

# TMAC

## Technical Mapping Advisory Council Meeting

### Virtual Public Meeting

March 1-2, 2021

#### **TMAC Members**

Doug Bellomo\*\*, *AECOM, Chair*

Nancy Blyler, *USACE, USACE  
Representative*

Scott Giberson, *CoreLogic Flood Services,  
Flood Hazards Determination Member*

David Guignet, *Maryland Department of the  
Environment, State CTP Representative*

Suzanne Jiwani, *Association of State  
Floodplain Managers, Flood Plain  
Management Member*

Carey Johnson, *Kentucky Division of Water,  
State CTP Representative*

Carolyn Kousky\*, *Wharton Risk Center,  
Risk Management Member*

Tony LaVoi\*, *NOAA, NOAA Designee*

David Love, *Mecklenburg County Storm  
Water Services, Local CTP Representative*

Robert Mason, *USGS, DOI Designee*

Salomon Miranda, *California Department of  
Water Resources, State NFIP Coordination  
Office Representative*

James Nadeau, *Nadeau Land Surveys,  
Surveying Member*

Jon Paoli, *Iowa Homeland Security &  
Emergency Management, GIS  
Representative*

Luis Rodriguez, *FEMA, FEMA Designee*

Jonathan Smith, *Natural Resources  
Conservation Service, USDA Designee*

Jeff Sparrow\*, *Moffatt & Nichol, Chair*

Joshua Stuckey, *Texas Public Infrastructure,  
Regional Flood and Stormwater  
Management Member*

Michael Tischler, *USGS, USGS  
Representative*

#### **Government Attendees**

Sarah Abdelrahim, *FEMA, ADFO*

John Ebersole, *FEMA, Legal Advisor*

Brian Koper, *FEMA DFO*

Michael Nakagaki, *FEMA, ADFO*

#### **Support Staff**

Henry Cauley, *Team Deloitte*

Jen Marcy, *Atkins Global*

Phetmano Phannavong, *Atkins Global*

Ryan O'Conner, *AECOM*

Alexis Richmond, *Team Deloitte*

Molly Tuttle, *AECOM*

Sarah Vining, *Team Deloitte*

**Subject Matter Expert**

Will Lehman, *USACE*, SME

**Legend:**

\*=Attended Day 1 Only

\*\*=Attended Day 2 Only

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the virtual Technical Mapping Advisory Council Public Meeting was to: (1) finalize and vote to submit the 2020 TMAC Annual Report and (2) review the 2021 Tasking Memo delivered by FEMA and begin to organize in preparation for the work in the coming year.

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

Mr. Brian Koper, TMAC DFO, welcomed everyone to the first day of the virtual March 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> TMAC Public Meeting. Mr. Koper informed the TMAC that the purpose of this meeting was for the TMAC to review and vote to submit the 2020 TMAC Annual Report, and then to review the 2021 Tasking Memo and prepare for the work in the coming year. Mr. Koper introduced the PM and PTS support staff, as well as the other FEMA attendees. Mr. Koper shared the agenda for the meeting with the TMAC and noted that a public comment period would be included each day per FACA requirements. Mr. Koper provided an overview on the use of Zoom for this meeting, including a reminder to use the raise hand function for any TMAC members that wish to speak. TMAC members should also use the Zoom chat box to inform the TMAC and DFO if they need to step away from the meeting momentarily.

### **Opening Remarks**

Mr. Sparrow, TMAC Chair, motioned to open the meeting and Mr. Bellomo, TMAC Vice Chair, provided a second. Mr. Sparrow welcomed everyone to the virtual TMAC Public Meeting and reiterated the purpose of the meeting today was to do a final review and vote on the 2020 TMAC Annual Report. Mr. Sparrow thanked all the TMAC and support teams for their efforts on finalizing the report. Once the TMAC votes on the report, it will go through a final technical copy edit, 508 compliance check, and the TMAC will have one last opportunity to review the report to find any issues prior to the report being submitted to FEMA and posted online.

### **Discussion: First Half of 2020 Annual Report**

Mr. Sparrow began the discussion by stating that there were no major changes to Chapter 1 since the last virtual TMAC Public Meeting. The chapter contains many sections of standard text that are similar to what has been found in previous TMAC Annual Reports. Mr. Sparrow requested that all members of the TMAC review this section to ensure their names and job titles are correct. An acknowledgment section was added to this chapter and Mr. Sparrow thanked the SMEs and support teams for their assistance.

Following the overview of the chapter the TMAC then provided several comments. Mr. Giberson noted that page six uses the term “national flood mapping program,” but the term does not appear anywhere else in the document. Additionally, page 43 discusses the Future of Flood Risk Data (FFRD), but FFRD is not mentioned in this opening section of the report. Mr. Bellomo agreed with Mr. Giberson on the need for consistent language when describing the future state. Mr. Bellomo also had additional comments for this section that he would send to the support team directly.

Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Guignet then provided an update for Chapter 2. The pair stated that some of the icons and graphics in this section have been updated but there was little change to the written content. Mr. Bellomo provided a suggestion for updating the graphic in section 2.1 and Ms. Jen Marcy agreed to make the change. Ms. Marcy questioned whether public comments that are provided during TMAC Public Meetings should be included in the body of the report or included as an appendix. Mr. Sparrow noted that public comments are already included as part of the meeting minutes that are posted to the TMAC website and thus do not need to be included as part of the report.

Mr. Giberson questioned whether the report should acknowledge that stakeholder engagement was better for some groups versus others. Mr. Giberson had drafted language that would encourage those groups who had less participation to be more actively involved in the future. Mr. Sparrow appreciated this suggestion by Mr. Giberson and agreed it should be put into section 2.3.

Mr. Bellomo provided an update to Chapter 3, beginning with section 3.1. Mr. Sparrow asked Mr. Rodriguez whether there were any concerns regarding the authority language on page 16. Mr. Rodriguez did not see any issue with this language. Mr. Bellomo stated that there were some language and graphic updates to section 3.1, including changing the language around the term “structure.” Mr. Jim Nadeau was concerned that the term “property-specific” would make people think it meant “building-specific.” Mr. Robert Mason agreed and questioned whether “location-specific” would be a better term. Mr. Nadeau suggested the term “collateral for the loan” but Mr. Bellomo noted that land could also be part of the collateral. Mr. Giberson added that the TMAC is looking to communicate risk to everyone, not just those with loans, so the suggested term should be removed altogether. Other members of the TMAC agreed with Mr. Giberson and the term was removed.

Mr. Guignet asked Mr. Will Lehman and Mr. Mason to provide the overview for section 3.2. Mr. Lehman stated there were no major changes to this section since the previous meeting, the only updates were to address some of the comments and to add an image that describes damage function related to structures. Ms. Suzanne Jiwani agreed with the image but believes the information should be reversed, with higher flows being indicated to the right and lower flows indicated to the left. Ms. Carolyn Kousky and Mr. Guignet agreed with Ms. Jiwani.

Mr. Bellomo noted that for figure 7, the lines should be extended into the structure and the curve should be steeper. Mr. Lehman agreed that the curve is too flat. Mr. Mason suggested removing the word “compound” from figure 4 and pointed out that some of the hydraulic issue examples for figure 5 are not hydraulic and that additional clarification is needed. Ms. Jiwani offered to develop language for this graphic as well. Mr. Sparrow suggested a short call between Mr. Mason, Mr. Lehman, and Ms. Jiwani to clean up this section.

Mr. Guignet continued to present on section 3.2, noting that figure 6 will remain in the document unless anyone from the TMAC objects. Additionally, the language regarding best practices in

section 3.2.5 was changed to “applied practices.” Mr. Guignet noted that information on First Street Foundation was added back into the document and that the writers do not feel it endorses First Street and thus should be okay. Mr. Giberson stated that the language on First Street Foundation later in the document will need to be checked to make sure it is not reintroducing the organization.

Mr. Bellomo continued to section 3.3. There were several changes to this section including striking the word mandatory from the graphic and the title. Mr. Bellomo added that the word “required” is used in bullet one on page 33 and suggested the term “encouraging” instead. Mr. Nadeau agreed with the use of encouraging. Mr. Nadeau added that language needs to be included in the report that explains the difference between precision and accuracy. Mr. Bellomo agreed that stakeholders may misunderstand these terms as technology improves. The TMAC consulted with the DFOs and agreed that the term “floodplain” is one word.

Concluding the conversation on Chapter 3, Mr. Sparrow suggested the TMAC review the dedication statement that will be included in the report as tribute to Mr. Mark Crowell. Mr. Sparrow noted that many members of the TMAC had previously worked with Mr. Crowell and that he was the first DFO of the TMAC when it was established following the passing of BW12. Mr. Crowell passed away in September 2020 and Mr. Sparrow and Mr. Bellomo had discussed dedicating this report to Mr. Crowell, although no previous TMAC Annual Reports were ever dedicated to anyone. Mr. Sparrow asked whether anyone on the TMAC had any concerns regarding this dedication or any comments on the dedication statement. No concerns or comments were presented.

### **Discussion, Second Half of 2020 Annual Report, pt. 1**

The TMAC then moved to discussing the second half of the report. Mr. Salomon Miranda began the discussion for Chapter 4. The TMAC provided several language update suggestions, including striking the word “finally” from page 45 and changing the title of section 4.3 to “Opportunities to Support the FFRD Initiative.” Mr. Michael Tischler questioned whether the order of the sections was correct, and Mr. Mason provided clarification that the order of the sections is correct. Mr. Miranda noted that there is a placeholder for a graphic on page 45 highlighting the importance of the framework. The graphic had originally been removed but Mr. Miranda felt the graphic should be put back into the report. Ms. Molly Tuttle noted that the graphic is still in development but will be added once complete. Mr. Miranda asked whether there was any update to when Risk Rating 2.0 would be rolled out and Mr. Rodriguez stated the date remains October 2021.

### **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Koper opened the Public Comment Period. Per the FACA, the TMAC holds a public comment period, written or spoken, about any of the topics the TMAC discusses. If commenters have not registered, Mr. Koper asked commenters to write in the Zoom chat. The public

comment period should not exceed 30 minutes. One request for public comment was submitted by Ms. Shana Udvardy from the Union of Concerned Scientists. A written version of her comment has been attached to the end of the meeting minutes. No other public comments were received.

### **Discussion, Second Half of 2020 Annual Report, pt. 2**

Mr. Miranda continued the discussion of Chapter 4 and noted that the table of statutes and regulations would not be included in the main body of the report. The TMAC agreed to share additional minor comments for section 4.2 with the support team. Mr. Bellomo suggested inserting the word “greater” into the second line of the first paragraph for section 4.2.4, since the goal “achieve greater resiliency and resiliency” is not binary. Mr. Miranda asked Mr. Tischler to provide an overview of section 4.3. Mr. Tischler appreciated that the scope of this section was broadened. The focus of this section remains on the data elements that can still support FFRD. Mr. Tischler added that Lidar should be all lower-case letters. Mr. Tischler agreed to share an article explaining why this spelling version is important and requested that the spelling be updated in the entire document.

Additional suggested edits were provided for section 4.3.1.5. Mr. Tischler asked Mr. Mason and Mr. Lehman if they had any additional comments to provide. Mr. Mason stated it was important to add information on uncertainty and probability and to call attention to the fact that one way to reduce uncertainty is to lengthen the record of observation. Mr. Lehman agreed with the comments of Mr. Mason and also expressed the need to make the National Structure Inventory available to the public. Mr. Mason stated that a new illustration for figure 8 was included and Mr. Bellomo expressed his support for this new graphic. The TMAC agreed that any links included in the report should be live links within the appropriate sections, rather than links that must be cut and pasted into a web browser or included in the appendix section. Mr. Tischler stated that he was working on additional graphics for section 4.3 and would submit them later this week.

The TMAC broke for lunch.

The TMAC returned from lunch and Mr. Koper reminded the TMAC members of the need to attend the annual ethics briefing at either of the proposed times. Mr. Jonathan Smith then provided the overview for section 4.4. Two updates were made since the last TMAC meeting. Section 4.4.1 discusses the CTP program and section 4.4.3 identifies data sets and tools that should be maintained in some form moving forward. Mr. Miranda asked Ms. Marcy whether there were any stakeholder survey insights that could be added to this section. Mr. Bellomo noted the BLE approach language is out of place and should be removed. Mr. Miranda agreed.

Mr. Giberson proposed a new subsection for 4.4.3 but would like to get feedback from Mr. Rodriguez. This addition would emphasize that while dynamic data is important, point and time data is also important because it provides an anchor point for decision making. Mr. Giberson

added that there were some comments in the stakeholder feedback survey that supported this view. Mr. Bellomo agreed with Mr. Giberson, version control can be a challenge and so point and time is important for a number of different tools and scenarios. Mr. Rodriguez also agreed on the need for version control for tools and data. Ms. Jiwani advocated that this language should be added to section 4.4.2 and Mr. Sparrow agreed. Mr. Miranda then asked Ms. Jiwani and Ms. Kousky to present on section 4.5. Mr. Bellomo noted that some local municipalities do provide flood risk tools and thus the graphic within this section should be reflective of this fact. Mr. Sparrow and other TMAC members also provided additional comments on how the chart could be updated. Ms. Kousky added that this section also mentions First Street Foundation and so the language needs to be compared to what is written earlier in the report to ensure the two sections are linked. Mr. Carey Solomon then provided an overview of section 4.6, stating that there were no major changes.

Mr. Sparrow discussed Chapter 5, which contains the recommendations that were approved during the last TMAC Public Meeting. The introduction to this chapter was updated and the numbering of the recommendations were changed to match the current list of recommendations submitted to FEMA. The new recommendations are numbered 35-38. Following the completion of the Annual Report, Mr. Sparrow will work with the subcommittee chairs to draft the transmittal letter that will be sent to FEMA.

The TMAC then reviewed the appendices for the 2020 Annual Report. Ms. Marcy noted that the weblink on the TMAC site for the stakeholder engagement work was not yet available. Mr. Sparrow requested that a cover image for each appendix be developed. Mr. Lehman noted that he did not need to be listed as an author for Appendix G, or if he is listed then Mr. Mason should also be listed as an author. Mr. Miranda gave kudos to the report development team for the graphics and pictures that were included in the report. Mr. Sparrow stated that the footers for each of the appendices need to be corrected.

#### **Discussion: “2020 Annual Report”**

Mr. Sparrow asked the TMAC whether there were any thoughts or comments to share on the overall report. Mr. Sparrow added that he felt the report has come along nicely. No comments or thoughts were submitted by the TMAC.

#### **Public Comment: “2020 Annual Report”**

Mr. Koper opened the Public Comment Period. Per the FACA, the TMAC holds a public comment period, written or spoken, about any of the topics the TMAC discusses. If commenters have not registered, Mr. Koper asked commenters to write in the Zoom chat. The public comment period should not exceed 5 minutes. One request for public comment was made by Ms. Shana Udvardy from the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Ms. Udvardy thanked the TMAC for the opportunity to provide a public comment and requested that the TMAC think creatively about how public comments could be incorporated into the 2020 TMAC Annual Report, perhaps as an appendix. Ms. Udvardy also commented that the schedule of rolling out Risk Rating 2.0 rates in April and then implementing these rates in October is not enough time to develop meaningful engagement and trust with those communities that will be most impacted by these changes. Additionally, the language in section 4.2.4, public engagement, lists “others.” Ms. Udvardy believes the TMAC should consider expanding upon what this means. Ms. Udvardy added that though the report is being released under the Biden Administration, there is no obvious mention of climate change in the document. Finally, Ms. Udvardy requested that the draft report be posted online prior to the TMAC Public Meeting so that the public would have adequate time to review and provide commentary on the report.

Mr. Koper thanked Ms. Udvardy for her comment and no other public comments were made.

### **Deliberation: “2020 Annual Report”**

Ms. Kousky questioned whether a statement should be added to the report that explains the purpose of the report is to respond to the 2020 Tasking Memo. Mr. Sparrow recommends working something into the background section of Chapter One. Ms. Kousky reiterated that this statement does not need to be more than a sentence. Mr. Giberson believes climate change is mentioned in the report, though it is not explored as it was not part of the tasking memo. Mr. Bellomo confirmed climate change is mentioned in several parts of the report.

### **Vote: “2020 Annual Report”**

The TMAC moved to vote on the 2020 TMAC Annual Report. Mr. Stuckey provided a motion to vote, and Mr. Miranda provided the second. The TMAC voted in the zoom chat and the report was approved unanimously.

### **Closing Remarks**

Mr. Sparrow thanked everyone for their hard work on the 2020 TMAC Annual Report. Mr. Bellomo thanked Mr. Sparrow for his leadership in guiding the TMAC to this point. The meeting was then adjourned for the day.

## **Day 2**

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

Ms. Abdelrahim welcomed everyone back to Day 2 of the virtual TMAC public meeting. Ms. Abdelrahim introduced the PM and PTS support staff and conducted the roll call for the TMAC members. Ms. Abdelrahim shared the agenda for the meeting with the TMAC and noted that a public comment period would be included today per FACA requirements. Ms. Abdelrahim

provided an overview on the use of Zoom for this meeting, including a reminder to use the raise hand function for any TMAC members that wish to speak. TMAC members should also use the Zoom chat box to inform the TMAC and DFO if they need to step away from the meeting momentarily.

### **Opening Remarks**

Mr. Sparrow welcomed everyone back to Day 2 of the virtual TMAC Public Meeting. Mr. Sparrow thanked the TMAC for all of their hard work and expressed his gratitude for being able to serve as Chair of the TMAC. Mr. Sparrow noted that the purpose of today would be to elect a new TMAC Chair and then begin to plan for the work this coming year, based on the information provided by the Tasking Memo issued by FEMA.

### **Vote to Elect the 2021 TMAC Chair**

Ms. Abdelrahim opened the vote for new TMAC chair and noted that Mr. Bellomo was currently running unopposed. No other members of the TMAC submitted a nomination for the position during the five minute voting period. Mr. Bellomo was elected new Chair of the TMAC and the DFO team thanked Mr. Sparrow for all of his leadership during the past year. Mr. Bellomo thanked everyone on the TMAC for their vote of confidence and thanked Mr. Sparrow for all of his work.

### **2021 TMAC Tasking Memo Presentation**

Mr. Bellomo suggested the TMAC review the 2021 Tasking Memo prior to Mr. Grimm joining the meeting. Mr. Bellomo stated that the hope for the second day of the meeting would be to develop a structure for the TMAC for the coming year. Mr. Johnson requested an update on which TMAC member's terms would expire at the end of the month. Mr. Bellomo confirmed those who's terms would be expiring, noting nine members in total would be expiring. Mr. Michael Nakagaki stated that the TMAC DFO team was continuing to work with the DHS CMO to vet and clear the new appointments. The TMAC confirmed that it can continue to meet even without the new members as quorum is defined as 50% +1 of the appointed TMAC members. Mr. Bellomo stressed the importance of everyone who remains on the TMAC participating in all of the meetings.

Mr. Bellomo welcomed Mr. Mike Grimm to the meeting and Mr. Grimm thanked the TMAC for the opportunity to speak about the 2021 Tasking Memo. Mr. Grimm shared and presented the 2021 TMAC Tasking Memo. Mr. Grimm noted that the tasking memo identifies three specific areas for the TMAC to focus in 2021: 1) continue the stakeholder engagement work that began in 2020, 2) review the recommendations established in the 2015 TMAC Future Conditions Report, and 3) explore how an Enterprise Risk Management Framework might be applied to flood risk management. Each of the three tasks also included several sub tasks to help guide the specific actions of the TMAC. Mr. Grimm added that as part of the new administration the TMAC is able to use the term climate change again. Mr. Grimm also asked Mr. Rodriguez if he had anything to add to the conversation. Mr. Rodriguez emphasized the opportunities for producing the report under the new administration.

Mr. Bellomo thanked Mr. Grimm for this presentation on the tasking memo and suggested the TMAC discuss each of the three items in turn. Regarding stakeholder engagement, Mr. Bellomo asked whether the work around SLTTs would be oriented to developing higher standards for these groups, or about providing additional data to help them increase their understanding of floodplain management and flood risk. Mr. Grimm replied that the request would cover both of those aspects. Mr. Sparrow noted that the stakeholders listed are very focused on local and state floodplain management officials and asked if FEMA would be okay with the TMAC reaching out to other stakeholder groups as well. Mr. Grimm replied “yes.” Mr. Giberson asked whether TMAC has any information regarding behavior change that it recommends the TMAC use? Mr. Grimm agreed to see what information was available and would share with the TMAC.

Mr. Guignet noted that there are still big gaps in how decisions are made regarding which data sets to use when making decisions related to floodplain management. Mr. Bellomo noted that enterprise risk management frameworks might help address this issue and that the third sub bullet for enterprise risk management makes it clear that risk management is scalable. Mr. Grimm agreed on the importance of making data available to help stakeholders make informed decisions. Mr. Rodriguez commented that years of experience have shown the government can be transparent but slow. Mr. Bellomo added that this is why other stakeholder groups are needed to allow for more dynamic data to be developed more quickly.

Mr. Sparrow noted that in 2017 the TMAC recommended that FEMA conduct a user needs assessment, based on the information in the 2015 Future Conditions Report; was the assessment completed? Mr. Grimm, Mr. Rodriguez, and Ms. Abdelrahim were unsure. Mr. Mason commented that Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. Sparrow, and Mr. Bellomo were all great leaders. Mr. Bellomo thanked Mr. Grimm for presenting on the tasking memo and noted the importance and value of hearing from Mr. Grimm directly. Mr. Bellomo added that there is an exciting year ahead for the TMAC.

### **2021 Subcommittee Determination and Selection (pt. 1)**

Mr. Bellomo informed the TMAC that the next item on the agenda would be to discuss how the TMAC would organize for the coming year, based on the information that was presented in the tasking memo. Mr. Tischler stressed that extra attention should be paid to who is and who is not expiring to ensure a fair and responsible distribution of work. Mr. Bellomo stated the TMAC should hope for the best and prepare for the worst regarding new members being able to join the TMAC in a timely manner. Mr. Bellomo also confirmed that the TMAC can leverage the use of SMEs in the coming year to supplement the loss of official members. Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Mason both commented that there is a lot of overlap between the three tasking areas.

Mr. Sparrow proposed that one subcommittee be formed to address enterprise risk management, one subcommittee be formed to address the 2015 Future Conditions Report, and a working group be formed that would be led by the subcommittee chairs to oversee the stakeholder engagement work. Mr. Bellomo felt this was an interesting approach and added that how the TMAC envisions the end state of the report could also determine the organizing structure. Mr. Miranda

commented that during the writing of the 2020 report, subcommittee two was dependent on the work of subcommittee one, which created challenges. Mr. Salomon suggested the TMAC wait to break into subcommittees until after the stakeholder engagement work began. Mr. Salomon added this could also allow for additional time for new members to hopefully join the TMAC and be brought up to speed. Mr. Guignet agreed with Mr. Salomon that a lot of energy was spent trying to figure out the best way to organize last year. Mr. Guignet suggested having another meeting to discuss each of the three topics at greater length, and then identify the ideal subcommittee structure. Mr. Johnson noted the importance for all of the TMAC members to be a part of the stakeholder engagement process.

Mr. Tischler questioned whether it was possible for the TMAC to not address all three areas outlined in the tasking memo. Mr. Bellomo replied yes, but that he was excited about all three areas. Other members of the TMAC also expressed their interest and excitement in all three areas. Mr. Mason reiterated the importance of getting the stakeholder engagement work moving quickly. Mr. Mason added that the scope of item 2, reviewing the 2015 Future Conditions Report, did not seem that difficult and would likely not take a full year to complete. Mr. Bellomo agreed. Mr. Love questioned whether there was anyone still on the TMAC who supported the development of the 2015 Future Conditions Report.

The TMAC paused for the public comment period.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Abdelrahim opened the Public Comment Period. Per the FACA, the TMAC holds a public comment period, written or spoken, about any of the topics the TMAC discusses. If commenters have not registered, Ms. Abdelrahim asked commenters to write in the Zoom chat. The public comment period should not exceed 30 minutes. One request for public comment was submitted by Ms. Shana Udvardy from the Union of Concerned Scientists. A written version of her comment has been attached to the end of the meeting minutes. No other public comments were received.

### **2021 Subcommittee Determination and Selection (pt. 2)**

Mr. Bellomo asked that the TMAC consider the following options during the break for lunch: 1) three subcommittees based around the three tasking areas, 2) two subcommittees and a combined working group, or 3) hold a meeting to develop the outline of the report and stakeholder engagement plan and then use this information to organize. Mr. Bellomo stated that any additional recommendations would also be welcome. Mr. Rodriguez questioned whether the TMAC had decided to reduce the potential scope of work, and Mr. Bellomo responded that the TMAC should consider the entire scope as presented in the tasking memo for now. Mr. Mason asked when the 2021 report would be submitted, and Mr. Bellomo replied anytime between December 2021 and April 2022, but the TMAC should target the December date if possible.

The TMAC broke for lunch.

Mr. Bellomo welcomed everyone back and asked if the TMAC had any thoughts on how to organize. Mr. Johnson reiterated Mr. Miranda's earlier point on the importance of both subcommittees being involved in the stakeholder engagement piece during the 2020 report. Mr. Johnson then recommended the TMAC organize around two subcommittees, one for enterprise risk management and one for the future conditions report, and then work as a group on the stakeholder engagement piece. Mr. Johnson added that the ASFPM conference is earlier this year and if the TMAC wants to use this as an opportunity to engage stakeholders the work will need to begin quickly. Mr. Giberson noted that he had reviewed the 2015 Future Conditions Report and that it has a lot of information.

Mr. Bellomo questioned whether the stakeholder engagement plan would have some type of targeted effort to engage those groups who otherwise would not be included in the participation. Mr. Rodriguez agreed that the approach should include how to engage with underserved and underrepresented communities and groups. Mr. Love asked Ms. Marcy how difficult it would be to stand up the stakeholder engagement effort again. Ms. Marcy replied that she currently has a list of 400 names of individuals who had expressed an interest in being a part of future stakeholder engagement sessions. Ms. Marcy added that the tasking memo this year identifies specific stakeholder groups while the tasking memo last year did not.

Mr. Johnson noted that the EPA had formed an environmental justice group and that Mr. Johnson was a participant. Mr. Johnson stated he would bring any lessons learned from working with this group to the TMAC. Mr. Johnson added that ASFPM has formed a social justice task force as well. Mr. Bellomo asked whether the focus groups in 2020 were oriented around the four NFIP pillars. Ms. Marcy replied that was partly the case. Ms. Marcy recommended focusing on the 400 names as a starting point since the smaller focus groups had already provided a great deal of time and effort last year. Mr. Sparrow recommended not going all the way back to a general survey as a starting point.

Ms. Marcy asked Mr. O'Conner and Ms. Tuttle if they had a stakeholder engagement plan. Ms. Tuttle replied they currently do not but that they would review all of the tools used by Ms. Marcy last year to help develop this plan. Mr. Bellomo recommended modifying the survey questions from last year and Mr. Sparrow questioned whether there was more value out of one form of stakeholder engagement versus others. Ms. Marcy replied that binary survey questions are much easier to analyze, however the open ended questions that were part of the webinars yielded the most valuable information. Mr. Sparrow noted the value of both options and asked Mr. Rodriguez whether FEMA has developed any prototype resources that can be used to start a discussion on enterprise risk management with the broader floodplain management community. Mr. Rodriguez noted the challenge is getting stakeholders to leverage and use these new tools. Mr. Mason agreed on the importance of having something related to enterprise risk management that could be shared during the stakeholder engagement work.

Ms. Jiwani expressed excitement for the TMAC in the coming year but also cautioned that any products should not be completely finished but instead leading questions should be asked of

stakeholders to help identify how to get these products over the finish line. Mr. Bellomo expressed the importance of demonstrating how the product can improve on what the stakeholder is already doing. Mr. Guignet added that because the conversation could be more detail-driven this time there would be much more value that could be derived.

Mr. Bellomo noted that the original agenda had the TMAC identifying and separating into two subcommittees for the afternoon session. However, with no official subcommittees formed, Mr. Bellomo proposed the TMAC still separate into two groups, with one group focusing on what stakeholder engagement might look like, and the other focusing on the tasking memo and thinking through what the report would look like. Mr. Bellomo also added that he does feel a sense of urgency to begin to make progress.

The TMAC broke into two separate groups for more specific discussion.

### **Working Group Report Outs and Next Steps**

Mr. Bellomo provided an overview of discussion for the first working group, which discussed how to organize the report. Mr. Bellomo stated the report would be slightly longer than the 2020 report, although the group did not target a specific length. The audience would also be similar to the past, but more background information would be needed as much of the audience would not be experts in enterprise risk management or floodplain management. The group did not develop consensus on whether the stakeholder engagement work would be a separate chapter or interwoven throughout the report. There would be some type of chapter on future conditions, as well as one on enterprise risk management. The group also talked about reducing the number of appendices and instead including links to additional resources that are available elsewhere.

Mr. Sparrow then briefed out on the second working group, which discussed the potential stakeholder engagement plan. Mr. Sparrow stated the group began by asking Ms. Marcy and Ms. Tuttle for a reminder of how the stakeholder engagement work was conducted for the 2020 report. Mr. Sparrow added that there are six sub-bullets for the stakeholder engagement task in the 2021 Funding Memo and that it would be important to tailor the outreach to these six questions. The group also discussed two or three specific engagement groups: 1) the floodplain management community; 2) the flood insurance community; and 3) underserved communities and populations. Additionally, while the desired outcomes of the three groups would be similar, the approach could be different depending on the stakeholder roles (user versus producer) and geography. In regard to timing, work for all three groups would begin in parallel and would jumpstart with ASFPM in May.

Mr. Bellomo questioned whether there were other venues where insurance stakeholders could be engaged, and Mr. Giberson replied there are also conferences in April and July that would be a possibility. Mr. Bellomo also asked whether there was any discussion on how to best engage with the underserved community stakeholders and Mr. Sparrow replied the group did not yet have an approach. Mr. Sparrow added they are aware that some Federal agencies are already engaged in similar efforts and the TMAC should try to leverage those efforts where possible.

Mr. Bellomo stated that a separate chapter on stakeholder outreach may be needed in the report, just to define how each of the groups were approached in their own unique ways. Mr. Bellomo also stressed the need to consider sharing the draft report for public comments for 30 days before the final TMAC meeting of the year since this would also allow for additional stakeholder engagement.

Mr. Bellomo stated that for a next step he would like to see an administrative meeting scheduled for some time in the next two weeks, with the possibility of additional administrative meetings later in the month. Mr. Bellomo added the need to make progress if the TMAC was going to leverage the conferences in April and May. Mr. Bellomo asked the TMAC to be on the lookout for a poll of potential meeting availability later in the week. Mr. Bellomo thanked everyone for their work the past two days and the meeting was adjourned.