

# **Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC)**

## **Virtual Administrative Meeting Notes**

**March 30, 2021, 1 PM – 3 PM ET**

### **TMAC Members**

Doug Bellomo, *AECOM, Chair*

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

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

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

Robert Mason, *USGS, DOI Designee*

Jim Nadeau, *Nadeau Land Surveys,  
Surveying Member*

Michael Tischler, *USGS, USGS  
Representative*

### **Subject Matter Experts**

Will Lehman, *USACE, SME*

### **Government Attendees**

Sarah Abdelrahim, *FEMA, ADFO*

John Ebersole, *FEMA, Legal Advisor*

Michael Nakagaki, *FEMA, ADFO*

### **Support Staff**

Jen Marcy, *Atkins Global*

Ryan O'Conner, *AECOM*

Ann Terranova, *AECOM*

Sarah Vining, *Team Deloitte*

### **Presenters**

N/A



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

Mr. Michael Nakagaki, the TMAC ADFO, welcomed members and participants to the meeting and introduced the Government attendees and support staff. He then proceeded with a roll call of TMAC members and went through the day's agenda. Mr. Nakagaki reminded everyone that the meeting is an administrative meeting.

Mr. John Ebersole, TMAC Counsel, reminded the TMAC members to submit their OGE 450 forms if they are classified as a special government employee given their role on the TMAC and if they had not already done so. Mr. Ebersole requested that all forms be submitted to him no later than April 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **Opening Remarks**

Mr. Doug Bellomo, TMAC Chair, thanked everyone for being in attendance and added additional thanks to those TMAC members whose terms expired today. Mr. Bellomo reiterated the purpose of the meeting today was to review the highlights of the last TMAC Administrative Meeting, talk about the subcommittee structure for the TMAC in the coming year, identify the co-chairs of each subcommittee, identify who would be included in the stakeholder engagement working group, and identify any additional SME briefs that the TMAC feels would be beneficial to receive. Mr. Bellomo stressed that it is already April and the TMAC needs to keep pushing forward to ensure the annual report is completed on time.

Mr. Bellomo noted that everyone should have received a summary email from him that provided an overview of the March 16<sup>th</sup> TMAC Administrative Meeting. Mr. Bellomo reminded the TMAC that during this previous meeting it was decided not to shut down any specific avenues related to stakeholder engagement and that, if possible, the TMAC would leverage the upcoming National Flood Conference and annual ASFPM Conference in order to conduct further stakeholder engagement.

Mr. Carey Johnson offered to help facilitate the conversation with the planning team for ASFPM and agreed that, because the conference is earlier this year, it is important that the TMAC begin to make progress now. Mr. Scott Giberson noted that for the National Flood Conference the TMAC could run a short "commercial" during one of the plenary speaking slots that would provide an overview of the stakeholder engagement work of the TMAC. Mr. Johnson felt this was a great idea and was similar to how the TMAC engaged with ASFPM last year. Mr. Bellomo also felt this was a good idea and recommended that the message not be longer than two minutes and serve to provide stakeholders with the link to the stakeholder engagement survey. Mr. Bellomo added that a survey would be a good tool for mass data collection and analysis provided the questions were not open ended.

Mr. James Nadeau stressed the need to ensure that stakeholder groups who were not heavily engaged in last year's effort be included this year. Specifically, Mr. Nadeau cited insurance agents, real estate agents, and lenders as stakeholder groups that need better engagement this year. Mr. Bellomo commented that many of these stakeholders attend the National Flood Conference and thus the TMAC should have an easier time reaching them this year.



TMAC Administrative Meeting Notes, March 30, 2021

Mr. Bellomo then reminded the TMAC of the three SME presentations that were provided during the March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting: 1) an overview of the FIMA Strategic Plan, 2) a discussion on behavior-change practices as used by FEMA, and 3) a presentation on enterprise risk management. Mr. Bellomo added that the slides for the three presentations were included in his summary email on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Bellomo then identified the three SME briefings the TMAC would still like to receive: 1) reaching underserved groups through HUD or other government agencies, 2) a presentation on data and tool prototypes developed by FEMA, and 3) an update on the status of prior TMAC recommendations. Mr. Bellomo requested that each of the subcommittees discuss any additional SME briefings they would like to receive during the breakout room conversations later in the meeting.

### **Subcommittee Structure**

Mr. Bellomo reminded the TMAC of the discussion at the previous TMAC Administrative Meeting for how the TMAC could organize for the coming year. The tentative decision at the last meeting was two subcommittees, Enterprise Risk Management and Future Conditions, and then representatives from each of the subcommittees would form a separate working group to support the stakeholder engagement function. Mr. Bellomo asked if anyone had issues with this approach and no concerns were put forward. Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Bellomo that this was a good way to organize the work for the coming year.

Mr. Bellomo then outlined the next steps for the meeting. TMAC members would identify which subcommittee they wished to join, then the subcommittees would break out, elect their chair/co-chairs, identify who from the subcommittee would join the stakeholder engagement working group, and identify any additional SME briefings the subcommittee or the larger TMAC should receive.

The TMAC then identified the members for each of the subcommittees:

Enterprise Risk Management Subcommittee: Dave Guignet, Will Lehman (SME), David Love, Scott Giberson, Jeff Sparrow (SME), Doug Bellomo (floating between both subcommittees), Jen Marcy (support), Molly Tuttle (support)

Future Conditions Subcommittee: Carey Johnson, Jim Nadeau, Jonathan Smith, Michael Tischler, Tony LaVoi (to be replaced by new NOAA designee), Doug Bellomo (floating between both subcommittees), Ryan O'Conner (support), Ann Terranova (support)

Mr. Tony LaVoi noted that he would be leaving the TMAC and a new person has been nominated to fill his role. Mr. LaVoi requested that the new person be added to all correspondence moving forward. Mr. Bellomo clarified that the new person would only be able to serve as a SME until the official nomination was complete. Mr. Bellomo also thanked Mr. LaVoi for all of his work with the TMAC.

The TMAC then broke into the two subcommittees.

### **Breakout Group: Future Conditions Subcommittee**

Mr. Johnson asked for clarification on what the subcommittee needed to discuss today, and Ms. Abdelrahim



TMAC Administrative Meeting Notes, March 30, 2021

provided a reminder. Mr. Johnson noted he would be happy to serve as co-chair but would not like to fill this role alone. Mr. Tischler noted that several long-term TMAC members, including Mr. Robert Mason and Mr. Luis Rodriguez, were currently unassigned to subcommittees and that it would be beneficial to add them to this subcommittee as they have more historical knowledge. Mr. Nadeau confirmed that Mr. Mason and Mr. Rodriguez were part of the future conditions report that was published in 2016 and 2017. Mr. Johnson questioned whether Mr. Mason had ended his current term on the TMAC and Ms. Abdelrahim stated that she would determine his status.

Mr. Johnson then asked if there were any SME briefings that the subcommittee members would like to receive. Mr. Nadeau suggested the importance of building a better understanding of climate change and climate change policy. Mr. Johnson agreed, noting that the new administration was making climate change a priority. Mr. Johnson suggested that the subcommittee receive a briefing from the administration on their new climate policy, if possible. Mr. Johnson also noted that the impact of climate change varies across the country and suggested having more regional-focused briefings regarding the impact of climate change on different parts of the country.

Ms. Ann Terranova introduced herself as part of the support team and shared a spreadsheet she had created which identifies all of the recommendations related to future conditions from the previous TMAC Annual Reports. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Nadeau both commented how useful this spreadsheet would be and requested that it be shared with the subcommittee. Mr. O'Conner offered to develop a Google Drive location for the subcommittee so that this and other relevant materials could be easily shared.

Mr. Nadeau questioned whether incentives could be a part of the recommendations made by the subcommittee related to future conditions. Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Nadeau and noted that the Tasking Memo did not appear to put any constraints on what recommendations are made by the group. Mr. Bellomo then joined the group and Mr. Johnson brought him up to speed on the conversation thus far.

The subcommittee meeting ended and the TMAC members returned to the main group.

### **Breakout Group: Enterprise Risk Management Subcommittee**

Ms. Jen Marcy opened the meeting in place of Mr. Phetmano Phannavong who was unable to attend. Ms. Marcy reminded the subcommittee that Mr. Phannavong will be supporting them and provided a brief overview of the discussion agenda.

Mr. Tischler opened the conversation by asking who would like to chair the committee, to which Mr. Guignet responded that it might be better to discuss which topics to focus on first. Mr. Giberson asked for further clarification on how Dr. Yoe's presentation on ERM could be applied to the Risk MAP program. Mr. Bellomo responded that there needs to be a balance of risk and tolerance, while also considering societal and environmental risks. Mr. Guignet agreed with Mr. Bellomo and emphasized that communities need to communicate risk better so community members can be better informed. Mr. Lehman vocalized his understanding of Mr. Guignet's response, to which Mr. Guignet responded that they said the same thing but to "different degrees of grey". Mr. Guignet added that flood plains are regulated and managed from 50 years back, but not outside of that timeframe.



TMAC Administrative Meeting Notes, March 30, 2021

Mr. Bellomo surmised that his approach was ideal from an economic standpoint, Mr. Guignet’s approach is more realistic and practical, and Mr. Lehman’s perspective introduced the idea that there might be interim steps to take such as watersheds built out or BLE+3. Mr. Bellomo and Guignet added that we need to ensure we are using the right verbiage when discussing risk – inform vs. manage. Mr. Lehman agreed with this perspective and emphasized how we are not necessarily managing from a geographic lens, but from a risk lens. Mr. Lehman added that it gets more complicated when they try to align community and government incentives and objectives.

Mr. Bellomo referred to Mr. Love to expound upon a presentation he heard regarding risk a point system. Mr. Love expounded to say that the intent of the point system was to take the focus away from the financial value of properties, and instead focus on the amount of damage done to the property. Mr. Bellomo and Mr. Love brought up the need to have a point threshold. Mr. Love stated that currently, the program threshold is focused on the question “where can we get to in the next 15 years”, followed by a hypothetical scenario. Mr. Lehman recapped the discussion and added that the focus of this approach is on being socially equitable which is in alignment with the objectives. Mr. Lehman continued that one challenge with the insurance model is the mandatory purchasing requirement which might “sink the ship” for many individuals.

Mr. Love and Mr. Bellomo discussed the threshold for elevation and the level of risk ownership for the homeowner. Mr. Love continued that the first goal should be ensuring that communities have enough knowledge to make informed decisions.

Mr. Lehman stated that while he is passionate about the topic, he does not qualify to lead the subcommittee. Mr. Bellomo agreed and stated that it needs to be TMAC members who will go on beyond that meeting. Mr. Love, Mr. Giberson, and Mr. Guignet concluded that Mr. Guignet and Love will be co-leads. Mr. Love and Mr. Giberson volunteered to be stakeholder engagement liaisons. Mr. Love also volunteered to monitor the flood plain area.

Mr. Lehman expressed interest in being a part where possible. Mr. Lehman and Ms. Marcy discussed Mr. Len Shabman, Dr. Charles Yoe, and somebody from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as potential SMEs. Mr. Lehman and Ms. Marcy also discussed reaching out to Ms. Carolyn Kousky for a risk management SME. Ms. Marcy clarified that there are one-time SMEs (individuals who give one-time presentations) and standing SMEs (individuals such as Mr. Lehman who have been to meetings, helped write reports, etc.) and requested that the group think about it further from this lens.

The breakout meeting concluded and the TMAC members returned to the main group.

### **Breakout Group Report Out**

Mr. Mason was able to join the TMAC meeting and Mr. Tischler recommended that Mr. Mason be placed in the Future Conditions Subcommittee. Mr. Mason agreed with this recommendation.

Mr. Johnson provided an overview of the discussion within the Future Conditions Subcommittee. Mr. Johnson



TMAC Administrative Meeting Notes, March 30, 2021

would serve as co-chair and another individual would be identified to serve alongside him. Mr. Johnson would also represent the subcommittee on the stakeholder engagement working group. Mr. Johnson confirmed that the subcommittee would like to receive briefings on the new administration's climate policy, as well as on the regional impacts of climate change across the country.

Mr. Dave Guignet then provided an overview of the discussion within the Enterprise Risk Management Subcommittee. Mr. Guignet would be serving as one of the co-chairs of the subcommittee, with Mr. David Love serving as the other co-chair. Mr. Love and Mr. Giberson would be representing the subcommittee on the stakeholder engagement working group. Mr. Guignet stated this was the extent of the subcommittee's discussion.

Mr. Bellomo noted that the next several months would be a challenge due to so many memberships expiring today and no clear timeline for when new members would begin. Mr. Bellomo thanked Mr. Johnson, Mr. Love, and Mr. Guignet for agreeing to lead their respective subcommittees and stated that they would be added to the TMAC chair call on a biweekly basis. Mr. Bellomo reiterated Mr. Johnson's suggestion to get a briefing from the new administration on their climate policy but added this may be difficult to achieve. Mr. Giberson offered to contact his organization's D.C. office to see if they had any connections that could be leveraged. Mr. Johnson also suggested the subcommittee could just read the climate policy as a group if need be. Mr. Bellomo asked Mr. Nadeau to expand upon his comment related to incentives and Mr. Nadeau stated that the reality of climate change is that it is going to occur, and so incentives should be a part of the conversation.

### **Closing Remarks**

Mr. Bellomo thanked everyone for their work today and noted that the next administrative meeting would be on April 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Bellomo also shared the list of those TMAC members whose terms were expiring, and Ms. Abdelrahim confirmed she would follow up with those members to determine who will continue to participate in a SME role. Mr. Bellomo provided a rough agenda for the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting and noted a final agenda would be sent out a day or two prior to the meeting. Mr. Bellomo also reminded everyone to submit their OGE 450 forms. Mr. Bellomo thanked everyone for attending and concluded the meeting.