

Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP)

Fiscal Year 2009 Flood Mapping Production Plan

Version 1.0

May 2009



FEMA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	ii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Flood Map Sequencing Strategy for FY09	3
2.1. Summary of Coastal Projects.....	7
2.2. Summary of Levee Projects.....	11
2.3. Riverine Flood Hazards	15
3. Risk MAP FY09 Flood Mapping Production Plan	19
Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast	

LIST OF TABLES, FIGURES, AND MAPS

Figure 1. Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP) Lifecycle.....	2
Map 1: U.S. Map of FY09 Projects	5
Map 2: U.S. Map of FY09 Coastal Projects	9
Map 3: U.S. Map of FY09 Levee Projects.....	13
Map 4: U.S. Map of FY09 Riverine Projects.....	17
Map 5: U.S. Map of FY09 Projects Relative to Map Mod Counties.....	18

Preface

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) manages several risk analysis programs that assess the impact of natural hazards that lead to effective strategies for reducing risk. These programs support the Department of Homeland Security objective to “strengthen nationwide preparedness and mitigation against natural disasters.” FEMA is beginning to transition from Flood Map Modernization to Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP) in fiscal year (FY) 2009. The vision for Risk MAP is to, through collaboration with State, local, and Tribal entities, deliver quality data that increases public awareness and leads to action that reduces risk to life and property. It also aims to foster informed risk management decisions and actions to mitigate risk through a consistent risk-based approach to assessing potential vulnerability and losses, and tools to communicate the message are needed. By analyzing and depicting flood risk, communities and the American public can better understand their risk and will make informed decisions to reduce vulnerability.

Flood Map Modernization transformed the majority of the flood hazard mapping inventory to 21st century digital technology and restored confidence in the reliability of floodplain boundaries, while making some updates to the underlying engineering data. However, the dynamic nature of floodplains will require updated analysis of flood hazards on a periodic basis to maintain a reliable inventory.

The FEMA Risk MAP Multi-Year Plan (Fiscal Years 2010-2014), dated March 16, 2009, includes the following goal pertaining to flood hazard data:

Goal 1: Address gaps in flood hazard data to form a solid foundation for flood risk assessments, floodplain management, and actuarial soundness of the National Flood Insurance Program.

With FY09 Congressional appropriations for Flood Hazard Mapping, FEMA is initiating flood map update projects to address gaps in required engineering and mapping for high flood risk areas impacted by coastal flooding, levees, and other flood hazards (e.g., lakes, rivers, and ponds).

FEMA must continue to maintain the quality of the flood hazard data used in support of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Leveraging successes from Flood Map Modernization, FEMA must take the next step to refresh more of the underlying engineering data depicted on the flood map. Part of the success of Flood Map Modernization was establishing a foundation for easier information depiction and distribution of the mapped flood hazard. To complete the evolution of the process, it is imperative to maintain the integrity and credibility of the engineering data for reliable risk identification, and ensure the information can be leveraged to improve mitigation activities beyond the minimum Federal requirements for participation in the NFIP.

1. Introduction

In support of FEMA's commitment to maintain the integrity of flood hazard data depicted on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) in support of Risk MAP, this document provides the strategy for selection of FY09 Risk MAP flood map update projects and the planned schedule for their completion.

FEMA will work with stakeholders to ensure that flood hazard information on FIRMs reflects existing conditions and is aligned with flood risk. FEMA will document the engineering gaps that require a map update based on the three principal factors that drive the need for updated flood hazard analyses as listed below:

- Physical changes: such as manmade influences which may include new bridges, culverts, and levees in the floodplain, as well as development that may influence watershed or coastal flooding characteristics, or natural changes which may include erosion and wildfires.
- Climate changes: such as changing rainfall data, and hurricane patterns and intensities.
- Engineering methodology changes: such as improved computer models and better understanding of the physics governing storm surges and major flooding events.

FEMA will develop a national baseline of map update issues and provide a process to share and enhance the information with local officials for constant update. The needs reflected by FY09 projects will be incorporated within the baseline data discussed herein.

Now that the majority of the NFIP map inventory is in digital format, most map updates need to occur only for flood map panels where hazards are changing and the underlying engineering data no longer supports existing conditions. This update is more easily accomplished through a Physical Map Revision than at a countywide level, resulting in a Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM).

Failing to keep pace with the changing and dynamic nature of watersheds ultimately leads to unwise decisions that place homeowners and communities at increased risk of flooding. Conversely, overstated hazards can result in potentially unnecessary construction costs and incorrect insurance rating decisions. Sound, reliable flood hazard information is a necessary component of ensuring the fiscal soundness of the NFIP.

Countywide Revision: Large-scale revision for the entire geographic area of a county, including the incorporated communities, typically involving updates to topography, base map, and/or updated hydrology and hydraulics for numerous streams within the county. During Flood Map Modernization, countywide revisions made up the vast majority of mapping products because of the cost efficiencies from converting paper products to digital.

Physical Map Revision (PMR): Small-scale revision to a DFIRM using the same process, technology, and methods used to develop a countywide revision. However, because of the limited changes in flood hazards, only the affected area(s) of the county require updating.

Through Flood Map Modernization, FEMA is providing new, updated, or validated engineering for 30 percent of the mapped stream and coastal miles. Flood map update projects initiated in Risk MAP in FY09 will increase the progress towards enhancing the quality of FEMA’s engineering data. The flood map update prioritization approach for FY09 addresses gaps in required engineering and mapping for high flood risk areas affected by coastal flooding, levees, and riverine flood hazards.

In delivering Risk MAP, FEMA will utilize mapping partners in the update of flood hazard data and maps and rely on local communities, regional entities, Tribes, and State agencies to ensure that the updated information is used in making informed decision regarding flood risk. Similar to the Multi-Year Flood Hazard Identification Plan (MHIP) process followed in Flood Map Modernization, continuous collaboration with stakeholders will be essential in Risk MAP. FEMA’s Risk MAP life cycle is depicted graphically in Figure 1. Flood hazard data and mapping developed in FY09 in support of Risk MAP Goal 1 addresses gaps in flood hazard data and supports continued risk identification, which forms the basis for quality risk assessments and mitigation planning.

Figure 1. Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning (Risk MAP) Lifecycle



2. Flood Map Sequencing Strategy for FY09

The FY09 Congressional Appropriation authorizes FEMA to spend \$220 million on updating, reviewing, and maintaining maps to ensure that flood maps remain current and accurately reflect flood hazards.

Risk MAP flood map update projects for FY09 were selected to align with engineering data needs for coastal, levee, and other riverine flood hazards, and to leverage established Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP) relationships. The FY09 Congressional Appropriation directed that no less than 20 percent of the funds provided under flood mapping be made available for map maintenance conducted by CTPs that provide a 25-percent cash match and have a strong record of working effectively with FEMA on floodplain mapping activities.

FEMA determined counties that were eligible for CTP maintenance funding based on the following criteria:

- The county must have an effective date that is at least three years old (or three years past its modernized date);
- A modernized map is a map product that meets the requirements outlined in FEMA's *Guidelines and Specification for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners* and with a geospatial dataset available online; and
- The eligible counties must be represented by an existing CTP agreement as of the beginning of FY09 and the CTP must provide a 25 percent cash match for the project.

FEMA has defined cash match as data that is not incorporated into the effective study, dollars to be spent on newly acquired data, or in-kind services that specifically relate to the flood mapping project or the development of data for the project.

A total of 465 Risk MAP flood map update projects are being initiated in FY09, including:

- 69 Coastal projects;
- 123 Levee projects; and
- 273 Other riverine projects.

These projects include some overlap of coastal, levee, and other riverine flood hazard mapping. Of these 465 projects, 55 support CTP maintenance activities. The scope of the projects that can be performed with FY09 funding varies. Many coastal projects do not include costs to complete the coastal engineering and DFIRM production. Multi-year funding will be needed to complete some Risk MAP flood map update projects initiated in FY09. PMR projects for levee and other riverine flood mapping include costs to complete DFIRM production.

Map 1 shows the location of coastal, levee, and riverine projects with planned FY09 funding.

Map 1: U.S. Map of FY09 Projects

2.1. Summary of Coastal Projects

Through Flood Map Modernization, FEMA updated the methodology for identifying and mapping coastal flood hazards along the Pacific, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico coastlines. In FY09, FEMA will use at least \$37 million to perform updated large-scale storm surge modeling for those areas determined to be in most need. More detailed studies of wave heights would be performed following the storm surge modeling. It has been estimated that this funding would result in more than 20 counties—representing approximately 1,800 miles of open coast—receiving fully updated FIRMs.

FEMA is also currently updating the methodology for the Great Lakes coastlines. Therefore, FY09 efforts along the Great Lakes will focus on scoping and data collection. The updated methods are due to be completed this year and, based on available funding, coastal modeling efforts beginning in FY10 along the Great Lakes will utilize these updated methods.

Future coastal study analyses and mapping needs will be selected based on risk, community and State cost share, and cost efficiencies using a large-scale study approach.

Map 2 shows the location of coastal projects with planned FY09 funding.

Map 2: U.S. Map of FY09 Coastal Projects

2.2. Summary of Levee Projects

The Nation faces flood hazards in communities that are affected by levee systems. Levees are located in over 25 percent of the counties where new DFIRMs are being provided through Flood Map Modernization. FEMA continues to learn more about the Nation's levees through coordination with Federal, State, regional, and local agencies. In FY09, FEMA will fund the review and update of DFIRMs to ensure the flood hazards and risk premium zones associated with levees are accurate based upon that increasing knowledge base. The review and update will include counties affected by the expiration of Provisionally Accredited Levees (PALs). The PAL process was instituted to provide a reasonable balance between providing timely and accurate flood hazard data to the public, while affording communities and levee owners an opportunity to submit the required documentation needed to accredit a levee system on NFIP maps.

The determination on whether a levee-affected area needs to be analyzed and potentially remapped will be based on whether levee owners provide the necessary technical data needed to accredit the levee system. To update the flood hazard maps affected by levees, FEMA will perform new hydraulic analysis and issue revised DFIRMs. Where necessary, funding will be used to analyze and map interior drainage hazards within the areas landward of accredited levee systems. Ongoing mapping projects shall not be delayed to accommodate approaching PAL expirations; rather FEMA will fund the PAL remapping project from initiation of the project, upon the PAL expiration date, to a final effective map. If data that changes the levee status are received during the PAL remapping project, FEMA will change direction and map the levee accordingly.

In FY09, FEMA will continue the assessment of the status of levees identified on FIRM maps. Portions of this funding will also allow FEMA to coordinate closely with other Federal agencies, particularly the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), in identifying the Nation's levees and promoting levee safety. Additionally, national levee activities will be funded from this total amount.

Map 3 shows the location of levee projects with planned FY09 funding.

Map 3: U.S. Map of FY09 Levee Projects

2.3. Riverine Flood Hazards

As previously stated, there are three principal factors that drive the need for updated flood hazard analyses:

1. Physical changes: such as manmade influences which may include new bridges, culverts, levees, and development in the floodplain;
2. Climate changes: such as recent flood disasters or additional stream gage data; and
3. Engineering methodology changes: such as improved computer models and better understanding of the physics of water flow.

Many of these changes have taken place many years after FEMA completed the initial analysis of flood hazards, so there is a backlog of other engineering needs. In addition, changes continue to occur through manmade development or natural occurrences that influence the flood hazard information reflected on the flood map. Recognition of the influence or impact of the flood hazard data based on these changes can assist in the selection process that ultimately leads to initiating a project to resolve the engineering need. This impact can be evaluated with respect to the potential change that may occur with the flood data (i.e., widening of the floodplain or increased flood elevations) or with an evaluation of the area that will be mapped with the revised data (i.e., populated area or areas of projected growth).

Investments in these engineering needs will be evaluated and sequenced based on the three factors above, with the intent of completing a map project to its effective status. Priority will also be given to those map projects for which States and communities bring significant cost-share, areas where data exists as a result of a federally declared flood disaster, completed Hazard Mitigation project, or where the greatest number of flood insurance policies exists.

Map 4 shows the location of riverine projects with planned FY09 funding. Map 5 depicts Risk MAP projects relative to Flood Map Modernization projects.

FY 2009 Flood Mapping Production Plan

Map 4: U.S. Map of FY09 Riverine Projects

Map 5: U.S. Map of FY09 Projects Relative to Map Mod Counties

3. Risk MAP FY09 Flood Mapping Production Plan

This section provides information regarding FY09 Risk MAP flood map update projects by engineering category and FEMA Region. The Appendix provides a list of States and counties impacted by FY09 Risk MAP flood map updates, category of mapping, CTP maintenance projects, and planned completion dates based on available funding.

Appendix

Risk MAP FY09 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Region 01

Connecticut

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Fairfield	09001	2011	2012	✓			
Hartford	09003	2010	2011		✓		
Middlesex	09007	2011	2012	✓			
New Haven	09009	2011	2012	✓			
New London	09011	2011	2012	✓			
Total Funding for Connecticut					\$2,161,000		

Maine

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Androscoggin	23001	2013	2014			✓	
Aroostook	23003	2010	2011		✓		
Total Funding for Maine					\$1,495,000		

Massachusetts

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Hampden	25013	2010	2011		✓		
Middlesex	25017	2010	2011		✓		
Nantucket	25019	2012	2013	✓			
Total Funding for Massachusetts					\$429,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

New Hampshire

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Carroll	33003	2013	2014			✓	
Coos	33007	2013	2014			✓	
Hillsborough	33011	2010	2011		✓		
Total Funding for New Hampshire					\$713,000		

Rhode Island

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Newport	44005	2012	2013	✓			
Providence	44007	2010	2011		✓		
Washington	44009	2012	2013	✓			
Total Funding for Rhode Island					\$1,434,000		

Vermont

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Bennington	50003	2013	2014			✓	
Total Funding for Vermont					\$684,000		
Total Region 01 Funding					\$6,916,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Region 02

New Jersey

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>						<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	
Atlantic	34001	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Cape May	34009	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Cumberland	34011	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Essex	34013	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Hudson	34017	2011	2012	✓			
Middlesex	34023	2011	2012	✓			
Monmouth	34025	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Morris	34027	2011	2012			✓	
Ocean	34029	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Salem	34033	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Somerset	34035	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for New Jersey				\$10,318,500			

New York

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>						<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	
Broome	36007	2009	2010		✓		
Essex	36031	2011	2012			✓	✓
Jefferson	36045	2011	2012			✓	✓
New York	36061	2011	2012	✓			
Rensselaer	36083	2011	2012			✓	✓
Total Funding for New York				\$2,502,500			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Puerto Rico

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Puerto Rico	72000	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Puerto Rico					\$263,000		
Total Region 02 Funding					\$13,084,000		

Region 03

Delaware

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Kent	^a 10001	2012	2013	✓			
New Castle	^a 10003	2011	2013	✓		✓	✓
Sussex	^a 10005	2012	2013	✓			
Total Funding for Delaware					\$444,000		

District of Columbia

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
District of Columbia	11001	2011	2012		✓		
Total Funding for District of Columbia					\$117,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Maryland

	FIPS	Projected Schedule			Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective					
Anne Arundel	<i>a</i> 24003	2012	2013		✓			
Baltimore	<i>a</i> 24005	2012	2013		✓			
Baltimore City	<i>a</i> 24510	2012	2013		✓			
Calvert	<i>a</i> 24009	2012	2013		✓			
Cecil	<i>a</i> 24015	2012	2013		✓			
Charles	<i>a</i> 24017	2012	2013		✓			
Dorchester	<i>a</i> 24019	2012	2013		✓			
Harford	<i>a</i> 24025	2012	2013		✓			
Kent	<i>a</i> 24029	2012	2013		✓			
Prince George's	<i>a</i> 24033	2012	2013		✓			
Queen Anne's	<i>a</i> 24035	2012	2013		✓			
Somerset	<i>a</i> 24039	2012	2013		✓			
St. Mary's	<i>a</i> 24037	2012	2013		✓			
Talbot	<i>a</i> 24041	2012	2013		✓			
Wicomico	<i>a</i> 24045	2012	2013		✓			
Worcester	<i>a</i> 24047	2012	2013		✓		✓	
Total Funding for Maryland					\$2,450,000			

Pennsylvania

	FIPS	Projected Schedule			Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective					
Allegheny	42003	2012	2013			✓		
Bradford	42015	2012	2013			✓		
Bucks	42017	2011	2012		✓	✓		
Clinton	42035	2011	2012		✓			
Lackawanna	42069	2010	2011			✓		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Pennsylvania

(Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Lehigh	42077	2009	2010		✓		
Lycoming	42081	2009	2010		✓		
Montour	42093	2011	2012		✓		
Northampton	42095	2009	2011		✓	✓	
Northumberland	42097	2011	2012		✓		
Washington	42125	2012	2013		✓	✓	
Total Funding for Pennsylvania					\$6,173,000		

Virginia

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Accomack	^a 51001	2012	2013	✓			
Albemarle	51003	2009	2010		✓		
Gloucester	^a 51073	2012	2013	✓			
Hampton	^a 51650	2012	2013	✓			
Isle of Wight	^a 51093	2012	2013	✓			
James City	^a 51095	2012	2013	✓			
King George	^a 51099	2012	2013	✓			
Lancaster	^a 51103	2012	2013	✓			
Loudoun	51107	2011	2012			✓	
Mathews	^a 51115	2012	2013	✓			
Middlesex	^a 51119	2012	2013	✓			
Newport News	^a 51700	2012	2013	✓			
Norfolk	^a 51710	2012	2013	✓			
Northampton	^a 51131	2012	2013	✓			
Northumberland	^a 51133	2012	2013	✓			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Virginia (Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Poquoson	^a 51735	2012	2013	✓			
Portsmouth	^a 51740	2012	2013	✓			
Richmond	51760	2010	2011		✓		
Rockingham	51165	2010	2011		✓		
Suffolk	^a 51800	2012	2013	✓			
Surry	^a 51181	2012	2013	✓			
Sussex	51183	2012	2013			✓	
Virginia Beach	^a 51810	2012	2013	✓			
Westmoreland	^a 51193	2012	2013	✓			
Williamsburg	^a 51830	2012	2013	✓			
York	^a 51199	2012	2013	✓			
Total Funding for Virginia					\$6,900,000		

West Virginia

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Cabell	54011	2009	2010		✓		
Mineral	54057	2009	2010			✓	
Mingo	54059	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for West Virginia					\$340,000		
Total Region 03 Funding					\$16,424,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Region 04

Alabama

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Baldwin	01003	2010	2012	✓			✓
Elmore	01051	2011	2012			✓	✓
Madison	01089	2010	2011			✓	✓
Mobile	01097	2010	2012	✓		✓	
Montgomery	01101	2010	2011			✓	✓
Morgan	01103	2010	2011			✓	
Shelby	01117	2010	2011			✓	
Tuscaloosa	01125	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Alabama				\$5,679,000			

Florida

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Bay	12005	2010	2012	✓		✓	
Dixie	12029	2011	2012			✓	
Duval	^a 12031	2011	2012	✓			
Escambia	12033	2010	2012	✓		✓	
Flagler	^a 12035	2011	2012	✓			
Gilchrist	12041	2011	2012			✓	
Gulf	12045	2010	2012	✓		✓	
Lafayette	12067	2011	2012			✓	
Lake	12069	2011	2012			✓	
Manatee	12081	2011	2012			✓	
Nassau	^a 12089	2011	2012	✓			
Okaloosa	12091	2010	2012	✓		✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Florida

(Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule			Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective					
Osceola	12097	2011	2012			✓		
Santa Rosa	12113	2010	2012	✓		✓		
St. Johns	^a 12109	2011	2012	✓				
Volusia	^a 12127	2011	2012	✓		✓		
Walton	12131	2010	2012	✓				
Total Funding for Florida					\$13,095,000			

Georgia

	FIPS	Projected Schedule			Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective					
Camden	^a 13039	2011	2012	✓				
Cobb	13067	2011	2012			✓		
Coweta	13077	2011	2012			✓		
Dekalb	13089	2010	2011			✓		
Douglas	13097	2011	2012			✓		
Effingham	^a 13103	2011	2012	✓				
Forsyth	13117	2011	2012			✓		
Fulton	13121	2010	2011			✓	✓	
Glynn	^a 13127	2011	2012	✓				
Gwinnett	13135	2011	2012			✓		
McIntosh	^a 13191	2011	2012	✓				
Total Funding for Georgia					\$7,690,000			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Kentucky

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Boyd	21019	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Bracken	21023	2010	2011			✓	✓
Bullitt	21029	2010	2011			✓	
Campbell	21037	2010	2011			✓	✓
Fayette	21067	2010	2011			✓	
Franklin	21073	2010	2011		✓		
Greenup	21089	2011	2012			✓	✓
Hancock	21091	2010	2011		✓		
Jefferson	21111	2010	2011			✓	
Kenton	21117	2010	2011		✓		
Lewis	21135	2010	2011			✓	✓
Magoffin	21153	2010	2011			✓	
Mason	21161	2010	2011			✓	✓
Pendleton	21191	2010	2011			✓	✓
Pike	21195	2010	2011		✓		
Total Funding for Kentucky					\$5,130,000		

Mississippi

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
De Soto	28033	2010	2011			✓	
George	28039	2010	2011			✓	
Lauderdale	28075	2011	2012			✓	
Lee	28081	2011	2012			✓	
Rankin	28121	2010	2011			✓	✓
Tate	28137	2011	2012			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Mississippi (Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Tunica	28143	2010	2011		✓		
Warren	28149	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Mississippi					\$2,165,000		

North Carolina

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Beaufort	37013	2010	2011			✓	✓
Bertie	37015	2010	2011	✓			
Brunswick	37019	2010	2011	✓		✓	✓
Carteret	37031	2011	2012			✓	✓
Chowan	37041	2010	2011	✓			
Columbus	37047	2010	2011	✓		✓	✓
Craven	37049	2010	2011			✓	✓
Currituck	37053	2010	2011	✓		✓	
Dare	37055	2010	2011	✓			
Duplin	37061	2011	2012			✓	✓
Durham	37063	2010	2011			✓	✓
Edgecombe	37065	2010	2011		✓		
Greene	37079	2010	2011			✓	✓
Johnston	37101	2010	2011			✓	✓
Lenoir	37107	2010	2011			✓	✓
Mecklenburg	37119	2011	2012			✓	✓
Nash	37127	2010	2011			✓	✓
New Hanover	37129	2010	2011	✓		✓	
Onslow	37133	2010	2011	✓		✓	✓

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

North Carolina

(Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Pender	37141	2010	2011	✓			
Pitt	37147	2011	2012			✓	✓
Robeson	37155	2010	2011		✓		✓
Tyrrell	37177	2010	2011		✓		
Wake	37183	2010	2011			✓	✓
Washington	37187	2010	2011	✓			
Wayne	37191	2010	2011			✓	✓
Wilson	37195	2010	2011			✓	✓
Total Funding for North Carolina				\$14,813,000			

South Carolina

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Beaufort	45013	2011	2012	✓			
Berkeley	45015	2010	2012	✓		✓	✓
Charleston	45019	2011	2012	✓			
Colleton	45029	2011	2012	✓			
Florence	45041	2010	2011			✓	
Georgetown	45043	2011	2012	✓			
Horry	45051	2011	2012	✓			
Jasper	45053	2011	2012	✓			
Lexington	45063	2010	2011			✓	✓
Total Funding for South Carolina				\$1,480,000			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Tennessee

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Davidson	47037	2010	2011			✓	
Hamilton	47065	2010	2011			✓	
Knox	47093	2010	2011			✓	
Shelby	47157	2010	2011			✓	
Sumner	47165	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Tennessee					\$2,283,000		
Total Region 04 Funding					\$52,335,000		

Region 05

Great Lakes Coastal Study

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Great Lakes Coastal Study ^a	C			✓			
Total Funding for Great Lakes Coastal Study					\$1,000,000		

Illinois

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Cook	17031	2010	2012			✓	✓
Jasper	17079	2010	2012			✓	
Lake	17097	2010	2011			✓	
Randolph	17157	2010	2012		✓		
Rock Island	17161	2010	2012		✓	✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Illinois

(Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
St. Clair	17163	2010	2012		✓		
Stephenson	17177	2010	2011			✓	
Will	17197	2010	2012		✓		
Total Funding for Illinois					\$3,610,000		

Indiana

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Hamilton	18057	2009	2010			✓	
Marion	18097	2011	2012		✓		✓
Shelby	18145	2009	2010			✓	
Vanderburgh	18163	2011	2012		✓		
Vigo	18167	2011	2012		✓		
Total Funding for Indiana					\$1,073,000		

Michigan

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Alcona	26001	2010	2011			✓	
Arenac	26011	2010	2011			✓	
Crawford	26039	2010	2011			✓	
Dickinson	26043	2010	2011			✓	
Gladwin	26051	2010	2011			✓	
Kent	26081	2009	2010		✓		
Menominee	26109	2010	2011			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Michigan (Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Total Funding for Michigan					\$1,706,000		

Minnesota

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Kittson	27069	2010	2012			✓	
Mahnomen	27087	2010	2012			✓	
Norman	27107	2010	2012			✓	
Polk	27119	2010	2011			✓	✓
Wilkin	27167	2010	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Minnesota					\$1,800,000		

Ohio

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Butler	39017	2010	2011			✓	
Clermont	39025	2010	2011			✓	
Columbiana	39029	2010	2011			✓	
Delaware	39041	2010	2011			✓	
Hamilton	39061	2010	2011		✓		
Holmes	39075	2010	2011			✓	
Mercer	39107	2010	2011			✓	
Montgomery	39113	2011	2012			✓	✓
Morgan	39115	2011	2012			✓	✓
Ottawa	39123	2010	2011		✓		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Ohio

(Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Total Funding for Ohio					\$2,250,000		

Wisconsin

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Juneau	55057	2010	2012			✓	
Rock	55105	2010	2012			✓	
Sauk	55111	2010	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Wisconsin					\$1,391,000		
Total Region 05 Funding					\$12,830,000		

Region 06

Arkansas

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Benton	05007	2010	2011			✓	
Cleveland	05025	2010	2011			✓	
Craighead	05031	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Crawford	05033	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Dallas	05039	2010	2011			✓	
Grant	05053	2010	2011			✓	
Greene	05055	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Jefferson	05069	2007	2009		✓		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Arkansas

(Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Lawrence	05075	2010	2011			✓	
Lincoln	05079	2010	2011			✓	
Pulaski	05119	2007	2009		✓		
Sebastian	05131	2010	2011			✓	
Washington	05143	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Arkansas					\$5,226,000		

Louisiana

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Bossier	22015	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Caddo	22017	2010	2011			✓	
Caldwell	22021	2010	2011			✓	
East Baton Rouge	22033	2010	2011			✓	
Rapides	22079	2010	2011		✓	✓	
St. Helena	22091	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Louisiana					\$2,545,000		

New Mexico

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Bernalillo	35001	2010	2011			✓	
Dona Ana	35013	2007	2010			✓	
Sandoval	35043	2010	2011			✓	
Santa Fe	35049	2010	2011			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

New Mexico (Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Socorro	35053	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for New Mexico					\$1,650,000		

Oklahoma

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Cleveland	40027	2010	2011			✓	
Grady	40051	2010	2011			✓	
Greer	40055	2010	2011			✓	
Harmon	40057	2010	2011			✓	
Kiowa	40075	2010	2011			✓	
Nowata	40105	2010	2011			✓	
Oklahoma	40109	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Tulsa	40143	2010	2011			✓	
Washita	40149	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Oklahoma					\$2,620,000		

Texas

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Aransas	48007	2009	2010	✓			
Brazoria	48039	2009	2010	✓			
Brown	48049	2010	2011			✓	
Calhoun	48057	2009	2010	✓			
Cameron	48061	2009	2010	✓			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Texas							
(Continued)							
	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Chambers	48071	2009	2010	✓			
Collin	48085	2010	2011			✓	
Dallas	48113	2009	2010		✓	✓	
El Paso	48141	2010	2011			✓	
Galveston	48167	2009	2010	✓			
Guadalupe	48187	2010	2011			✓	
Harris	48201	2009	2010	✓		✓	
Hays	48209	2010	2011			✓	
Jackson	48239	2009	2010	✓			
Jefferson	48245	2009	2010	✓			
Jim Wells	48249	2009	2011			✓	
Kleberg	48273	2009	2010	✓			
Matagorda	48321	2009	2010	✓			
Nueces	48355	2009	2010	✓			
Orange	48361	2009	2010	✓			
Rains	48379	2010	2011			✓	
Refugio	48391	2009	2010	✓			
San Patricio	48409	2009	2010	✓			
Smith	48423	2010	2011			✓	
Tarrant	48439	2010	2011			✓	
Victoria	48469	2009	2010	✓			
Willacy	48489	2009	2010	✓			
Williamson	48491	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Texas					\$6,090,000		
Total Region 06 Funding					\$18,131,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Region 07

Iowa

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Black Hawk	19013	2011	2012		✓		
Boone	19015	2010	2012			✓	
Cedar	19031	2010	2011			✓	
Chickasaw	19037	2010	2011			✓	
Clayton	19043	2010	2012		✓		
Clinton	19045	2010	2012		✓		
Des Moines	19057	2010	2012		✓		
Franklin	19069	2010	2011			✓	
Hardin	19083	2010	2011			✓	
Howard	19089	2010	2011			✓	
Iowa	19095	2010	2011		✓		
Jackson	19097	2010	2012		✓		
Keokuk	19107	2010	2011			✓	
Lee	19111	2010	2012		✓		
Louisa	19115	2010	2012		✓		
Mahaska	19123	2010	2011			✓	
Marshall	19127	2010	2012			✓	
Mills	19129	2011	2012		✓		
Mitchell	19131	2010	2011			✓	
Muscatine	19139	2010	2012		✓		
Pottawattamie	19155	2011	2012			✓	
Van Buren	19177	2010	2011			✓	
Wapello	19179	2010	2011		✓		
Washington	19183	2010	2011			✓	
Webster	19187	2010	2012			✓	
Winneshiek	19191	2010	2012			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Iowa

(Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Woodbury	19193	2010	2012		✓		
Worth	19195	2010	2011			✓	
Wright	19197	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Iowa					\$2,715,000		

Kansas

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Allen	20001	2010	2011		✓		
Atchison	20005	2011	2012			✓	
Butler	20015	2011	2012		✓		
Douglas	20045	2011	2013		✓		
Ford	20057	2011	2012		✓		
Leavenworth	20103	2011	2012			✓	
Lyon	20111	2010	2011		✓		
Marion	20115	2010	2012		✓		
Miami	20121	2010	2012		✓	✓	
Montgomery	20125	2011	2012			✓	
Reno	20155	2011	2012		✓		
Riley	20161	2011	2012			✓	✓
Sedgwick	20173	2010	2012		✓	✓	
Shawnee	20177	2009	2011		✓		
Wilson	20205	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Kansas					\$3,282,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Missouri

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Andrew	29003	2010	2012		✓		
Butler	29023	2011	2012		✓		
Callaway	29027	2010	2012			✓	
Carroll	29033	2010	2012			✓	
Cass	29037	2011	2012			✓	
Chariton	29041	2010	2012			✓	
Clark	29045	2010	2012			✓	
Clay	29047	2010	2012		✓		
Cole	29051	2011	2012			✓	
Franklin	29071	2010	2012		✓		
Jackson	29095	2010	2012		✓		
Jasper	29097	2011	2012		✓	✓	
Lewis	29111	2010	2012			✓	
Osage	29151	2010	2012			✓	
Saline	29195	2010	2012			✓	
Scott	29201	2010	2012		✓		
St. Charles	29183	2009	2010		✓		
St. Louis	29189	2009	2010		✓		
Taney	29213	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Missouri					\$3,680,000		

Nebraska

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Colfax	31037	2010	2012			✓	
Dawes	31045	2010	2011			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Nebraska (Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Dodge	31053	2010	2011		✓		
Douglas	31055	2011	2014		✓	✓	
Lancaster	31109	2011	2012			✓	
Red Willow	31145	2010	2011		✓		
Sarpy	31153	2012	2014			✓	
Total Funding for Nebraska					\$925,000		
Total Region 07 Funding					\$10,602,000		

Region 08

Colorado

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Broomfield	08014	2010	2011			✓	✓
Denver	08031	2010	2011			✓	✓
Douglas	08035	2010	2011			✓	✓
Jefferson	08059	2010	2012			✓	✓
Morgan	08087	2010	2011			✓	
Prowers	08099	2010	2011			✓	
Pueblo	08101	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Colorado					\$1,093,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Montana

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Lake	30047	2011	2012			✓	
Sanders	30089	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Montana					\$1,240,000		

North Dakota

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Burleigh	38015	2010	2012			✓	✓
Cass	38017	2010	2011			✓	
Morton	38059	2010	2011			✓	✓
Pembina	38067	2010	2011			✓	
Slope	38087	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for North Dakota					\$1,375,000		

South Dakota

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Minnehaha	46099	2010	2011		✓	✓	
Sanborn	46111	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for South Dakota					\$820,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Utah

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Sevier	49041	2010	2011			✓	
Utah	49049	2010	2011			✓	
Weber	49057	2010	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Utah					\$978,000		

Wyoming

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Teton	56039	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Wyoming					\$530,000		
Total Region 08 Funding					\$6,036,000		

Region 09

Arizona

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Cochise	04003	2011	2013			✓	
Greenlee	04011	2011	2012		✓		
La Paz	04012	2011	2013		✓		
Maricopa	04013	2011	2012			✓	✓
Mohave	04015	2011	2013		✓		
Navajo	04017	2011	2012		✓		
Pima	04019	2011	2013		✓		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Arizona (Continued)

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Pinal	04021	2011	2012			✓	
Santa Cruz	04023	2010	2010			✓	
Yavapai	04025	2011	2013		✓		
Yuma	04027	2011	2013		✓		
Total Funding for Arizona					\$4,000,000		

California

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Alameda	06001	2011	2012	✓	✓		
Alpine	06003	2011	2012			✓	
Butte	^a 06007				✓		
Calaveras	06009	2011	2012			✓	
Colusa	^a 06011	2011	2012		✓	✓	✓
Contra Costa	06013	2011	2012	✓	✓	✓	
Del Norte	^a 06015	2011	2012		✓		
Fresno	^a 06019	2011	2012		✓		✓
Humboldt	^a 06023			✓			
Imperial	06025	2011	2013		✓		
Inyo	06027	2011	2012			✓	
Kern	06029	2011	2012		✓		
Kings	06031	2011	2012			✓	
Lake	06033	2011	2012			✓	✓
Los Angeles	^a 06037	2011	2012		✓		
Madera	^a 06039				✓		
Marin	06041	2011	2012	✓			

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

California (Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Mendocino	^a 06045			✓			
Merced	^a 06047	2011	2012		✓		
Mono	06051	2011	2012			✓	
Monterey	^a 06053			✓			
Napa	06055	2011	2012	✓			
Orange	^a 06059			✓			
Placer	06061	2011	2012			✓	
Plumas	^a 06063	2011	2012		✓	✓	✓
Riverside	06065	2011	2012		✓		
Sacramento	^a 06067				✓		
San Bernardino	06071	2011	2012		✓		
San Diego	^a 06073	2011	2012		✓		
San Francisco	06075	2011	2012	✓			
San Joaquin	^a 06077	2011	2012		✓		
San Luis Obispo	^a 06079	2011	2013		✓		
San Mateo	06081	2011	2012	✓			
Santa Barbara	^a 06083	2011	2012			✓	
Santa Clara	^a 06085	2011	2012	✓	✓	✓	
Santa Cruz	^a 06087			✓			
Shasta	06089	2011	2012			✓	
Sierra	06091	2011	2012			✓	
Solano	06095	2011	2012	✓	✓	✓	
Sonoma	06097	2011	2012	✓		✓	
Stanislaus	^a 06099	2011	2012		✓	✓	✓
Sutter	^a 06101				✓		
Tehama	06103	2011	2012			✓	
Trinity	06105	2011	2012			✓	

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

California (Continued)

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Ventura	^a 06111	2011	2013		✓		
Yolo	^a 06113	2011	2012		✓	✓	✓
Total Funding for California					\$19,150,000		

Nevada

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Eureka	32011	2011	2012			✓	
Lander	32015	2011	2012			✓	
Lyon	32019	2011	2012			✓	
Washoe	32031	2011	2012			✓	
White Pine	32033	2011	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Nevada					\$1,050,000		
Total Region 09 Funding					\$24,200,000		

Region 10

Alaska

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Anchorage	02020	2010	2012			✓	
Seward	02011	2010	2011			✓	
Total Funding for Alaska					\$600,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Idaho

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Bannock	16005	2010	2012		✓		
Bonner	16017	2010	2011		✓		
Canyon	16027	2009	2010			✓	
Gem	16045	2010	2012			✓	
Jefferson	16051	2010	2012		✓		
Shoshone	16079	2010	2012		✓	✓	
Valley	16085	2010	2012			✓	
Total Funding for Idaho					\$1,425,000		

Oregon

	<i>Projected Schedule</i>			<i>Coastal</i>	<i>Levee</i>	<i>Riverine</i>	<i>CTP Maintenance Resource</i>
	<i>FIPS</i>	<i>Preliminary</i>	<i>Effective</i>				
Clackamas	41005	2011	2012			✓	
Clatsop	41007	2011	2013	✓	✓		
Columbia	41009	2010	2010		✓		
Curry	41015	2010	2013	✓			
Douglas	41019	2010	2011		✓		
Lane	41039	2010	2011		✓		
Lincoln	41041	2010	2013	✓			
Tillamook	41057	2010	2013	✓			
Umatilla	41059	2010	2010		✓		
Total Funding for Oregon					\$2,870,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.

Appendix: Risk MAP FY 2009 Detailed Production Report and Forecast

As of April 2009

Notes:

1. Additional funding is anticipated from those counties indicated by a checkmark under the CTP Maintenance Resource column.
2. CTP Maintenance Resource cash match is not included in the total funding.
3. MIP Sequencing data is the source of the funding amounts.
4. Checkmarks under Coastal, Levee, and/or Riverine columns indicate projected funding in those categories.
5. Dollars shown are projected for engineering and map production and do not necessarily reflect dollars that would be given directly to the State.

Washington

	FIPS	Projected Schedule		Coastal	Levee	Riverine	CTP Maintenance Resource
		Preliminary	Effective				
Chelan	^a 53007	2010	2012			✓	
Clark	53011	2011	2012		✓		
Cowlitz	53015	2010	2012		✓		
Grays Harbor	^a 53027			✓			
King	53033	2011	2012	✓			
Kittitas	53037	2010	2012			✓	
Okanogan	^a 53047	2010	2012			✓	
Pacific	^a 53049	2011	2012	✓			
Thurston	53067	2010	2012			✓	
Whitman	53075	2010	2012		✓	✓	
Yakima	53077	2010	2010			✓	
Total Funding for Washington					\$4,030,000		
Total Region 10 Funding					\$8,925,000		

a - Project does not result in an effective DFIRM with FY09 funding.