

# Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC)

## In-person/Virtual Hybrid Public Meeting Notes

January 23, 2024, 8AM - 5PM ET

### **TMAC Members**

Stephen S. Aichele, *USGS, Geological Survey Representative*  
Stacey Archfield, *USGS, Department of the Interior Designee*  
Doug Bellomo, *AECOM, Engineering Member, Chair*  
Vince DiCamillo, *Stantec Consulting, Mapping Member, Vice Chair*  
Scott Giberson, *CoreLogic Flood Services, Flood Hazards Determination Member*  
Ataul Hannan, *Harris County Flood Control District, Local CTP Representative*  
Maria Cox Lamm, *South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, NFIP*

*Coordination Offices*  
William Lehman, *USACE, USACE Designee*  
Jamie Reinke, *Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, State CTP Representative*  
Luis Rodriguez, *FEMA, FEMA Designee*  
Brooke Seymour, *Mile High Flood District, Regional Flood and Storm Water Member*  
Jonathan Smith, *Resource Inventory Division of Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Designee*  
Jeff Sparrow, *Moffatt & Nichol, Floodplain Management Member*

### **Subject Matter Experts**

Kim Dunn, *T&M Associates*  
Salomon Miranda, *California Department of Water Resources*

### **Government Attendees**

Sarah Abdelrahim, *FEMA, ADFO*  
John Ebersole, *FEMA, Legal Counsel, ADFO*

Brian Koper, *FEMA, DFO*  
David Rosa, *FEMA, ADFO*

### **Support Staff**

Henry Cauley, *PM Support*  
Sonia Clemens, *Compass PTS*  
Kathryn Friedman, *ARC PTS*  
Naeemah Islam, *PM Support*  
Brian Koch, *ARC PTS*  
Necolle Maccherone, *STARR II PTS*  
Grace Morris, *STARR II PTS*

Shobha Pathmanathan, *ARC PTS*  
Sloan Oliver, *PM Support*  
Dora Szalai, *ARC PTS*  
Molly Tuttle, *Compass PTS*  
Kevin Enoch, *ARC PTS*  
Susan Patton, *Compass PTS*  
Ronda Nowak, *ARC PTS*

**Other Attendees**

Shabnum Amjad, *FEMA DHS*

David Conrad, *ASFPM*

Geoffrey Golick, *NYS Department of Environmental Conservation*

Betsy Hicks, *ASFPM*

Ruthie Maniscalchi, *West Virginia Emergency Management Division*

Whitney Montague, *Arkansas Natural Resources Division*

Shilpa Mulik, *FEMA DHS*

Susan Patton, *The Nature Conservancy*

Jon Paoli, *Iowa Homeland Security & Emergency Management*

Rick Sacbibit, *FEMA DHS*

Austin Watkins, *FEMA DHS*

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this meeting was for the Technical Mapping Advisory Committee (TMAC) to continue discussing the overview of a draft report. The TMAC discussed past TMAC recommendations and overarching objectives and framework for recommendations.

## **Subcommittee Meeting**

TMAC members optionally participated in subcommittee meetings for one hour to refresh and debrief on materials related to the topics being discussed during the meeting. The TMAC then proceeded to the next agenda item.

## **Welcome, Roll Call, Administrative Items, and Opening Remarks**

Mr. Brian Koper, TMAC DFO, introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the virtual and in-person public meeting. After the roll call, Mr. Brian Koper explained the requirements and protocols associated with this public meeting compared to previous administrative meetings; he emphasized the procedures for public comments. He then handed it over to Mr. Doug Bellomo to review the agenda for the day. After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

## **Lighting Page Turn of Document**

In the lightning-paced discussion regarding a document on floodplain management, participants covered various chapters and key agenda items. They initially emphasized the need to review and potentially swap chapters due to participant availability. The meeting delved into the executive summary, introduction, and document creation process, emphasizing the importance of graphics for effective communication.

Chapter 3, titled "Redefining the SFHA," incorporated recommendations from FEMA's memo, addressing challenges and providing graphical representations of flood-prone areas. Chapter 4 revisited interim report content, discussing FEMA's standards for fill requirements and floodplain notifications.

The discussion then moved to Chapter 5, introducing new content on 2D methodologies and complex data representation. Participants discussed recommendations, including a rolling transition plan, new 2D modeling standards, and an IT infrastructure upgrade. Graphics were highlighted as crucial for conveying complex concepts, and additional figures were shared.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

## **Review of Chapter 1 and Executive Summary**

During a meeting focused on floodplain management, regarding Chapter 1 and the executive summary of their document. Mr. Vince DiCamillo led the conversation, outlining the structure of the executive summary and considering potential reductions in content. The participants explored the alignment with FEMA's memo, addressing challenges, and incorporating recommendations. They delved into the order of tackling topics, emphasizing the unique approach taken in the document creation process. Mr. DiCamillo highlighted the importance of listening sessions and introduced changes in the design Sprint concept. Mr. Doug Bellomo suggested graphical enhancements for better text flow, and Ms. Necolle Maccherone offered support for editing. Concerns about meeting access were addressed. The conversation transitioned to Chapter 1, covering standard elements, updating member lists, and refining references to previous reports. The participants scrutinized the list for accuracy and addressed subtleties in subcommittee references, planning further cleanup and clarification. The meeting concluded with a commitment to refining the document to enhance coherence and accessibility, reflecting a collaborative effort in the report preparation process.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Break**

The TMAC took a 25-minute break.

### **Review of Chapter 2**

Ms. Mary Jo Mullen and Ms. Christine Brittle discuss Chapter 2 of their report, with Mr. Bellomo. Ms. Mullen provides an overview of the chapter, focusing on the design Sprint process and modifications made to fit TMAC's goals. Mr. Bellomo suggests moving some subcommittee details to Chapter 1. Ms. Mullen agrees, emphasizing the need for coherence. They discuss potential graphic additions and consider appendices for detailed information. The conversation shifts to the listening sessions, where Ms. Brittle explains the logistical aspects and participant categories. Mr. Bellomo suggests a paragraph emphasizing the qualitative nature of the findings. They plan to include a table or graphic for clarity. Mr. Bellomo praises Ms. Brittle and Ms. Mullen for their valuable contributions to the report, highlighting the efficiency and credibility brought by the Sprint process and collaborative approach. Mr. DiCamillo credits Ms. Maccherone for suggesting the Sprint concept, and the team expresses satisfaction with the cohesive progress of the report.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Review of Chapter 3 (Part 1)**

Ms. Maria Cox Lamm provided updates on their progress in Chapter 4. Despite being slightly ahead of schedule, they decided to focus on Chapter 4 instead of Chapter 3. Ms. Cox Lamm shared insights into the significant editing of Chapter 4 and parts of Chapter 3, emphasizing the

importance of accurately reflecting language used during listening sessions. Ms. Brittle suggested referring to initial thinking rather than recommendations, leading to a discussion on terminology and maintaining consistency in language.

Ms. Cox Lamm detailed the content of Chapter 4, addressing considerations, stakeholder feedback, and the process of narrowing down recommendations. Concerns were raised about potential loopholes, leading to a discussion on the delicate balance required in crafting recommendations. Mr. Solomon Miranda expressed a desire for explicit guidance to prevent exploitation, and Mr. Bellomo gave reassurance that language allowed for local discretion. The meeting concluded with a focus on integrating information from listening sessions into Chapter 4 for coherence and clarity in the final document.

The discussion also covered environmental impacts, hazards from fill activities, notifications, and the delicate balance required in managing these situations. The team considered incremental steps and recommendations that necessitate notifications rather than outright prohibitions. Mr. Miranda suggested reinforcing the idea in FEMA's processes, and the group debated the complexities of cumulative impacts and the need for further exploration of recommendations. The conversation aimed at finding a balanced approach to managing fill activities in floodplains, considering both environmental concerns and development needs.

In a separate discussion, participants addressed topics related to flood hazard areas, processing forms, and potential misunderstandings. Mr. DiCamillo emphasized the importance of suggesting specific cases be processed under a particular form, leading to a discussion on MT-1 forms and their relevance. Concerns were raised about potential misunderstandings, and Mr. Bellomo suggested addressing these in Chapter 5.

The conversation also touched upon Chapter 3, statistical considerations, and potential revisions to Figure 3.2. Mr. Sparrow emphasized adjusting information in the recommendation box based on statistical discussions. The participants engaged in a detailed exploration of recommendations, structural considerations, and challenges associated with implementing proposed changes in FEMA policies. The discussion aimed at refining language, ensuring consistency, and addressing potential issues in the interpretation of recommendations related to flood hazard areas and confidence levels.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Lunch**

The TMAC took a one-hour lunch break.

### **Review of Chapter 3 (Part 2)**

Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Sparrow discussed sections 3.1 and 3.2, considering potential changes in

titles. They briefly touched on section 3.3, discussing its title and the use of terms like "new SFHA" to avoid confusion. The conversation evolved to address challenges related to future conditions and the development of a proxy value for areas.

The discussion included considerations about the 500-year floodplain and the implications of using it as a proxy for upper-bound conditions. Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Sparrow also explored the idea of eliminating the floodway, debating its necessity and potential administrative benefits. Recommendations were made to assess the impacts of fill and development and to redefine flood-prone areas and SFHA. The meeting concluded with considerations for the floodway and the need for further exploration of these complex issues, with plans to refine the language and ensure consistency in FEMA's policies. The team aimed to integrate information from listening sessions into the final document for coherence and clarity.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

#### **Review of Chapter 4**

Ms. Cox Lamm took charge of leading the discussion in Chapter 4, guiding the members through an exploration of its structure. The central focus of the conversation was FEMA's request, communicated through an April 11, 2023, memo, regarding the consideration of fill in the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). Delving into the chapter's content, the TMAC members concentrated on two key considerations derived from the listening sessions.

Firstly, they discussed the importance of incorporating all requirements related to the placement of fill in Flood-Prone Areas (FPAs) as part of the floodplain management requirements in 44 CFR 60.3. Secondly, the group proposed a requirement for participating communities to assess, quantify, and document the impacts of proposed fill and other developments on flood stages and the environment as part of permitting duties before issuing fill permits.

The collective decision was made to update the chapter's content and integrate graphics before the subsequent version of the report is released, ensuring a comprehensive and visually enhanced presentation of the recommendations.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

#### **Break**

The TMAC took a 15-minute break.

#### **Review of Chapter 5 (Part 1)**

This chapter outlines the TMAC's evaluation and recommendations about two specific topics outlined in FEMA's Tasking Memo to the TMAC. The first topic involves TMAC's assistance to

FEMA in devising a strategy to help communities overcome administrative and technical challenges linked to the implementation of 2D hydrologic and hydraulic models for regulatory floodplain management. The second topic explores approaches that FEMA can adopt to present intricate data to communities in a way that minimizes confusion and enhances usefulness in mitigating flood risks and reducing disaster-related distress.

Additionally, Mr. Ataul Hannan shared a series of 2D output graphics with TMAC members during the meeting. The group engaged in a discussion about relocating the Transition Plan and Model Ordinance sections from Chapter 5 to a new chapter, tentatively titled Chapter 6, Transition Plan.

Responding to this, Mr. Bellomo and Mr. DiCamillo requested the submission of new edits for Chapter 5 to TMAC by February 13, 2024, with a commitment to further updates as necessary beyond that date. This collaborative effort aims to streamline the content and enhance the effectiveness of the recommendations in Chapter 5.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Koper began the public comment period at 3:30 p.m. ET. Mr. Koper opened the forum for those who would like to make a public comment, and he explained the procedure for making a public comment.

David Conrad from the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM) gave a public comment. A written version of the comment is provided at the end of this document.

Without any further public comments, Mr. Koper adjourned the public comment period.

### **Review of Chapter 5 (Part 2) & Second Lighting Review**

Ms. Jamie Reinke re-started the discussion about Chapter 5 with the group. Early in the discussion, the group decided to continue the Chapter 5 discussion tomorrow at the TMAC January Public Meeting – Day 2.

Mr. Bellomo provided comments on the mentioned sections, referring to them in the Navigation Pane and indicating that the remaining three would be discussed on the following day. Ms. Reinke inquired about starting the next section, to which Mr. Bellomo suggested waiting until the following day. Mr. Hannan delved into a historical perspective, emphasizing the evolution from digital mapping to the current emphasis on 2D modeling. He highlighted the importance of organizing resources and finances for successful transitions, proposing a collaboration with various organizations, and sharing success stories.

Mr. Bellomo acknowledged these considerations and suggested incorporating financial and resource needs into the transition plan. Mr. Hannan stressed the necessity of organizing efforts and responsibilities across different agencies for success. Mr. DiCamillo suggested addressing fiscal constraints in the transition plan, which Mr. Bellomo agreed with. Mr. Hannan continued to emphasize the importance of collaboration and learning from successful cases. Mr. Bellomo acknowledged the need to address these issues in the transition plan, recognizing the diverse challenges faced by communities. The meeting concluded with Mr. Bellomo summarizing the day's comments and considerations, expressing the importance of addressing financial and resource aspects in the transition plan for a successful outcome.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Summary of Day & Wrap-Up**

Mr. Bellomo summarized the day's achievements in the draft report. For the next day, Mr. Bellomo reviewed the agenda for tomorrow and discussed the straw vote that would take place tomorrow. He thanked the TMAC for their contributions and effort and concluded the meeting at 5:02 p.m. ET.

# Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC)

In-person/Virtual Hybrid Public Meeting Notes

January 23, 2024, 8AM - 5PM ET

## **TMAC Members**

Stephen S. Aichele, *USGS, Geological Survey Representative*  
Stacey Archfield, *USGS, Department of the Interior Designee*  
Doug Bellomo, *AECOM, Engineering Member, Chair*  
Vince DiCamillo, *Stantec Consulting, Mapping Member, Vice Chair*  
Scott Giberson, *CoreLogic Flood Services, Flood Hazards Determination Member*  
Ataul Hannan, *Harris County Flood Control District, Local CTP Representative*  
Maria Cox Lamm, *South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, NFIP*

*Coordination Offices*  
William Lehman, *USACE, USACE Designee*  
Jamie Reinke, *Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, State CTP Representative*  
Luis Rodriguez, *FEMA, FEMA Designee*  
Brooke Seymour, *Mile High Flood District, Regional Flood and Storm Water Member*  
Jonathan Smith, *Resource Inventory Division of Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Designee*  
Jeff Sparrow, *Moffatt & Nichol, Floodplain Management Member*

## **Subject Matter Experts**

Kim Dunn, *T&M Associates*  
Salomon Miranda, *California Department of Water Resources*

## **Government Attendees**

Sarah Abdelrahim, *FEMA, ADFO*  
John Ebersole, *FEMA, Legal Counsel, ADFO*

Brian Koper, *FEMA, DFO*  
David Rosa, *FEMA, ADFO*

## **Support Staff**

Henry Cauley, *PM Support*  
Sonia Clemens, *Compass PTS*  
Kathryn Friedman, *ARC PTS*  
Naeemah Islam, *PM Support*  
Necolle Maccherone, *STARR II PTS*  
Grace Morris, *STARR II PTS*

Sloan Oliver, *PM Support*  
Molly Tuttle, *Compass PTS*  
Kevin Enoch, *ARC PTS*  
Dora Szalai, *ARC PTS*  
Ronda Nowak, *ARC PTS*  
Susan Patton, *Compass PTS*

**Other Attendees**

Shabnum Amjad, *FEMA DHS*

David Conrad, *ASFPM*

Geoffrey Golick, *NYS Department of Environmental Conservation*

Betsy Hicks, *ASFPM*

Ruthie Maniscalchi, *West Virginia Emergency Management Division*

Whitney Montague, *Arkansas Natural Resources Division*

Shilpa Mulik, *FEMA DHS*

Jon Paoli, *Iowa Homeland Security & Emergency Management*

Rick Sacbibit, *FEMA DHS*

Austin Watkins, *FEMA DHS*

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this meeting was for the Technical Mapping Advisory Committee (TMAC) to continue discussing the overview of a draft report. The TMAC discussed past TMAC recommendations and overarching objectives and framework for recommendations.

## **Subcommittee Meeting**

TMAC members optionally participated in subcommittee meetings for one hour to refresh and debrief on materials related to the topics being discussed during today's meeting. The TMAC then proceeded to the next agenda item.

## **Welcome, Roll Call, Administrative Items, and Opening Remarks**

Mr. Brian Koper, TMAC DFO, introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the virtual and in-person public meeting. After the roll call, Mr. Brian Koper explained the requirements and protocols associated with this public meeting compared to previous administrative meetings; he emphasized the procedures for public comments. He then handed it over to Mr. Doug Bellomo to review the agenda for the day. After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

## **Review of Chapter 5 (Part 2)**

In a recent discussion led by Mr. Bellomo and Ms. Jamie Reinke, the focus was on Chapter 5, covering FEMA's floodplain map updates and regulatory triggers. Mr. Bellomo navigated through relevant aspects like the transition plan, standards, tools, views, and training recommendations. Ms. Reinke emphasized the regulatory map change trigger, suggesting community ownership of maps and addressing challenges in 2D modeling. Mr. Bellomo raised practical implementation questions. The conversation delved into the complexities of map updates, aligning engineering perspectives with regulations, and concluded with Vince stressing the development of regulatory map change triggers.

In a related conversation, participants including Mr. Bellomo, Ms. Necolle Maccherone, Mr. William Lehman, Ms. Seymour, and Ms. Maria Cox Lamm discussed challenges in FEMA's floodplain map updates. Mr. Bellomo emphasized balancing technical and administrative criteria. Mr. Lehman highlighted moral hazard concerns and potential conflicts, while Ms. Brooke Seymour stressed the need for a balance between preventing unwise development and avoiding excessive map changes. Ms. Cox Lamm discussed issues with federal highways not adhering to FEMA rules and challenges posed by budget constraints. The conversation explored responsibilities, potential conflicts, and the importance of clear definitions.

In a separate discussion involving Mr. Bellomo and Ms. Reinke, the challenges of 2D modeling data storage were addressed. Ms. Reinke emphasized the need for clear guidelines on data retention, advocating for an overhaul of mapping systems. Mr. Bellomo suggested categorizing data based on accessibility needs. Ms. Cox Lamm shared experiences at the state level, discussing reproducibility challenges and the impact of varying computational environments. Mr.

Lehman urged a shift away from extreme precision, emphasizing the need to balance flexibility with providing information.

In another dialogue, Mr. Ataul Hannan highlighted the importance of calibrating models for accurate floodplain modeling. He emphasized understanding hydrology basics, the significance of gauges, and the need for a comprehensive approach. Mr. Bellomo acknowledged challenges, stressing the effective integration of various aspects. The conversation covered the complexity of 2D modeling and challenges in defining "reasonably safe from flooding." Ms. Cox Lamm cautioned against legal issues, and Mr. Salomon Miranda suggested incorporating building codes into model ordinances. The discussion underscored the need for proper training and a collaborative approach to floodplain management.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Break**

The TMAC took a 30-minute break.

### **Summary of Discussion and Chapter Review**

Mr. Bellomo reviewed key points from each chapter of the document, addressing comments and suggestions. In Chapter 1, adjustments to the executive summary and the introduction were discussed, with a focus on summarizing objectives and incorporating graphics. Chapter 2 involved adding context to quantitative research and describing the content before listening sessions. Chapter 3 highlighted modifications to the proposed 95% SFHA, emphasizing the word 'new' and considering the use of the 500-year floodplain, when the 95% SFHA is unavailable. Chapter 4 touched upon clarifying distinctions between LOMR MT-1 and MT-2, proposing a quad chart for project descriptions. Chapter 5 included discussions on resource gaps, local leadership in flood-prone area maintenance, and expanding the discussion on 'no rise.' A new Chapter 6 was suggested for transition, ordinances, and training recommendations. Participants also emphasized the importance of graphics, call-out boxes, and consistent formatting.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Koper began the public comment period at 12:00 p.m. ET. Mr. Koper opened the forum for those who would like to make a public comment, and he explained the procedure for making a public comment.

Mr. David Conrad from the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM) gave a public comment. A written version of the comment is provided at the end of this document.

Without any further public comments, Mr. Koper adjourned the public comment period.

### **Summary and Review of Recommendations**

The discussion centers around FEMA's recommendations, specifically focusing on recommendations 45, 46, and 47.

Recommendation 45 proposes the development of a new Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) and a flood-prone area with increased confidence, incorporating the term "confidence" without specifying the 95% confidence level. However, further clarification is needed, leading to a temporary deferral until Jeff rejoins the conversation.

Recommendation 46, underscores FEMA's creation of SFHA based on the existing 1% annual chance of flood, considering uncertainty estimates at the 95% confidence level rather than the mean. Consideration is given to streamlining the recommendation by removing the phrase "by including estimates of uncertainty," and confirmation is sought regarding the current practice referring to the mean or median.

Recommendation 47 addresses FEMA's requirement for flood-prone areas in floodplain management to be based on future conditions, including land use and climate change, at the 95% confidence level.

A concise revision is proposed, suggesting FEMA requires new flood-prone areas for floodplain management to consider future conditions. In a meeting attended by Mr. Bellomo and others, discussions covered mandatory floodplain purchases, special letters for determination, uncertainties in flood models, and clarity of statements. Specific references were made to the 0.2% annual chance of flood, and Ms. Christine Brittle sought clarification while Mr. Bellomo proposed direct wording. Considerations included Zone X (shaded) meanings and future flood conditions, with Mr. DiCamillo suggesting language simplification. The meeting concluded with a focus on establishing flood hazard areas with 95% confidence limits for both existing and future conditions, emphasizing clear delineations and abandoning mean or median values for floodplain management. Reflections included contemplation on incorporating future conditions for the 500-year flood and concerns raised by Mr. Hannan and Mr. Sparrow about managing such conditions and communicating wide floodplains effectively.

Mr. Bellomo voiced apprehensions regarding the development of future conditions for the 500-year flood at the 95% confidence level, citing concerns about associated costs, maintenance, and potential complexities. Ms. Seymour raised thoughtful inquiries about the necessity of the 500-year event and proposed exploring the 95th percentile limit around the 500-year event as a viable alternative. Ms. Kim Dunn contributed valuable insights by highlighting uncertainties and potential legal challenges arising from integrating future conditions and climate change into the 2% annual chance flood delineation. The conversation also addressed practical implications for critical facilities, emphasizing the need for careful evaluation. Ultimately, the group considered recommending an evaluation of developing the existing conditions 500-year flood at the 95% confidence level, recognizing the multifaceted challenges and considerations involved in this decision.

Meanwhile, in a separate discussion with Mr. DiCamillo, Mr. Bellomo sought clarification on the feasibility of their current approach, expressing the need for reassurance. Mr. DiCamillo underlined the routine use of multifrequency in their operations and discussed potential costs associated with mapping a larger area for a 500-year flood at a 95% confidence level. The conversation explored the value of such an endeavor in addressing concerns beyond the 1% flood zone and considered factors such as climate data and cost implications. Mr. Bellomo suggested a lower-cost approach by assuming the same land use conditions as the 100-year future conditions,

and Mr. DiCamillo concurred, emphasizing the importance of evaluating the need for future conditions equivalent to the 500-year flood. The group concluded that proposing such an evaluation to FEMA could be advantageous, considering the potential costs in light of regulatory and practical benefits.

During a meeting discussion, Mr. Bellomo, along with Mr. Sparrow, Mr. DiCamillo, and Mr. Hannan, delved into proposed changes in AR 48 related to floodplain management. Mr. Bellomo stressed the need for substantive changes and requested Mr. Sparrow's review of proposed changes in AR 1 through AR 47. Concerns arose regarding Recommendation 45, with Mr. Sparrow questioning the addition of "more confidently." Mr. Bellomo clarified the connection to the 95% confidence limit, leading to a potential straw vote.

Transitioning to AR 49, the group, including Ms. Cox Lamm, discussed FEMA's role in 0.2% annual-chance ("500-year") estimates and future conditions. The conversation extended to AR 50, where Ms. Cox Lamm suggested language refinement, and Mr. Hannan emphasized MT1 process importance for filling permits.

Further discussions, led by Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Hannan, explored the implications of permitting fill-in floodplains, with considerations for FEMA CLOMR requirements and challenges faced by smaller communities. The meeting segment emphasized the critical nature of evaluating and mitigating alternatives, with a shift to AR 50 and AR 51, highlighting the need to broaden the scope for future technological changes.

The team also discussed AR 55, emphasizing FEMA's collaboration with states, tribes, and territories, recognizing the delicate balance between state and local considerations. A subsequent discussion involved insights from Ms. Cox Lamm and Ms. Reinke on updating floodplain ordinances, culminating in a shift from recommending a model ordinance to proposing a guidance document.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Lunch**

The TMAC took a one-hour lunch break.

### **Summarize Recommendation Discussion**

During this discussion, Mr. Bellomo suggested refining a recommendation related to FEMA's IT infrastructure. The discussion involves considerations about the breadth of the recommendation, including terms like 2D data, information interfaces, and tools. Mr. Hannan emphasizes the importance of accessibility, while others propose incorporating concepts like "FAIR" (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) principles. Mr. Stephen Aichele simplifies the recommendation to focus on FEMA establishing IT infrastructure to support user needs in a 2D data environment. The group agrees to this concise wording, and Mr. Bellomo plans to email the document for further review before a straw vote.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Break**

The TMAC took a 5-minute break.

### **Straw Vote**

Mr. DiCamillo initiated the motion to proceed with a straw vote, which was seconded by Mr. Bellomo. The process involved members using the “raise hand” function on Microsoft Teams raising their hands for yay or nay votes on each recommendation.

Mr. Bellomo guided the members through each recommendation, noting the number of raised hands. AR 45 received eight yay votes, with one abstention. Recommendations AR 46, AR 47, AR 48, AR 49, AR 50, AR 51, AR 52, AR 53, AR 54, AR 55, and AR 56 all garnered unanimous support with nine yay votes each. Mr. Bellomo expressed gratitude for the collaborative effort and mentioned that a formal vote would take place in the next public meeting.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

### **Close Out**

Mr. Bellomo led discussions on scheduling, recommendation refinement, and report finalization. Key points of the discussion included a critical deadline set for February 13<sup>th</sup>, after which editors will format the document, and Mr. Bellomo stressed the need for authors' availability for queries. The 0.95 version is slated for public release by February 25<sup>th</sup>, culminating in a hybrid meeting on February 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>, including a final vote. Cover design options are considered, favoring an abstract design.

The meeting concluded at 4:11 p.m. ET with expressions of gratitude and an optimistic outlook for the future stages of the project.

## **Public Comments**

### **Public Comments of David R. Conrad, Association of State Floodplain Managers to the Technical Mapping Advisory Council on January 23, 2024.**

I'm with the Association of State Floodplain Managers. First of all, ASFPM acknowledges and appreciates the hard work that this Committee or this Council is doing to help move forward the mapping program at FEMA and modernize that program. I missed some of the meetings today because of a couple of other meetings I had, but I became just a little concerned in the discussion about the use of the word "recommendation" and the team. I'm sorry, the FEMA NFIP should do this and that, mostly because I just thought that it would be particularly important for the TMAC, as much as it can reach a consensus on changes that they truly feel are important, to put that forward as clearly as possible. A rationale for both updated special flood hazard areas, including the higher confidence level that is being considered, and the new proposal for identifying flood-prone areas, as well as basic reasons to better manage, restrict, and in many cases, avoid fill in floodplain areas is important. But to just say that doesn't make them important; including the rationale for why such would be recommended by the TMAC is very important too.

I know there's always a balance between the amount of kind of rhetoric and just getting the message across. It is an issue, but I'm urging that the TMAC uses its expertise and offers its expertise on just why this is being proposed at this time. Because of a growing sense of urgency now and in the future, we are operating in an increasingly dynamic environment that is predictably affected by influences of changing climate, dynamic sea levels, and substantially changing development in developing landscapes. So, I'm just thinking the narrative should not skimp or avoid being as clear as we can as to why now is the time to make such recommendations. I think it will be most useful and helpful to FEMA, the department, and anyone else concerned about mapping to see that rationale and have that included as just a kind of basic overall view. As you were doing this final editing work, thank you again for the opportunity to put in a few words. I hope that is helpful. I, again, think you're doing a tremendous job, and this is the right group to work on this. So, we appreciate it. Thank you.

### **Public Comments of David R. Conrad, Association of State Floodplain Managers to the Technical Mapping Advisory Council on January 24, 2024.**

David Conrad with the Association of State Floodplain Managers: I have been trying to monitor the discussions, which I have found fascinating amongst the TMAC members. Yesterday, I made a comment that I would amplify based on the last few minutes of discussion. When we talked yesterday about this range of implications, there was a bit of discussion after the public comment period about potentially creating a graphic identifying 4 different quadrants where environmental impacts are considered by regulators at the local level and/or at FEMA. The idea of environmental impacts and property risk-related impacts is a good one and should be pursued. The main thing I was trying to impart is that, beyond the TMAC and FEMA, although FEMA is significant, there is a need for a review of the final text to ensure that TMAC members are aware of the need for an explanation. This is crucial to explain why adding the 95% confidence interval

or confidence level and future conditions is important. Congress requested this more than 10 years ago, and it represents crucial progress. When we reach the point of a near-final draft, ASFPM will ensure that the science underpinning these discussions is summarized to help the uninitiated follow the recommendations. The weaknesses of current method mapping standards and methodologies being discussed include current experiences leading us to use mapping tools to identify risks and help all segments of society make better location decisions, particularly for economic activity and residences set for safety purposes. We will be looking to ensure that the report doesn't solely focus on professions but also addresses the purposes behind these recommendations. Thank you, and ASFPM will aim to communicate this more cogently in writing, either now or in the coming month, as we continue to pay attention. That concludes my three minutes. Thank you.