



Vol. 14, No. 5
October 2002

ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, INC.

THIRTY YEARS UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

Editor's note: This month marks the 30th anniversary of the passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act, groundbreaking legislation that has brought a remarkable degree of balance and scientific understanding to the nation's use and protection of its coastal areas. The CZM program operates through a state-federal partnership and system of standards and incentives that is in many ways analogous to the framework used to work toward wise floodplain management in the United States. As one way of exploring what the CZMA has meant to the states, Coastal Services magazine interviewed 18 state coastal zone managers, asking about the strengths, areas needing improvement, and future of the CZMA. What those managers said is reported in an article in the magazine's September/October issue, parts of which are reproduced here. The full article, along with the rest of that issue, which contains other perspectives on the CZMA, can be viewed or downloaded at <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/magazine/>.

One of the primary things that has made the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) a success is also what makes it hard to quantify or categorize. This distinctive piece of legislation has over the past 30 years empowered 34 of 35 coastal states and territories to create coastal zone management programs that specifically address their governance and coastal issues.

"Because each state sets its own priorities, coastal management accomplishments vary state to state," notes Tony MacDonald, executive director of the Coastal States Organization. "Louisiana has shown advancement in focusing local communities on the coastal restoration and wetland protection priorities that are so important to that state. In California, we see a lot of focus on reviewing development proposals because of development pressures. In the Great Lakes, there's more of a focus on working with communities and waterfront revitalization. They all work on other things as well, but they each have different priorities."

And then there are the differences between the coastal management programs and the 25 National Estuarine Research Reserves that the CZMA also has created. Trying to match up the successes and needs of regulatory and planning programs with this system of protected area research and education programs is much like trying to compare pelicans to dolphins. What is clear is that the breadth and scope of the act itself has resulted in a coastline that is better planned, regulated, developed, monitored, accessible, restored, appreciated,

researched, understood, and protected than it would have been without the CZMA.

There also are many ways in which the managers interviewed for this article thought that the program could be strengthened. And there is the sense that now is the time to plan for the CZMA's next 30 years to try to get in front of issues such as coastal population growth, climate change, ocean management, and many more.

The Legislation

The CZMA was passed in October 1972. It created a state-federal partnership that leaves day-to-day coastal management decisions to states that have federally approved coastal programs. Through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the federal government provides financial and technical incentives for coastal states to manage their coastal zones in a manner consistent with CZMA standards and goals, which are to preserve and protect coastal resources while allowing compatible economic growth. Every coastal state and territory but Illinois participates in the program.

The National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) also was established by the CZMA. Federal and state authorities work together to establish, manage, and maintain these representative estuarine ecosystems, and to provide for their long-term stewardship. The reserves serve as "living laboratories" where research

[continued on page 10]

from the Chair

George Riedel

The President's Fiscal Year 2002 budget is not a "done deal." We are hearing that the entire \$300 million dollars requested for flood mapping may not remain in the budget [see article on page 7].

It is apparent that, with the anticipated program for modernizing the flood hazards maps, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will be undertaking the National Flood Insurance Program's most significant mapping effort since the program's inception. All members of the Association of State Floodplain Managers need to educate their Congressional representatives about the importance of this \$300 million funding for FEMA's map modernization and the significance of improved maps to their own states and localities. Members should emphasize to their Congressional representatives that this \$300 million is just the first payment in a multi-year plan for map modernization. This education needs to be done immediately.

The ASFPM is continuing to work with the Mapping Coalition to try to ensure that the full \$300 million remains in the budget.

The proposed creation of a Department of Homeland Security is still being hotly debated. Some members of Congress have expressed concerns about putting FEMA into this new department. The ASFPM believes that the nation may be better served if FEMA remains as a separate agency. However, if FEMA is included, it

should be a separate entity within the new department, to ensure that its capacity to reduce damage and suffering caused by natural disasters is not lost.

The ASFPM fully supports the President's efforts to strengthen our nation's ability to provide security and protection from terrorism. However, we need to ensure that the nation does not lose its focus on damage and suffering caused by natural hazards. We need to ensure that we retain and enhance the capability and programs—especially mitigation programs—that FEMA has built over the years.

Members are urged to share these ideas and thoughts with their Congressional leaders. The ASFPM will continue to promote these notions throughout the hearings and adoption process.

* * *

Don't forget that the deadline for submitting an abstract for a presentation at the ASFPM's next annual conference is fast approaching! Abstracts are due October 18, 2002 for "Lessons Learned, Gateway to Flood Mitigation," in St. Louis, Missouri, May 11-16, 2003. More details are on the Call for Abstracts at <http://www.floods.org/StLouis>, along with an authors' submittal form. All it takes is a simple paragraph explaining your paper or presentation.

However, there is still plenty of time (until March 1, 2003) to nominate an outstanding local or state program or person for one of the national awards in floodplain management. The submittal information is at <http://www.floods.org/awards.htm>, along with a list of past recipients and their projects or programs. □

Graduate Fellowship Awarded

The Graduate Fellowship in Floodplain Management for 2002–2003 has been awarded to Mary Margaret Shaw, a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Her project, "Urban Containment: Impacts Upon Residential Development Decisions and Development in Areas Subject to Natural Hazards" will address the problem of residential development in floodplains by looking beyond homeowners to the decisionmakers and others who make the provision of infrastructure in floodprone areas possible. According to Raymond J. Burby, her academic advisor, Shaw's work is the first to address a serious issue for flood hazard mitigation: the potential for urban containment programs (especially those involving growth boundaries, green belts, and utility extension policy) to increase development pressures on urban floodplains when outlying areas become off limits. "With appropriate floodplain management measures, planners can counter this threat," Burby says, "but the record to date indicates that in many planning agencies, floodplain management and hazard mitigation receive little attention. By shedding light on this issue and devising appropriate tools for coupling urban containment programs with appropriate floodplain management tools, Shaw's research will help insure that smart growth is also safe growth."

The \$25,000 Fellowship is awarded each year by the ASFPM, with sponsorship from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

NO ADVERSE IMPACT QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

This column explores the details and nationwide applicability of the ASFPM's "no adverse impact" approach to floodplain management. Your questions about NAI can be sent to the Editor at the email address on the last page.

QUESTION What good are all the 100-year floodplain maps if my community adopts NAI?

ANSWER A major benefit of using the NAI approach is to preserve the integrity of the flood maps for your community. What happens now is that the maps are produced based on today's conditions in the watershed. As development occurs over the years, both inside and outside the floodplain, flood levels increase. This is caused by a number of things. For example, when development changes forests or farm fields into rooftops and parking lots, more runoff enters the stream from the same rainfall event. That increased runoff results in higher flood elevations. Higher flood elevations result in more flood damage—both to structures that existed before the new development occurred and to those built during and after the ongoing development—because most communities require building only to the flood height based on the conditions that existed when the maps were made.

The result is the need to continuously update the maps to keep current with increased runoff. By computing runoff based on projected future development, the community can ensure that its new development is protected from those future floods. Further, the maps will stay current, rather than becoming obsolete in a few years (this is especially true in rapidly developing areas).

A number of progressive communities also adopt development policies and stormwater regulations that have the goal of containing the increased runoff within the development. There are a number of ways to accomplish this, and it must be done carefully, or it could exacerbate the runoff during certain events.

QUESTION Why should my community have an NAI standard, when it is clear that a single development action in the floodplain doesn't have any effect?

ANSWER The case above illustrates why considering a single development by itself is not effective in preventing increased flood levels and damage. In high school science many of us did the experiment where we filled a glass with water, and then dropped pennies into it. We were amazed that we could get a large number of pennies into the glass, one by one, without its overflowing. But at some point the glass did overflow. By failing to consider the cumulative impacts of all potential development, we ignore the fact that eventually, flood levels will be increased significantly. More importantly, we miss the issue of "fairness." Property rights are not "first come, first served." A community that uses that approach leaves itself open to court action that would probably tell them they cannot restrict one property owner from doing something that others could do—when the circumstances are not different.

Communities can account for this and treat all property owners fairly by having a comprehensive plan for the watershed that is based on all planned future development, and then calculating all that development's impacts on flood levels. If there are adverse impacts, they would be mitigated in the plan through various techniques that could include development policies, runoff requirements, appropriate mapping, and better management. There is no one solution to this—a community may select from a variety of tools to mitigate the impacts. When it does, its citizens are protected, its maps remain current, and all property owners are treated fairly. This approach does not prevent development; instead, it works to protect the community's investments for current and future development. □

Learn More about NAI

For too long, flood losses in the United States have continued to rise, despite the best efforts of everyone concerned with floodplain management. The ASFPM believes that this situation can best be remedied by adopting a much broader 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>.

Whither the *NOTEbook*?

For many issues our regular feature, "A Floodplain Manager's Notebook," provided concise descriptions, usually with accompanying graphics, of solutions to common questions and situations faced by floodplain managers.

You may have noticed that the NOTEbook has been missing of late. That is not because we think the nuggets are no longer useful, but simply because our principal (in fact, sole) contributor has been busy with other projects. We know everyone has their favorite way of explaining to local officials, property owners, and others the intricacies of proper floodplain management. Please feel free to send your ideas for future NOTEbook pieces to the Editor at the address on the back page. They are always welcome.

>>> Meanwhile, you can access the previous NOTEbook pages on the website of RCQuinn Consulting, Inc. at <http://www.rcquinnconsulting.com>.

State and Local Report

PRINCEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA CELEBRATES NEW RIVER TRAIL

The City of Princeville unveiled the first three miles of the community's first walking trail early this summer, at a celebration and cook-out. The National Park Service's Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA) helped the Princeville Tourism and Historical Society and citizens from throughout the community plan a system of multi-use trails linking significant community resources. The trail network will also include interpretive signage describing the history of the town and its citizens. This first trail segment is along the newly rebuilt levee along the Tar River. Princeville was inundated with flooding in 1999 and has used this heritage trail to spur interest in the rebirth of the community, which is the oldest town in America incorporated by African Americans.

>>> For more information, contact Chris Abbett at (404) 562-3175 x522; chris_abbett@nps.gov.

CITIES AND COUNTIES MITIGATE DISASTERS TOGETHER

Licking County, Ohio, with a history of local flooding and dangerous logjams in the south fork of the Licking River, has recently established a broad-based disaster mitigation initiative aimed at building a more sustainable community. In the past, very little had been done about the logjam problem, outside of cleaning up after the latest flood or hurricane. But increased education on behalf of the local elected leadership, combined with the frustration of community and business leaders over

perpetual rebuilding, caused a shift in thinking. They came together to focus on the logjam situation, and the conversations shifted towards steps they could take toward mitigation. They ended up forming the Licking County Community Partners, and designated clearing and preventing logjams as a top priority in reducing the county's flood risks. A combination of local business contributions, federal funds, state and local matches, and other support has resulted not only in action on the logjams but also in disaster-resistance activities like updating floodplain maps, providing local grants for retrofitting homes, and implementing a public awareness campaign. Having realized the benefits of proactive planning and partnership, Licking is working to form a Disaster Recovery Business Alliance, implement an improved Emergency Broadcasting System, and other projects aimed at mitigating losses.

The Licking, Ohio, story is one of eight studies of partnerships formed between cities and counties for purposes of disaster mitigation that are profiled in a new report by the Joint Center for Sustainable Communities, an advisory committee for the National Association of Counties (NACo). The 31-page report, *City/County Collaborations on Disaster Mitigation: Borderless Solutions to a Borderless Problem* profiles municipalities ranging from rural counties to small cities from eight states, dealing with flooding, hurricanes, tornadoes, and other hazards.

>>> For more information, contact Martin Harris, NACo, Joint Center for Sustainable Communities, 440 First Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001; (202) 661-8805; fax: (202) 737-0480; mharris@naco.org. Copies are available at http://www.naco.org/programs/comm_dev/center/disasterbook.pdf.

[continued on page 5]

State and Local Report (cont.)

STATE ASSOCIATIONS CHRONICLED

The development and accomplishments of the 25 state- (and region-) based associations for floodplain managers across the nation are catalogued in a new report just issued by the Association of State Floodplain Managers. These groups have been forming since the early 1980s and many have become Chapters of the ASFPM.

The report has lists and tables showing the range of state association activities and achievements, including newsletters, conferences, state legislation and funding, websites, certification programs, training, publications, and other programs. A thoughtful commentary helps set the data in context. Summaries provided by each state association show the diversity among the groups, listing additional historical facts, milestones, and outlooks for the future. The ASFPM will update the report annually, and invites the submission of data any time during the year to asfpm@floods.org.

>>> *The History and Future of State and Regional Floodplain Management Associations* was compiled by Les Bond, LA Bond Associates, Executive Director of the New Mexico Floodplain Managers Association and also past Chair of the Arizona Floodplain Managers Association. The 37-page report is available at <http://www.floods.org>.

LOUISIANA MAKES ACCESS TO LOCAL OFFICIALS EASIER

Visitors to LouisianaFloods, the excellent website hosted by the Louisiana State University AgCenter, can now quickly find specific contact information for their own local floodplain administrator. The new convenience is a result of a cooperative arrangement between the AgCenter and the State National Flood Insurance Program Coordinating Office (the Louisiana Department of Transportation & Development).

DOTD routinely keeps contact information on all the state's local building officials in a database (they use Microsoft Excel). The state office provided the AgCenter with a copy of the file. The fields were altered slightly, converted to Access/SQL, and a display screen for the website was generated, delineating the information by parish (county). Links were then set to various websites as needed. A private screen was also set up, through which DOTD can edit or update the data as needed.

Among the features shown on the Louisiana site are the name, address, phone, and email of the person responsible for floodplain management (building inspector, city clerk, permit officer, etc.) at the municipal and parish level; and the name of the local CEO. Other pieces of information could easily be added, such as the CRS class of the community, whether the local officials have CFM status, or the name of the CRS Coordinator.

Check out these websites to see how the contact information for Louisiana local officials is displayed and

linked to other sites, and how useful this kind of arrangement could be for your state.

- http://www.louisianafloods.org/Maps_Finding.asp
- http://www.louisianafloods.org/Maps_Finding.asp
- http://www.louisianafloods.org/Maps_Permit_Office.asp
- <http://www.agctr.lsu.edu/eden/mem-check.asp?state=Louisiana>

>>> For more information about how the links and database were integrated, contact Pat Skinner at pskinner@agctr.lsu.edu.

COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM SPECIALISTS NEEDED

With the growth of the Community Rating System (CRS) and some turnover in staff who have responsibility for CRS activities, the Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO) is looking for one or two ISO/CRS Specialists. These are technical staff who are responsible for reviewing community applications for CRS classification and verifying implementation of activities credited by the CRS.

- Location—anywhere west of the Mississippi River will be considered
- Salary range is open, approximately equivalent to a GS grade 12
- Experience—knowledge of the Community Rating System and the National Flood Insurance Program is needed. Preference will be given to those who are Certified Floodplain Managers and have graduated from the CRS course at the Emergency Management Institute.

>>> Obtain more information or send resumes to Bill Trakimas, P.O. Box 501016, Indianapolis, IN 46250-1016; (317) 848-2898; wtrakimas@iso.com.

ASFPM HIRING PROJECT MANAGER

The Board of Directors of the Association of State Floodplain Managers has created a position of Project Manager to increase the ASFPM's capability to more effectively meet its mission and goals and better serve its members. This professional staff position, located in the ASFPM Executive Office in Madison, Wisconsin, will develop, procure, and manage grants and contracts for policy analysis projects, educational programs, and workshops.

>>> See the full position description and application process at <http://www.floods.org/projmgr.pdf>.

Washington Report

COMPETITIVE MITIGATION GRANTS PONDERED

In late September the ASFPM provided comments on a competitive pre-disaster mitigation grant process included in the President's proposed FY 2003 budget [see article on Appropriations, this page]. Although it is not certain that the new program will be included in the final appropriations, or what role the agency will play, the Federal Emergency Management Agency sought input on the proposal from its partners and stakeholders, through a notice in the *Federal Register* (Vol. 67, no. 151, pp. 50890-50891) and via a "listening session" in mid August (in which the ASFPM also participated).

The ASFPM opposes elimination of the existing Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) in favor of a competitive pre-disaster program as called for in the President's budget, but at the same time recognizes the need for and endorses pre-disaster mitigation funding. Among the many ASFPM recommendations were:

- a "cost effectiveness" approach should be continued in any new mitigation grant program, as opposed to relying solely on benefit/cost analyses;
- there should be an ongoing role for the states to help develop plans, prioritize projects, and coordinate between local jurisdictions and FEMA;
- any new pre-disaster mitigation program authorized under the Stafford Act should maintain the focus on natural hazards, for which the President declares an average of nearly 50 major disasters every year. Other programs are or will be created to address terrorism threats.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE— A VERY UNCLEAR PICTURE

A staff member for the House Appropriations Committee summed up the status of Congressional activity recently by saying, "Anyone who says they know what is going to happen, doesn't know." So Capitol Hill is a swirl of hearsay, guesswork, and rumor just now.

After a good deal of action on appropriations bills in June and July, the pace has dropped off so much since the August recess that it has almost stopped. The end of the fiscal year is upon us. The Interior appropriations bill has stalled on the Senate floor and the prevailing wisdom is that the Congress will pass a Continuing Resolution to continue spending at FY '02 levels. The CR would cover all federal agencies except those funded through the Defense and Military Construction appropriations bills. There could be a CR that would last until after the election, when a lame duck session would finish up

business. There could also be a CR that would extend until early spring—highly unusual, but quite possible.

Legislation to create a Department of Homeland Security has also stalled on the Senate floor. The House had passed its version, H.R. 5005, in July. Whether or not Congress will complete action on this measure, which would likely include the Federal Emergency Management Agency, remains to be seen.

Appropriations

Chairman C.W. Bill Young (R-FL) introduced a short-term Continuing Resolution (H.J. Res. 111) on September 25th to keep the government funded at FY '02 levels until October 4th.

All 13 regular appropriations bills have been reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee and three have passed the full Senate (Defense, Military Construction, and Legislative Branch). Only eight of the bills have been reported out of the House committee, but five have passed the full House (Defense, Military Construction, Legislative Branch, Interior, and Treasury/Postal Service). The committee has scheduled markups on the D.C. and Transportation bills for September 26th. A major problem in concluding action on all these bills is that the budget ceilings allocated to the various subcommittees are generally higher in the Senate than in the House.

The VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill, which funds FEMA, has not been marked up in the House subcommittee yet. It is still possible that the subcommittee could mark up in early October.

Despite strong support for FEMA's flood map modernization initiative in the House Subcommittee, it seems likely that the bill will not approve the full \$300 million requested for mapping. The Senate bill (S. 2797), which has been reported out of committee, includes the \$300 million. The Administration had also sought \$300 million for a new, competitive, pre-disaster mitigation program and assumed that the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program would not be utilized. After hearing from a number of groups and individuals, the Director of FEMA did indicate in appropriations hearings that he thought a balance between a pre-disaster competitive grant program and the post-disaster, formula-based HMGP would be a better approach [see the article on the ASFPM's comments, above]. The Senate bill funded a pilot competitive grant program at \$25 million and indicated that HMGP should continue as usual. The Committee Report (S. Rept. 107-222) states that any such change should be studied by the authorizing committee.

The Energy and Water Appropriations bill reported out by the Senate committee (S. 2784) is \$788 million over the President's request and \$1.1 billion over FY '02. The House bill is \$516 million over the President's

[continued on page 7]

request and \$857 million over FY '02. The Senate bills would fund Flood Plain Management Services at \$9 million (the request was \$7.5 million) and Section 22 Planning Assistance to States at \$8.3 million (\$6 million requested). Section 206, Aquatic Ecosystems Restoration, would be funded at \$20 million (\$10 million requested). The House Energy and Water Appropriations Bill (H.R. 5431) was reported out on September 5th.

In the Interior Appropriations Bills (H.R. 5093 and S. 2708), funding for many U.S. Geological Survey programs was restored to at least the FY '02 level, since the Administration's budget request seriously reduced funding. Mapping and Water Resources programs were among those restored.

Additional appropriations details were given in the August 2002 issue of *News and Views*.

Department of Homeland Security

The House of Representatives passed its bill, H.R. 5005, in July. House leaders had appointed a Select Committee on Homeland Security to facilitate consideration of the bill. The measure closely tracks the Administration's proposed legislation to create a new Department of Homeland Security. FEMA, along with a number of other federal agencies or parts of agencies, would be folded into the new department, which would have some 170,000 employees (FEMA has about 2,500).

The Senate Governmental Affairs Committee reported out its bill, S. 2452, on June 24th and it had been debated for three weeks already on the Senate floor in September. Robert Byrd (D-WV) held the floor for much of that time in order to raise issues concerning the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of government, the rights of the Congress to exercise oversight, and the rights of federal employees who would be affected by the transfers of their agencies to the new department. A large number of amendments have been filed for floor consideration. A few deal with FEMA, either proposing that FEMA not be included in the new department, proposing that FEMA retain its agency identity within the new department, or proposing that FEMA's emergency preparedness functions be separated from its natural hazards functions into different parts of the new department. James Jeffords (I-VT), Chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, has filed two FEMA-related amendments, one to keep FEMA a separate agency and another to maintain FEMA as a separate entity within a new department.

Here again predictions are difficult. Some have concerns that if the stalemate on the Senate floor is not broken, no bill will be passed. Others believe that if sufficient support can be gathered for approving the House bill (which has been referred to the Senate), there would be few areas of disagreement between the bills and the matter could be wrapped up without considering all the amendments filed for the Senate's bill.

Water Resources Development Act

The Water Resources Development Act for 2002 (H.R. 5428) was marked up in subcommittee and in the full

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on September 24–25. It authorizes the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and specifically authorizes particular projects for navigation, flood control, shoreline protection, and environmental restoration.

The bill authorizes more than 200 projects at a cost of about \$4 billion. It contains some policy provisions, but none of the so-called Corps reform provisions such as independent review of large projects and revisions to the *Principles and Guidelines*. It does provide the Corps with a new authority to provide technical, planning, and design assistance for watershed projects.

It is possible that the bill will be considered on the House floor as early as the second week of October. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is not likely to mark up a WRDA bill, however.

Dam Safety

The House of Representatives passed the Dam Safety Act (H.R. 4727) on September 5th. The bill reauthorizes the dam safety program for four years and authorizes \$8.6 million each year for state grants and other assistance. The measure directs FEMA to develop a dam safety plan. The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works was scheduled to mark up its version of the bill on September 26th.

Partnerships

The ASFPM has continued to work with the Flood Map Modernization Coalition to explain the critical need for fully up-to-date and modern, digitized maps and their broad utility in providing for the safety of citizens and their property. ASFPM also works with the Rivers and Trails Coalition and other groups to discuss the importance of programs at a variety of federal agencies in enhancing the effectiveness of floodplain managers.

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

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

EQIP FUNDS AVAILABLE

The Department of Agriculture announced an additional \$200 million in FY 2002 funds to provide technical, financial, and educational assistance under the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). Through this allocation, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) state offices will receive allocated funding needed to provide financial and technical assistance to farmers, ranchers, and tribes for conservation practices that improve soil, water, and air quality; wildlife habitat; and surface and ground water conservation on eligible agricultural land, including livestock operations.

>>> For more information, see <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/farmbill/2002> or contact your local NRCS office or conservation district.

ARE WE PLANNING SAFER COMMUNITIES? RESULTS OF A NATIONAL SURVEY OF COMMUNITY PLANNERS

Diana L. McClure
Consultant, Institute for Business and Home Safety
and
Members, Land Use Planning Committee,
Institute for Business and Home Safety

*Editor's note: In the August issue of the **News & Views**, an article by Scott Choquette and Michele Steinberg discussed the implications for mitigation planning and programs at the state level of a recent IBHS survey of municipal planners. Here, in a piece reprinted from the **Natural Hazards Observer**, Diana McClure and the IBHS Land Use Planning Committee explain in some detail the actual survey results, the specific responses of the local planners who participated, and what they mean for local hazards planning overall.*

Property-casualty insurance companies in the United States paid more than \$90 billion to cover catastrophe losses during the 1990s, and local, state, and federal governments paid tens of billions of dollars more. If catastrophe trends continue, as they are projected to do, that decade's enormous losses could eventually become small in comparison. However, with land use planning that takes into account an area's potential disaster risks, many losses could be avoided or reduced. Unfortunately, few communities have fully embraced this approach.

Are We Planning Safer Communities?, a study completed recently by the Institute for Business and Home Safety (IBHS), shows that few communities—including those that recently experienced a catastrophic loss—have comprehensive land use plans that consider natural hazards risks.

IBHS is a national nonprofit organization funded by the insurance industry to reduce deaths, injuries, property damage, economic losses, and human suffering caused by natural disasters. Insurers have long supported efforts to prevent and reduce losses from natural catastrophes through improved building materials and construction techniques, stronger building codes, and other means. Comprehensive land use plans that consider natural catastrophe risks could also do a great deal to mitigate future disasters.

A study completed last year at the University of North Carolina estimates that appropriate land use measures could reduce expected property losses by one-third over the next 50 years (Burby, 2001). The greatest savings come from reducing the effects of landslides and floods. In all cases, maximum savings can be realized only if local comprehensive plans contribute to the effort.

Findings of the National Survey

To learn whether plans incorporate safety elements that could help lower catastrophe risks, IBHS and its Land Use Planning Committee worked with the American Planning Association and the American Institute of Certified Planners to survey municipal land use planners

throughout the United States. Planners in 505 cities and counties in nearly every state responded. IBHS then weighted the data according to geographic distribution of the U.S. population.

To answer the survey, respondents received a booklet compiled by IBHS called "Community Land Use Evaluation for Natural Hazards." They were asked a series of questions, and they provided information about their community, including size, disaster history, and factors they thought might help them to incorporate information about natural hazards into their local plans.

IBHS determined that the ideal local comprehensive plan would address eight elements:

Plan basics—a general or comprehensive plan supported by a professional planning staff;

Quality data—factual data and maps;

Identification of issues—natural hazards and other community issues;

Community support and involvement;

Policies that specifically address hazards;

Coordination—consistency with federal, state, regional, and internal community plans.

Implementation—goals linked to specific actions; and

Organization—a plan that is readable, comprehensible, and easy to use.

To produce a planning safety rating, IBHS used these elements to create a checklist of 71 items that planners could use. The typical community scored 48%, which earned a B minus on the IBHS safety report card. A surprisingly high percentage—8%—scored zero. On average, plans scored well above 50% on four of the eight elements—basics, citizen involvement, consistency, and organization. This is encouraging, because it means that local comprehensive plans provide a good basis for future growth and development. Overall,

[continued on page 9]

though, plans fell short in the areas that are most important for safe growth. They contained 40% or fewer of the items related to vulnerability, identification of issues, new policies and programs, and ways to implement these measures.

Most survey participants said they would be willing to use the information in the booklet to include safety considerations in their plans. However, they also said hazards planning elements would be difficult to implement without public demand as well as additional funding, support from elected officials, and technical assistance to do this type of planning. Other needed support included better mapping and data, state mandates for planning, additional staff, and legislative changes.

Average Scores

Overall Plan Quality = 48%

Plan Basics	66%
Quality of Data	30%
Issues Identified	39%
Community Support	62%
Policies	34%
Coordination	57%
Implementation	39%
Organization	57%

States and Hazard Planning

The importance of interest at the state level was borne out by the sharply higher scores in the six states that require local planning that takes natural hazards into account. This indicates that one key to better performance is state-mandated local comprehensive plans.

Are We Planning Safer Communities? found that a typical municipal land use plan addresses only half the elements that contribute to a safe, hazard-resistant community. Communities in six states scored highest in planning for safety—Florida (statewide), Nevada (large cities and counties only), North Carolina (coastal region communities only), Oregon (statewide), South Carolina (coastal communities only), and Washington (growth management act jurisdictions). These states required local planning, specified that plans must attend to safety from natural hazards, and required that local plans be consistent with state policy. Scores in these six states averaged 55% higher than localities in states that did none of these things.

Where states did not mandate planning but had established specific requirements for intergovernmental consistency and a hazards element in local plans, community scores were nearly 30% higher. Two states—Georgia and Nevada (for smaller cities and counties)—fell into this category.

There was also a significant trend toward higher average scores for communities in states that mandate local comprehensive plans with hazard elements. In states with planning mandates but no requirements for

consistency or hazard safety elements, scores dipped closer to the overall average.

Why Be Concerned?

The need for land use planning with hazards elements is increasing, particularly where the U.S. population is growing, because the greatest growth is occurring on the east and west coasts, along the Gulf of Mexico, and in and around forests and wildlands. These areas are at highest risk for major catastrophes such as hurricanes, earthquakes, landslides, and wildfires.

The United States is already seeing the effects of this growth in high-risk areas. Since 1989, the nation has frequently entered periods in which losses from catastrophic natural disasters averaged about \$1 billion per week. And these losses are expected to continue to rise (Mileti, 1999). This is a disturbing trend for the private and public entities that bear much of the financial risk associated with these losses.

Further, social and economic disruptions and environmental damage caused by natural disasters can affect entire states and regions as well as the nation. Proper land use planning would help ensure that development and redevelopment occurs outside high-risk areas and/or employs mitigation measures to minimize the potential impacts of natural disasters. For instance, in low-lying areas where hurricanes can cause flooding, homes and businesses either would not be allowed or would be built (in conjunction with local building codes) in a manner that mitigates risk.

Hazards safety policies within community plans can make it easier to implement necessary zoning ordinances and building code requirements. Such policies can also help inform municipal departments, real estate developers, and the public about the extent and magnitude of natural hazards risks in a community. □

>>> *Are We Planning Safer Communities? Results of a National Survey of Community Planners and Natural Disasters* (2002, 24 pp.) is available from the IBHS website at http://www.ibhs.org/research_library/view.asp?id=289. Click on “Appendix B” for the survey booklet. The *IBHS Showcase State Model for Natural Disaster Resistance and Resilience*, which includes state and local planning concepts, is also available at http://www.ibhs.org/research_library.

References

Burby, Raymond J., editor. 2001. *Delphi Survey of the Impacts of Hazard Adjustments on Property Losses from Selected Natural Hazards, 2000-2050: Summary of Findings*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Department of City and Regional Planning.

Mileti, Dennis S. 1999. *Disasters by Design: A Reassessment of Natural Hazards in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.

[Reprinted from the *Natural Hazards Observer*, July 2002, p. 1-3]

Coastal Zone Management (cont.)

and education efforts are conducted to help communities understand and address coastal resource issues.

NOAA Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere Tim Keeney notes the act is “a balanced piece of legislation that focuses on protection of coastal resources and the economic development of coastal areas. It really provides the potential for the optimal mix of protection and use of coastal resources.”

Accomplishments

The list of CZMA accomplishments noted by the managers interviewed includes everything from increased public access and improved coastal development to habitat and wetlands protection and restoration, to research and education. Other areas of success include the public’s involvement in and awareness of coastal issues; mitigation of the potential damage from coastal hazards, such as hurricanes; special area management planning; waterfront redevelopment; water quality; erosion; and various partnerships.

The general consensus, however, is that the act’s greatest accomplishment may be the fact that 34 state coastal zone management programs and 25 reserves have been established.

“One of the primary strengths has been that it provided the incentive for states to create coastal management programs to manage these resources Congress found so important to the country,” says Patrick Galvin, director of the Alaska Division of Governmental Coordination. “It’s been very successful in getting states to adopt those plans.”

Gary Lytton, director of the Rookery Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve in Florida, says, “The longer the NERRs [reserves] are in place and are able to implement programs through the NERRS system, the more convinced I am that this is the way to deal with coastal management. It enables state and federal resources to have the most effective impact at the local level. . . . we have to be working with local communities to be having any success at all.”

Some managers say that part of the success of both the coastal programs and reserves is their sum, rather than their parts.

“The strength of the act is tied to the fact that it creates an organization which can coordinate activities on the coast,” says Stuart Stevens, administrator of the Georgia Coastal Management Program. “That’s not clear in the way the law is worded, but in reality that’s what’s happened.”

Strengths

One of the strengths of the CZMA that the managers interviewed for this article agreed upon is the power of the federal consistency clause in the CZMA. Under CZMA, section 307, federal agency activities that affect any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal

zone must be consistent with the enforceable policies of the state coastal program.

“The federal consistency provisions of the federal law are perhaps its most important element,” says Peter Douglas, executive director of the California Coastal Commission. “It’s a significant states’ rights provision.”

In Michigan, according to Catherine Cunningham, chief of the Michigan Coastal Management Program, federal consistency’s power to bring other agencies to the table was primarily responsible for various federal and state governmental agencies and other organizations coming together to save the state’s lighthouses. The Michigan Lighthouse Project, now considered a model by the U.S. Coast Guard, “may never have happened” without the provision.

Federal consistency was the reason Alaska joined the program, explains Patrick Galvin, director of the Alaska Division of Governmental Coordination. “At the time, we were looking at a lot of offshore oil and gas activities, and we were very concerned because of the high-value fisheries and subsistence activities that depend on offshore resources. We had the need for state input in federal decisions, and the CZMA gave us the opportunity to influence federal decisions in ways not previously available to the state.”

The fact that the act is flexible, voluntary for states, and comprehensive in scope seems to be considered both the CZMA’s greatest strength and one of its weaknesses.

“I think one of the strengths of the program has been that while it prescribes for the management of the coastal zone, it allows the states to adopt management mechanisms that best fit within the governmental structure and political organization of those states,” says Rick DeVoe, executive director of the South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium.

John King, acting chief of NOAA’s Coastal Programs Division, agrees that states’ flexibility in implementing the program has been a highlight of the act, but notes “the flip side is that the program objectives are so broad that they are difficult to measure.” New York’s Stafford says that while having a lot of discretion in the act is “good in terms of allowing states to address their own priorities, it’s a weakness in terms of having a strong partnership between state and federal governments to deal with national priorities.”

Room for Improvement

While managers see the CZMA as a cohesive piece of legislation, most say they would like to see more guidance, financing, or national focus in some areas—habitat protection and restoration, ocean management and observing, water quality, hazard mitigation, protected areas, and climate change, to name a few.

Managers suggested creating national marketing plans to increase public awareness and participation in coastal issues; elevating NOAA’s political authority within the administration; focusing on regional issues;

[continued on page 11]

Coastal Zone Management (cont.)

integrating federal environmental statutes; and improving interagency coordination. Other ideas were for providing incentives for local governments; increasing the flexibility in working with nonprofits; providing opportunities for the transfer of technology between state and federal programs; and better focusing national research on state issues.

The biggest debate among managers centers on determining ways to measure coastal management performance and how the program can best address national issues.

"I think the biggest weakness [in the CZMA] is the lack of accountability," says Peter Douglas, "the fact that it does not have a meaningful way to evaluate the real on-the-ground effectiveness of the state coastal management programs."

"I worry about the states having to develop a consistent set of performance indicators," says Michigan's Cunningham. "Because state programs are set up differently it's going to be difficult to develop indicators that are the same for each state. They need to be based on the objectives of the CZMA, but tailored to meet the priorities and resources of that state."

Ralph Cantral, acting chief of NOAA's National Policy and Evaluation Division, agrees that indicators are needed, but acknowledges the difficulty of measuring "what the impact of the act actually is. It's even more difficult because each state adopts its own program. It's hard to get a national picture from that."

One manager noted a concern that "in an attempt to find a way to do evaluations, we'll settle on indicators that are not really pertinent. . . . Our success needs to be measured by how much communities are taking [coastal] issues on and dealing with them on their own."

Stafford is one of the managers calling for more of a focus on national priorities. "It may not be popular to say this, but I think after 30 years, states have a blueprint for what they perceive is needed and are acting on implementing that. Now let us move into the next generation of the act, which needs to be perhaps a rethinking of what the national priorities and problems are, and focusing the base CZM programs on those individual problems."

"This is the push-pull when it comes to the state and federal power struggle," says Galvin. If you push this voluntary program "to the next level where the federal government is requiring a certain level of protection or mandating a certain level of protection, it becomes

questionable how attractive" the program will remain to the states.

The amount and structure of federal funding is another area almost all the managers suggest needs to be changed.

"There needs to be some greater investment if we're really going to make the coastal zone a healthier place from an environmental standpoint, and to provide more human benefits," says Marc Hershman, director of the University of Washington School of Marine Affairs and a member of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

Stuart Stevens says the law capping the amount of federal money available to states is hindering many coastal programs. "It's been in effect for a long time and has never been changed. It needs to be adjusted" to enable the states to keep up with the many coastal issues they face.

The CZMA's Future

Most managers agree that their jobs are going to get harder as more and more people move to coastal areas.

"I think the pressures on the coasts are increasing," says DeVoe. "A lot more people are coming to live, retire, and vacation here. With a lot more people we will see more structures being built, a lot more users of the resources, and with that, user conflicts will increase. Coastal managers are going to feel this pressure themselves in trying to meet those challenges and balance

all these interests."

Managers note that they also will be facing new challenges as well, such as ocean and watershed management, sea level rise, and climate change. Most predict that closer partnerships of all kinds will be necessary to address future coastal issues.

The majority of managers say they are hopeful that the creation of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, which was appointed by President George Bush to conduct a two-year study to recommend broad policies for how the U.S. addresses its coastal and ocean areas, will result in improved coastal management.

"I think the ocean commission has our future in their hands," Stevens says. "The commission is in the right position to make recommendations that could completely change the way we do business [in the future.]. It could be either good or bad. We need to get involved to make sure it's good."

Peter Douglas adds, "Protecting coasts is like protecting coveted geography everywhere; it's never finished. It's always being done. Coastal zone management is here to stay. Our coasts need it, the public demands it, and future generations deserve it."

[Excerpted from *Coastal Services*, September/October 2002, pp. 4-7]

Publications, Software, AV & the Web

The website of the Federal Emergency Management Agency has been undergoing redesign and updating. If you have looked for a favorite publication or other item recently, you may have found that it isn't where it used to be. For some of the URLs, you can access the new location simply by typing in "shtm" instead of "htm" as the extension. For others, try searching the site or surfing. Some, unfortunately, seem to have disappeared, at least temporarily. FEMA is still working on the redesign, and comments and suggestions can be sent to Donna Hurdle at donna.hurdle@fema.gov.

The ASFPM's Mapping & Engineering Standards Committee has arranged for a web-based "message board" to facilitate ongoing discussions about floodplain mapping implementation. The ASFPM will be using the new message board to provide information to its members on floodplain mapping and to promote discussion on this major new national initiative that has the potential to result in quality floodplain maps. The link for the message board is <http://www.agctr.lsu.edu/eden/forum/>. (Click on "register" at the top first, to enter a user name and password for yourself; then you can log in). It was set up through the generosity of Pat Skinner and the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

In addition, summaries of the mapping discussions held at the ASFPM's conference in Phoenix in June, ASFPM's comments on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's April draft Map Modernization Implementation plan, and other related issues are posted on the M&E Committee web page on the ASFPM website at <http://www.floods.org>.

The Emergency Management Listserve promotes discussion of legislative and regulatory issues and related items of interest to disaster types, including floodplain managers, and is especially helpful because it lists new bills and *Federal Register* notices. Check them out at <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/emlegislation/>.

The *Program Description of the National Flood Insurance Program* was updated in August and has been posted on the website of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The new version includes some editorial changes and some updates, such as a reference to the new "Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners," and some changes to the descriptions of the Map Modernization Program and the mandatory purchase requirements. The 36-page document gives an overview of the NFIP and concise sections on such topics as how flood-prone areas are identified and mapped; the floodplain management requirements a community must adopt and enforce; FEMA's community assistance and monitoring activities; how flood insurance is sold; what structures are eligible for flood insurance coverage and the amount of coverage available; the Community Rating System; and the Flood Mitigation Assistance program. A glossary of terms and acronyms is appended. So that it can be used as a standard resource and guide to the NFIP, the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration intends to keep this document updated, particularly when major program changes occur or when any of the data or information in the description becomes significantly outdated. An initial update will probably be done sometime in 2003. The *Program Description* is posted at <http://www.fema.gov/doc/library/nfipdescrip.doc> and also at <http://www.fema.gov/nfip/libfacts.htm> (click on Flood Insurance Library, then on Publications, then on General Publications).

A Review of Statewide Watershed Management Approaches is the final report of an assessment, conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Water, of the experiences of eight states (Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Washington) in implementing statewide approaches to managing watersheds to achieve requirements of the Clean Water Act. Among the conclusions reached are: (1) The trend in state watershed management appears to be toward a localized, partnership-based approach driven by multi-stakeholder teams; (2) the watershed approach has resulted in improved interagency coordination, enhanced public involvement, and better CWA program management (e.g., better data, improved capability for developing total maximum daily loads, and more efficient and equitable NPDES permitting); (3) interagency coordination is not as successful as it could be or needs to be; and (4) many states believe that EPA has not demonstrated enough support or sensitivity to state watershed management in its rules, policies, and oversight, and needs to go beyond providing training and technical assistance to also identify and eliminate the barriers and constraints that its rules, policies, organizational structures, and oversight practices pose to state watershed efforts. 2002. 68 pp. The report is available at http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/approaches_fr.pdf. For more information, contact John Kuriawa at (202) 566-1303 or Kuriawa.John@epa.gov.

An Evaluation of the Boulder Creek Local Flood Warning System provides a brief overview of the nationally recognized flash flood warning system in Boulder, reviews detection and warning practices in other communities, presents a survey of local emergency planning officials and residents along Boulder Creek, and reviews flash flood plans for several non-residential Boulder floodplain occupants. Even if all aspects of the warning system worked perfectly, a flash flood might take many lives. The authors make recommendations for public education, use of new technologies and new education techniques, and the involvement of local businesses and schools in the warning system. Eve Gruntfest, Kim Carsell, and Tom Plush. 2002. 100 pp. Copies are available from the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, P.O. Box 7150, Colorado Springs, CO 80933; ecg@uccs.edu.
[excerpted from the *Natural Hazards Observer*, July 2002, p. 25]

Flood Damage in the United States, 1926-2000: A Reanalysis of National Weather Service Estimates updates, extends, and re-analyzes the nation's flood damage data. The damage figures examined in the report were collected by the National Weather Service between 1925 and 2000, and are estimates of direct physical damage due to flooding that results from rainfall or snowmelt. The data are obtained from diverse sources and compiled soon after each flood, but historically have not been verified by comparison with actual expenditures. A primary objective of the study, therefore, was to examine the scope, accuracy, and consistency of the NWS damage estimates with the goal of improving the data sets and offering recommendations on how they can be appropriately used and interpreted. The authors provide flood damage data in a national data set, a state-level data set, and a drainage basin data set, along with links related to flood damage data and recommendations for further reading. Roger A. Pielke, Jr., Mary W. Downton, and J. Zoe Barnard Miller. Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado. Available at <http://www.flooddamagedata.org>.

Benefits of Flood Mitigation in Australia identifies the substantial costs savings to both communities and government in five case studies of flood mitigation. The studies examine a wide variety of mitigation measures such as land use planning, voluntary purchase, building controls, levees, and road sealing. The Australian government allocates financial resources to mitigate the impact of floods through the use of various tools and measures; however, little work has been done to assess the effectiveness of such mitigation. The Australian Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics Report 106. 2002. Free from GPO Box 501, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia; 6 (126) 274-7210; fax: 6 (126) 274-6816. Also available at <http://www.btre.gov.au/recent.htm#Top>.
[excerpted from the *Natural Hazards Observer*, September 2002, p. 22]

Calendar

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

October 12–16, 2002: ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS, Columbus, Ohio. 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/2002_mid-year_program.html.

October 14–18, 2002: 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/>.

October 15–18, 2002: REDUCING RISKS & VULNERABILITY THROUGH SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT: 5TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, Shanghai, China. Sponsored by the Local Authorities Confronting Disasters & Emergencies (LACDE). Contact LACDE 2002 Conference Organizing Committee, Shanghai Municipal Civil Defense Office, 593 Middle Fuxing Rd., Shanghai 200020, China; lacde@mfb.sh.cn.

October 16–17, 2002: ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NEW YORK STATE FLOODPLAIN & STORMWATER MANAGERS ASSOCIATION, Cobleskill, New York. Contact Bill Nechamen at (518) 402-8146; wsnecham@gw.dec.state.ny.us.

October 21–24, 2002: DIGITAL HAZARD DATA, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.

- October 28—November 2, 2002:** 22ND ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE NORTH AMERICAN LAKE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY, Anchorage, Alaska. Contact NALMS at nalms@nalms.org; <http://www.nalms.org>.
- November 3–7, 2002:** AWRA 2002: ANNUAL WATER RESOURCES CONFERENCE, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Sponsored by the American Water Resources Association (AWRA). Contact Janet L. Bowers, Conference Chair, Chester County Water Resources Authority, West Chester, PA; (610) 344-5400; fax: (610) 344-5401; jbowers@chesco.org; <http://www.awra.org/meetings/Philadelphia2002/>.
- November 4–8, 2002:** THE COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- November 10–13, 2002:** NATIONAL TRAILS SYMPOSIUM, Orlando, Florida. Sponsored by American Trails and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Office of Greenways & Trails. Contact American Trails at (530) 547-2060; fax: (540) 547-2035; symposium@americantrails.org; or see <http://www.AmericanTrails.org>.
- November 13–15, 2002:** ANNUAL CONGRESS FOR NATURAL HAZARD LOSS REDUCTION, New Orleans, Louisiana. Sponsored by the Institute for Business and Home Safety. See <http://www.ibhs.org/congress/>.
- November 15, 2002:** LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKSHOP, Mt. Morris, New York. Sponsored by the Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council. For more information, contact the Planning Council at (585) 454-0190; gflrpc@gflrpc.org or see <http://www.gflrpc.org/Planning/Events/Fall2002/wsindex.htm>.
- January 6–9, 2003:** COASTAL GEOTOOLS 2002, Charleston, South Carolina. Sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center. Contact Mark Jansen, NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2234 South Hobson Ave., Charleston, SC 29405-2413; (843) 740-1200; geo.tools@noaa.gov or see <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/GeoTools>.
- January 27–31, 2003:** RETROFITTING FLOOD-PRONE RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- January 27–30, 2003:** DIGITAL HAZARD DATA, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- February 22–26, 2003:** MID-YEAR MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, Washington, D.C. Information and registration materials will be available in December 2002. Contact NEMA at (859) 244-8162; nema_admin@csg.org or see <http://www.nemaweb.org/index.cfm>.
- February 24–28, 2003:** INTERNATIONAL EROSION CONTROL ASSOCIATION 34TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE AND EXPO, Las Vegas, Nevada. Contact IECA, P.O. Box 774904, 1355 S. Lincoln Ave., Steamboat Springs, CO 80477-4904; (970) 879-3010; fax: (970) 879-8563; ecinfo@ieca.org or see <http://www.ieca.org>.
- March 3–6, 2003:** INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ADVANCES IN FLOOD FORECASTING IN EUROPE, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Sponsored by WL/Delft Hydraulics and the Joint Research Center of the European Commission. Contact Bob van Kappel; WL/Delft Hydraulics, P.O. Box 177, 2600 MH Delft, The Netherlands; (31) 15-285-85-85; bob.vankappel@wldelft.nl or see <http://www.wldelft.nl>.
- March 10–14, 2003:** RESIDENTIAL COASTAL CONSTRUCTION, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- March 16–23, 2003:** THIRD WORLD WATER FORUM, Kyoto, Shiga, and Osaka, Japan. Sponsored by the World Water Council. Contact the Secretariat of the 3rd World Water Forum, 5th Floor 2-2-4 Kojimachi Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0083, Japan; +81-3-5212-1645; fax: +81-3-5212-1649 or see <http://www.worldwaterforum.org>.
- March 31—April 4, 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/>.
- April 7–11, 2003:** THE COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.

- April 13–16, 2003:** INAUGURAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COASTAL AND ESTUARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, Baltimore, Maryland. Sponsored by Restore America's Estuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, and many others. Contact Heather Bradley, Conference Coordinator, Restore America's Estuaries, 3801 North Fairfax Dr., Ste. 53, Arlington, VA 22203; (703) 524-0248; fax: (703) 524-0287; hbradley@estuaries.org or see <http://www.estuaries.org>.
- May 11–16, 2003:** LESSONS LEARNED, GATEWAY TO FLOOD MITIGATION—TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE FLOODPLAIN MANAGERS, St. Louis, Missouri. Abstracts are due October 18, 2002. 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/StLouis>.
- May 12–15, 2003:** DIGITAL HAZARD DATA, Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Contact EMI at 1-800-238-3358 or see <http://www.fema.gov/emi/>.
- May 12–15, 2003:** WATER FOR A SUSTAINABLE WORLD—LIMITED SUPPLIES AND EXPANDING DEMAND, SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE, Phoenix, Arizona. Sponsored by the United States Committee on Irrigation and Drainage. Contact the U.S. Committee on Irrigation and Drainage, 1616 17th St., Ste. 483, Denver, CO 80202; (303) 628-5430; fax: (303) 628-5431; stephens@uscid.org or see <http://www.uscid.org>.
- June 8–13, 2003:** SOCIETY OF WETLAND SCIENTISTS 24TH ANNUAL MEETING, New Orleans, Louisiana. Contact Lisa C. Gandy at (501) 225-1552; gandy@swbell.net.
- June 11–13, 2003:** WATER STEWARDSHIP: HOW ARE WE MANAGING? 56TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CWRA CONFERENCE, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Water Resources Association. Contact Stefan Joyce at (605) 875-6391; s_joyce@hayco.com or see <http://www.hayco.com>.
- 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, H2T 1A4, Canada; (514) 289-4628; fax: (514) 289-4546; pinsonneault.lise@hydro.qc.ca or see <http://www.cigb-icold.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 South Hobson Avenue, Charleston, SC 29405-2413; (843) 740-1279; Jan.Kucklick@noaa.gov or see <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/cz2003/>.
- 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/>.
- 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 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 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/>.
- November 1–4, 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 10–14, 2003:** 30TH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON REMOTE SENSING OF THE ENVIRONMENT, Honolulu, Hawaii. See <http://www.symposia.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 ©2002 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

George Riedel
Missouri Emergency Mgmt. Agency
P.O. Box 116
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 526-9141
fax: 573-526-9198
griedel@sema.state.mo.us

VICE CHAIR

Chad Berginnis
Ohio Dept. 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) 462-7114
fax: 401-944-1891
pam.pogue@ri.ngb.army.mil

TREASURER

Nicholas Winter
Metropolitan Commission
Charles River Dam
250 Warren Ave.
Charlestown, MA 02129
(617) 727-0488
fax: 617-523-1793
nick.winter@state.ma.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Larry Larson
ASFPM Executive Office
larry@floods.org