses that take a tragic toll on far too many Americans.

I believe great promise lies ahead in removing people from harm's reach not only through voluntary buyouts and relocation but also elevation and floodproofing. We have at our disposal increased benefits to help property owners comply with state and local floodplain management laws and ordinances after future flood losses. Those benefits will be most useful if more communities and states upgrade floodplain management ordinances that address repetitive flood loss properties. There is a larger source of federal funds available to deal with repetitive flood losses. Granted greater flexibility, we can apply compassionate measures that give the owners of repetitively flooded properties real options to escape the inevitability of another flood loss. Together, we can accomplish this. □

Opinions Wanted on NFIP Standards

As part of an overall evaluation of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) being conducted for the Federal Emergency Management Agency by the American Institutes for Research, a short questionnaire about the NFIP's minimum building standards for design and construction of buildings in flood hazard areas has been posted at <http://www.coastalhazard.com/pages/811368/index.htm>. Floodplain managers and others with experience to share can log on and respond to the questionnaire via email by June 15, 2003.

>>>> For more information, contact Christopher Jones, 5525 Jomali Dr., Durham, NC 27705; (919) 382-0130; hazards@chris-jones.mailshell.com.

Annual Conference (cont.)

information systems to flood hazard reduction; the new HAZUS flood loss estimation model and its use for mitigation planning; uses and limitations of LIDAR and other remote sensing data; computer modeling; risk assessment and vulnerability analysis; flood map modernization; restoration of floodplain resources; performance of levees; flood forecasting, warning, and response; riparian protection; partnerships among all levels of government and the public and private sectors; public education and awareness of flood hazards and floodplain resources; coastal issues; and many others.

Two special sessions addressed the ASFPM's No Adverse Impact initiative: a training workshop and an open house, both designed to discuss and gather input on the seven building blocks of NAI and how they can be used in different situations to avoid flood losses.

In addition to the technical program, the conference week included the ASFPM's membership and committee meetings and election of new Board members [see back panel of this issue]. A record number of exhibits was displayed on many aspects of floodplain management. Each region, some chapters, and some state associations held breakfast gatherings to exchange news and ideas, and there were several breakfast roundtables on such issues as mapping, flood insurance, mitigation funding, and coastal regions. Thursday brought the annual luncheon at which awards were presented [see pages 8-9]. Training workshops before and after the conference covered map amendments and revisions, GIS and digital maps, impacts of dams, mitigation planning, hydrology and hydraulics for poets, and the ever-popular Floodplain Management 101. The ASFPM's Certified Floodplain Manager examination was administered twice. Technical field trips were made to examine the enormous number of flood-loss-reduction features in the St. Louis area, including the metropolitan stormwater management and flood control system, bridges, locks and dams, levees, large buyout projects, riparian restoration areas, and award-winning bridges. The annual golf tournament and several opportunities for socializing and networking rounded out the gathering.

The technical papers presented at the conference will be released as proceedings by the ASFPM this fall. □

The ASFPM appreciates the extraordinary efforts of all who contributed to the success of the St. Louis meeting, especially the Conference Hosts Paul Osman and George Riedel; Program Chair Cindy Crecelius; and Exhibits Coordinator Dan Accurti.

State and Local Report

SOUTH CAROLINA COASTAL COUNCIL ACTION UPHELD

On April 28 the South Carolina Supreme Court ruled that no unconstitutional “taking” occurred when the South Carolina Coastal Council denied a permit to build a bulkhead and fill tidelands on what had earlier been two residential lots in North Myrtle Beach. By the time the property owner applied for the permits and his applications were rejected, the lots, which had originally been created from fill material, had reverted to tidelands. In *McCain v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, on remand from the U.S. Supreme Court, the court ruled that the public trust doctrine places “a restriction on McCain’s property rights inherent in the ownership of property bordering tidal water.”

>>>> For background on the case, see the South Carolina Environmental Law Project website at <http://www.scelp.org/updates.php#10>. The full opinion is posted at <http://www.judicial.state.sc.us/opinions/displayOpinion.cfm?caseNo=25642>.

HOUSTON KIDS USE DETENTION BASIN

Fifty youths from primarily low-income neighborhoods participated in Houston's first Sprockids Clinic, and they came away smiling. (Sprockids is a youth program created by the International Mountain Biking Association.) The Greater Houston Off Road Biking Association (GHORBA), Houston Parks and Recreation, and the National Park Service held the event to introduce kids and their parents to the planned “Hill” at Sims Greenway. The Hill is a joint project of the Houston Flood Control District and the Parks Department that will create hilly terrain around a regional flood detention

basin and make it into a mountain biking park. GHORBA supporters rallied around this youth event, obtaining 25 donated bikes and providing an abundance of volunteer instructors. The Police Department gave each participant a bike helmet. GHORBA and the Parks Department quickly laid out and cleared about a one-mile single-track trail for the clinic. The trail was so well received that the Parks Department is planning to leave it in place as a designated trail.

>>>> For more information, contact Kathryn Nichols, Community Planner, at (512) 916-5161 or Kathryn.Nichols@nps.gov.

[from Conservation Successes, April 2003]

OKLAHOMA GROUP AIDS IN WATERSHED EDUCATION

Members of the Oklahoma Floodplain Managers Association helped plan and teach at the Caney Valley Conservation District’s ninth annual Outdoor Classroom, a conservation education program for all fourth graders in Washington County, Oklahoma. At a local park, the students rotated through 10 learning stations that included wildlife, water quality, master gardening, soils, Oklahoma-grown products, fire safety, trees, water safety, stream investigations, and a “habitat lap sit.” They learned about the importance of maintaining green space and pervious areas in the watershed. One floodplain manager developed a learning tool from LEGO blocks to demonstrate how land use planning can meet a community’s need for both building sites and open space. Students also had the opportunity to judge the health of the stream by the kinds of living organisms found in it.

[excerpted from The B.F.E., April/May 2003, p. 3]

ISO/CRS SPECIALIST WANTED

Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO), the leading provider of information to the property/casualty insurance industry, is seeking an ISO/CRS Specialist to work with North Carolina communities to foster their participation in the Community Rating System of the National Flood Insurance Program. The position includes collecting flood information through community visits, preparing appropriate reports in accordance with established standards, and representing ISO at meetings involving community officials. ISO offers a competitive salary, benefits package, and a company car.

Desirable qualifications include emergency management service experience and knowledge of the NFIP, and Certified Floodplain Manager (CFM) designation is a strong plus. General engineering experience with strong technical knowledge is desirable. College degree preferred but not required. Training will be provided. Excellent customer service, math, and verbal/written communication skills, and experience with MicroSoft Windows are essential. Must be self-motivated, detail oriented, possess a strong work ethic, and demonstrate the ability to work independently. Position requires a valid driver’s license and overnight travel.

>>>> Send your resume to Willie McDonald, Insurance Services Office, Inc., 545 Washington Blvd., Jersey City, NJ 07310-1686; (201) 469-3001; wmcDonald@iso.com with a copy to William Trakimas, Insurance Services Office, Inc., 2033 Hamilton Lane, Carmel, IN 46032; (317) 848-2898; fax: (317) 848-3578; wtrakimas@iso.com.

TAXPAYERS SAVE MONEY WITH COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES ACT

Paul Souza
Coastal Barriers Coordinator
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) has celebrated its 20th birthday. Signed into law on October 18, 1982, CBRA is a rare, market-based approach to environmental protection. By withholding federal funds for development and disaster relief, CBRA sought to protect valuable habitat for fish and wildlife, discourage people from building in the path of hurricanes, and save taxpayers' money. Restrictions on federal flood insurance apply in Coastal Barrier Resources System areas and "otherwise protected areas," which are depicted on Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

In a report sent to Congress in September 2002, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service demonstrated that CBRA has saved Americans a lot of cash during its 20 years. The report looked at federal spending for disaster relief, roads, potable water, and wastewater, and found that CBRA has saved more than \$1 billion. Furthermore, CBRA will keep saving dollars as long as it exists. Another \$200 million in disaster relief may be saved by 2050.

We also know that CBRA works best when state and local partners add layers of protection onto CBRA's fiscal disincentive. Texas, for example, prohibits state-backed windstorm insurance in the areas designated by CBRA. On Dauphin Island in Alabama, the state's coastal construction control line coincides with the CBRA boundary, and the local government has zoned the entire area for conservation and park land. The National Audubon Society is buying CBRA lands in North Carolina and will hold them in trust for fish and wildlife in perpetuity. The Act's limitations on federal

spending undoubtedly allowed Audubon to purchase coastal barrier lands at a comparatively low cost.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's partnership with the National Flood Insurance Program is a critical underpinning for CBRA. Often, people learn about CBRA when they apply for a flood insurance policy. It is therefore important for agencies to strive for seamless integration of CBRA boundaries onto FIRMs, which will improve customer service by clearly showing property owners and officials in communities that participate in the NFIP where the restrictions on federal flood insurance apply.

Creating digital CBRA maps will help foster this integration. As we look to the future, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the NFIP should find ways to use today's technology to improve the precision of CBRA boundaries on FIRMs and the maps adopted by Congress. We are taking some initial steps to digitize boundaries and hope to have better mapping tools available in the next couple of years. Eventually, state and local governments will be able to integrate CBRA boundaries into their planning tools and use them to help target their conservation efforts and get more for their money. We believe this will improve customer service and help meet all the intentions of this unique law.

>>>> Download *The Coastal Barrier Resources Act: Harnessing the Power of Market Forces to Conserve America's Coasts and Save Taxpayers' Money* from <http://www.fws.gov/CEP/TaxpayerSavingsfromCBRA.pdf>.

[reprinted from *Watermark* 2003, no. 1, p. 25]

Publications, Software, AV & the Web

The *National Flood Insurance Guide* is a new consumer document from the Federal Emergency Management Agency that explains how the National Flood Insurance Program works. The three-part booklet gives basic information about flood risks; building and contents coverage; tips for protecting homes and belongings; and activities that individuals, organizations, and governments can take to build flood-resilient communities. A description of the mandatory purchase requirement and explanations of FEMA programs that provide mitigation and planning assistance in coping with flood are also included. The booklet is publication F-550 and can be ordered by calling 1-800-480-2520 or downloaded from <http://www.fema.gov/doc/library/nfipdescrip.doc>.

Flood Hazard Vulnerability: A Study of Tropical Storm Allison Flood Impacts and Adaptation Modes in Louisiana discusses the impacts of Tropical Storm Allison, which caused severe flood damage in June 2001 to several communities in Louisiana. The factors associated with increased vulnerability of people to flood hazards and flood victims' modes of adaptation and coping were explored through a survey of 149 afflicted households, and the results are presented here. Francis O. Adeola. 2003. QR 162. Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center. Available at <http://www.colorado.edu/hazards/qr/qr.html>.

“Using GIS to Demonstrate Successful Floodplain Management” is the title of a compact disk with information about how communities can use geographic information systems (GISs) to promote flood hazard mitigation. The CD includes a PowerPoint presentation; several GIS maps that demonstrate ways to display combinations of spatial data such as mapped floodplains, flood damage, evacuation routes, and property acquisitions; a case study of innovative floodplain management in Kinston-Lenoir County, North Carolina; and a list of internet resources. Available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency Distribution Center by calling 1-800-480-2520; fax: (301) 362-5335.

The *Catalog of Federal Funding Sources for Watershed Protection* is now online as an easy-to-use, searchable website that provides information for practitioners and others on 84 federal funding sources for various watershed-related projects. The website updates the Environmental Protection Agency’s previous catalog, published in 1999. The website, which EPA plans to update regularly, was developed by the EPA’s Office of Water Finance Work Group with representatives from the Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds; Office of Wastewater Management; and Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water. For more information call 1-800-490-9198 or access the catalog at <http://www.epa.gov/watershedfunding>.

The Federal Alliance For Safe Homes—FLASH, Inc., has unveiled an improved website that offers disaster safety tips; property protection information; and resource links for flood, hurricane, lightning, and other hazards. Visit at <http://www.flash.org>.

Floods, Droughts and Climate Change provides an introduction to climate patterns that links isolated and dramatic events to the forces, human and otherwise, behind the weather. The authors describe climate variability and its impacts, emphasizing the natural, long-term mechanisms of climate change. Topics also include the atmosphere, the geology of climate, winds, oceans and air, climate history, El Niño, hurricanes, and global warming. Michael Collier and Robert H. Webb. 2002. 160 pp. \$17.95. To purchase a copy, contact the University of Arizona Press, 355 South Euclid, Suite 103, Tucson, AZ 85719; (520) 621-1441; fax: (520) 621-8899; <http://www.uapress.arizona.edu>.

The Jefferson County, West Virginia, Project Impact team maintains a collection of materials for conducting flood and other hazard-related outreach and education for children of all ages. Recent additions to their collection include four stories in which children (or animals) and their families experience hurricanes, thunderstorms, and related phenomena: *The Storm*, by Kathy Henderson (ages 4–8); *The Storm Book*, by Charlotte Zolotow (ages 3–7); *Storm in the Night*, by Pat Cummings, (Ages 4–8); and *Chimp and Zee and The Big Storm*, by Catherine and Laurence Anholt (ages 4–8). *Floods—A True Book*, by Paul P. and Diane M. Sipiera (ages 9–12), is a nonfiction collection of flood facts and how floods start. To find out more about the usefulness of these titles, or to share information about other materials suitable for children, contact Barb Miller, Project Impact Coordinator, Jefferson County, West Virginia, at (304) 728-3329 or bmiller@jeffersoncountywv.org.

Calendar

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

June 16–20, 2003: 21ST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON LARGE DAMS, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Dam Association and others. Contact Lise Pinsonneault, Communications Committee, CIGB-ICOLD Montreal 2003, 75 W. Renee-Levesque Blvd., 21st Floor, Montreal, Quebec, H27 1A4, Canada; (514) 289-4628; fax: (514) 289-4546; pinsonneault.lise@hydro.qc.ca or see <http://www.cigb-icold.org>.

June 22–25, 2003: WORKING TOGETHER: 13TH WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Centre for Emergency Preparedness. Contact World Conference on Disaster Management, (416) 595-1414 or see <http://www.wcdm.org>.

July 13–17, 2003: COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT THROUGH TIME, Baltimore, Maryland. Sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Coastal Services Center. Contact Jan Kucklick, NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2234 So. Hobson Ave., Charleston, SC 29405-2413; (843) 740-1279; Jan.Kucklick@noaa.gov or see <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/cz2003/>.

- July 28–31, 2003:** STORMCON '03, THE NORTH AMERICAN SURFACE WATER QUALITY CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION, San Antonio, Texas. Sponsored by Forester Communications and *Stormwater* magazine. For more information, see <http://www.stormcon.com>.
- August 11–15, 2003:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact 1-800-238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- August 27–29, 2003:** FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE OHIO FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Columbus, Ohio. Contact Christopher Thoms, Conference Chair, at (614) 265-6752 or see <http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/water/>.
- September 6–13, 2003:** TOWARD NATURAL FLOOD PROTECTION STRATEGIES, Warsaw, Poland. Sponsored by the Institute for Land Reclamation and Grasslands Farming. Contact ECOFLOOD, Department of Nature Protection in Rural Areas, Institute for Land Reclamation and Grassland Farming (IMUZ), Falenty, 05-090, Raszyn, Poland; +48-22-7200531; ecoflood@levis.sggw.waw.pl or see <http://www.imuz.edu.pl/imuz.htm>.
- September 7–10, 2003:** DAM SAFETY 2003, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Sponsored by the Association of State Dam Safety Officials. Contact ASDSO at 450 Old Vine St., 2nd Floor, Lexington, KY 40507; (859) 257-5140; fax: (859) 323-1958; info@damsafety.org or see <http://www.damsafety.org/conferences.cfm?content=annual>.
- September 10–12, 2003:** 7TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE INDIANA ASSOCIATION FOR FLOODPLAIN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, Lake Monroe, Indiana. Contact Jon Stolz, INAFSM Vice President and 2003 Conference Chair, at jstolz@cbbel-in.com.
- September 10–12, 2003:** SAFER SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES: 2003 AUSTRALIAN DISASTERS CONFERENCE, Canberra, Australia. Sponsored by Emergency Management Australia. Contact EMA at P.O. Box 1020, Dickson, Australian Capital Territory 2602, Australia; 61 (0) 2 6232 4240; enquiry@einsteinandedison.com.au; http://www.ema.gov.au/fs-call_for_abstracts.html.
- September 14–17, 2003:** FLOODING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES FOR VENICE AND ITS LAGOON: STATE OF KNOWLEDGE 2003, Cambridge, England. Sponsored by Churchill College. Contact Venice 2003, Cambridge Coastal Research Unit, Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 3EN U.K.; +44-1223-766578; venice2003@geog.cam.ac.uk; or see <http://ccru.geog.cam.ac.uk/events/venice2003>.
- September 15–19, 2003:** MANAGING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358; <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- September 15–26, 2003:** FIFTH COURSE ON FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT, Beijing, China. Sponsored by the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center. Contact ADPC, P.O. Box 4, Klong Luang, Pathumthani 12120, Thailand; (66-2) 516-5900-10; tedadpc@adpc.net or see <http://www.adpc.net/training/tefrm5.html>.
- September 17–20, 2003:** SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES OF ARIZONA'S REGIONAL WATERSHEDS, Mesa, Arizona. Sponsored by the Arizona Hydrological Society and others. Contact Pete Kroopnick at (602) 567-3850, PKroopnick@brwncaid.com or see <http://www.azhydrosoc.org>.
- September 22–26, 2003:** THE COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Call 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- September 28—October 3, 2003:** RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- September 29—October 10, 2003:** HEALTHY WATERSHEDS: COMMUNITY-BASED PARTNERSHIP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DECISION-MAKING, Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Office of Personnel Management. Registration deadline is June 30. Contact Phyllis O'Meara, (303) 671-1010; Theresa Trainor at (202) 566-1250, trainor.theresa@epa.gov or see <http://www.leadership.opm.gov>.
- October 5–9, 2003:** XI WORLD WATER CONGRESS: WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN THE 21ST CENTURY, Madrid, Spain. Sponsored by the International Water Resources Association (IWRA). Contact the XI Water Congress, Centro de Estudios Hidrograficos, Paseo Bajo Virgen del Puerto, 3, 280005, Madrid, Spain; mwwater2003@cedex.es or see http://www.cedex.es/iwracongress2003/en/hoja2_en.htm.

- October 20–24, 2003:** LANDSCAPE SCALE WETLAND ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT: ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE WETLAND MANAGERS, Nashua, New Hampshire. See <http://aswm.org/calendar/2003am/>.
- October 21–24, 2003:** FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, TECHNOLOGIES AND PREPAREDNESS, FIFTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL HYDROLOGIC WARNING COUNCIL AND 14TH CONFERENCE OF THE SOUTHWESTERN ASSOCIATION OF ALERT SYSTEMS, Dallas, Texas. Abstracts are due July 1, 2003. Contact Dan Miller at (913) 895-6032, dmiller@opkansas.org or Steve Waters at (602) 506-1501, sdw@mail.maricopa.gov, or see <http://www.altersystems.org>.
- October 30–31, 2003:** ECOSYSTEMS: RESTORATION & CREATION: 30TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, Tampa, Florida. Sponsored by Hillsborough Community College. Abstracts are due June 30, 2003. See <http://www.hccfl.edu/depts/detp/eco-conf.html>.
- November 3–6, 2003:** ANNUAL WATER RESOURCES CONFERENCE, San Diego, California. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See <http://www.awra.org/meetings/California2003/index.html>.
- November 10–14, 2003:** 30TH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON REMOTE SENSING OF THE ENVIRONMENT, Honolulu, Hawaii. See <http://www.symposia.org>.
- November 13-14, 2003:** SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR FLOODPLAIN, STORMWATER AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT, Wisconsin Dells, Wisconsin. Contact Dan Cook, Conference Chair, at (414) 266-1500, dan.cook@gasai.com, or Dave Fowler, Chair, WAFSCM at (414) 277-6368, dfowler@mmsd.com.
- November 15–19, 2003:** ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS, Orlando, Florida. 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>.
- November 16–18, 2003:** THIRD NATIONAL TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD SCIENCE AND POLICY CONFERENCE, Chicago, Illinois. Sponsored by the Water Environment Federation, Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Geological Survey, and others. See <http://www.wef.org/pdf/files/TMDL03Call.pdf>.
- November 17–19, 2003:** RESTORING STREAMS, RIPARIAN AREAS, AND FLOODPLAINS IN THE SOUTHWEST: SECOND SOUTHWEST TRAINING WORKSHOP AND SYMPOSIUM, Socorro, New Mexico. Sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and others. Contact Jon Kusler at (518) 872-1804; aswm@aswm.org or see the call for papers at <http://www.aswm.org/calendar/southwest/index2003.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>.
- May 16–21, 2004:** 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>.
- July 11–14, 2004:** WATERSHED2004, Dearborn, Michigan. Sponsored by the Water Environment Federation. Abstracts are due August 1, 2003. See <http://www.wef.org/Conferences/>.
- November 1–4, 2004:** ANNUAL WATER RESOURCE CONFERENCE, Orlando, Florida. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association. See <http://www.awra.org>.
- November 6–9, 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>.



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 ©2003 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@attbi.com.

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
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

SECRETARY

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

VICE CHAIR

Jason Donham
NFIP Coordinator
Arkansas Soil & Water
Conservation Commission
101 E. Capitol Ave., Ste. 350
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 682-3907
fax: 501-682-3991
jason.donham@mail.state.ar.us

TREASURER

William Nechamen
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
ASFPM Executive Office
larry@floods.org