[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2000 6:21 PM
To: Buckley, Mike
Cc: [redacted] todd davison; matt miller; mark vieira; [redacted] doug bellomo; [redacted] mary hudak
Subject: Re: Meeting Request

Mike,

The purpose of the meeting that we requested was to clarify your response on the following issues from the 10/18/00 meeting. These were issues for which you could not provide us a conclusive response in accord with FEMA's regulations during the meeting. The issues were:

1 - Why is the floodway elevation in FEMA's 9/26/00 map below the flood plain elevation instead of being in accord with 44CFR60.3(d)(2) on the Lexington County side of the Congaree River?
2 - Why were you presenting 44CFR65.12 as a requirement for a CLOMR since FEMA did not require SCDOT to adhere to the regulation when FEMA agreed to move the floodway on to the Richland County side of the river as part of FEMA's 1994 approval of the 12th Street Connector for SCDOT?

Although you may believe that your explanation of the regulations was clear, respectfully I have not talked anyone that attended the 10/18/00 meeting who understands what you were trying to explain during the meeting regarding CLOMRs. More importantly, your explanation appears to be in conflict with Matt Miller's letter to Lisa Holland dated January 26, 1999. Also, we left the 10/18/00 meeting believing that we had a firm commitment from you that FEMA would acknowledge to us prior to the LFD whether we had properly computed a CLOMR-ready HEC-2 model, and allow us the opportunity to review it with Lexington County prior to the LFD.

The above are all issues that are independent of the current public comment process and that we want to discuss with you in a meeting format as soon as possible. Please contact me regarding your availability.

As we have stated on several occasions, we are prepared to resolve the re-mapping of the Congaree River in accord with FEMA's 9/26/00 map and the local resolutions.

thanks,

[redacted]

The information contained in this e-mail message and any attachments is confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entities named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately.

----- Original Message -----

From: [redacted] <Mike.Buckley@fema.gov>
To: [redacted]
Cc: Miller, Matt <Matt.Miller@fema.gov>; Bellomo, Doug <Doug.Bellomo@fema.gov>; Davison, Todd <Todd.Davison@fema.gov>; Hudak, Mary <Mary.Hudak@fema.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2000 2:45 PM
Subject: Meeting Request

[redacted]

Regarding your request for another meeting, it is not clear to me what the purpose of the meeting would be. FEMA has not made any decisions on the technical issues that have been raised, as that would be premature given the extension of the comment period granted at the request of Columbia Venture.

Also, we obviously have not received all the data that we expect will be submitted before the established deadline of January 2, 2001, as well as any response to the data received by FEMA as called for in my letter dated November 22, 2000. As stated in my letter, we will post all data received prior to January 3, 2001 on our WEB site so that those who wish to comment may do so by February 15, 2001. I also do not think it is appropriate for FEMA to respond to any potential Conditional Letter of Map Revision request until such time that the maps are finalized. I believe our regulations and study guidelines spell out the criteria that would be used in evaluating a CLOMR request. If, however, you or any other party would like clarification of FEMA's regulations and guidelines, I would be happy to respond to a written request indicating the specific area of interest.