

Project Name:	<i>Dallas County, AR Countywide Study</i>
Meeting:	<i>Scoping/Initial Coordination Meeting</i>
Date:	<i>October 27, 2009</i>
Place:	<i>Dallas County OEM, Fordyce, AR</i>
Time:	<i>8:30 AM (CT)</i>

Attendees: See attached attendance sheet

Agenda Items

1. Introduction/Sign-in Sheet

Mr. Guy Lowes, representing FEMA Region VI, began the meeting at 8:30 AM (CT) with a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Guy Lowes stated that during this meeting, the representatives of the different organizations would have the opportunity to discuss the flood mapping issues that should be included or addressed during the DFIRM study process. RAMPP, a joint venture of the Dewberry, URS Corporation and ESP Associates will ensure that they coordinate with the communities and the Region throughout the restudy effort.

Mr. Guy Lowes indicated that RAMPP would compile the results of the Scoping Meeting in the Scoping Report. RAMPP would enter the mapping needs captured at the meeting into needs database. The database would be used to justify funding from Congress for the future.

Introductions of attendees proceeded. All attendees acknowledged that they had signed the sign-in sheet

2. 44 CFR 66 Discussion

Mr. Mike Seering, Project Manager with RAMPP, began by indicating it is important to establish points of contact for the project at the scoping stage. This helps identify decision makers for each community and creates a good working relationship throughout the project. Mr. Jim Johnson identified himself as the main point of contact for the communities involved in the project. Mr. Mike Seering indicated that the main purpose of this meeting was to identify the community needs and to identify concerns for future map maintenance. He stressed that the maps were being produced for the communities, and that each community would be happier with the maps if all of the final data was correct. He also stressed that it is important for the community to work with the mapping contractor throughout the process so that any issues can be resolved before the maps are released.

Mr. Mike Seering provided a detailed overview of the compliance requirements of 44 CFR 66. The discussion included: the approximate date the proposed study would commence, the areas identified for study, the nature and purpose of the proposed study, the scope and methodologies for the proposed study and the intended use of data obtained for the study.

3. Study Overview

National Flood Insurance Program Overview and Flood Mapping Process

Mr. Mike Seering provided a complete description of the Flood Mapping Process using a slide. Each task was presented in chronological order, with approximate time frames shown as well.

Map Base Options

Mr. Mike Seering provided an overview of the options for the DFIRM base map, which included ortho or vector-based map. His discussion included the advantages and disadvantages of each type of map, which included:

- The refresh rate for orthos can be longer for the public when using ortho-based maps.
- Identification of flood hazards for vector maps can be difficult when a County does not have adequate road coverage.
- Orthophoto base maps could make maps difficult to read when they are copied or faxed.
- Roads and rail are identified with lines and labels on a vector based map, but only with labels on an ortho-based map.
- Paper maps will have the same ortho on them until maps are updated again.
- There is complete countywide coverage with orthophotography.
- Orthophotography may be harder to see at larger scales.
- Communities and end users without GIS capabilities may have a hard time determining locations on a vector based map
- All communities opted for the vector-based DFIRM.*

Topographic Data Acquisition

Mr. Mike Seering provided an overview of the need for the best available topographic data to prepare new flood maps.

Engineering Analysis

Mr. Mike Seering provided an overview of the engineering analyses and the study types including: Detailed Study, Enhanced Approximate Study, Approximate Study as well as Redelineation and Refinement. The communities indicated ongoing “clear-cutting” of forests in the County.

Mapping and DFIRM Production Overview

Mr. Mike Seering provided slides showing an overview of the mapping process of merging base data, topography, flood data, and placing it on a DFIRM. The communities indicated the availability of GIS data from the South West Arkansas Planning & Development District, which includes street centerline spatial data. The communities also noted that the State of Arkansas Geographic Information Office may have additional GIS data. The communities indicated that the City of Fordyce has benchmarks.

Proposed DFIRM Panel Layout

Mr. Mike Seering provided visuals of the effective FIRM panel and stream layout, and compared them with the draft panel layout for the 2009 studies that included scales of as 1”=500’ and 1”=1000’ for the urban areas and 1”=2000’ for the less populated areas.

- The communities agreed on the acceptability of the draft panel layout.

DFIRM and FIS Report

Mr. Mike Seering informed the meeting attendees that all of the new and effective data would be merged to create a single, countywide DFIRM set and FIS. Communities would no longer be separated out. The communities confirmed that the flood boundaries shown on the effective are generally accurate for the studied stream lengths.

Incorporation of Engineering Studies by Others

Mr. Mike Seering asked the communities to provide any LOMRs to RAMPP in a timely manner to ensure they are captured and incorporated into the maps. They were also informed that engineering studies may be incorporated into the maps if they meet specific criteria listed in the PowerPoint presentation.

4. Levees

Mr. Mike Seering provided a brief overview of levee incorporation in FIRMs from the PowerPoint presentation. The communities confirmed that no mapped levees were present.

5. Post Preliminary Process and Map Adoption

Mr. Guy Lowes gave a brief overview of the steps that would be taken once the DFIRM process had been completed.

6. Outreach

Mr. Mike Seering indicated there are outreach tools from FEMA to assist in keeping the community informed about the process.

Please refer to the <http://www.rampp-team.com> for more updates on the project.

7. Community Risk Assessment

Mr. Mike Seering indicated that every state, County, city, and town has some level of risk from some threat, whether it's economic risk, health risks, or flood risks. The difference is in how those risks are managed.

8. Mitigation Planning

Mr. Mike Seering indicated Mitigation Plans create a framework for risk-based decision making to reduce damages to lives, property, and the economy from future disasters. Mr. Seering indicated Technical assistance from the State and FEMA is available upon request. Other resources include:

- Free FEMA 386-series of How-to Guides
- G-318 Mitigation Planning for Local governments
- Local Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance
- State Hazard Mitigation Office
- www.fema.gov

Mr. Mike Seering indicated the January 31, 2009 status of the Mitigation Plan to be Approvable Pending Adoption. The communities indicated that the Mitigation Plan has been approved.

9. Needs Assessment

Mr. Mike Seering indicated going forward needs will be captured via the Coordinated Needs Management Strategy (CNMS). CNMS is GIS driven with validation of 7 critical items and 10 secondary items.

10. Scoping Presentation Summary

Mr. Guy Lowes provided a brief summary of the scoping meeting including contact information.

11. Community Needs Collection – Group

The communities voiced some of their needs throughout the presentation. The community representatives agreed that the biggest flooding issues are in the City of Sparkman, including drainage problems and concern for public safety. The communities indicated future development in the City of Fordyce. Members of RAMPP and FEMA noted these concerns and informed the community representatives that the countywide flood study will represent existing conditions only. The communities were also informed of the potential to apply for a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) after development occurs.

The communities also several stormwater problems of debris clogging drain openings. Members of RAMPP and FEMA noted these concerns and informed the community representatives that the scope of the current study will not include the mitigation of stormwater drainage repairs.

12. Community Needs Collection – Break-out Sessions

Members of RAMPP and FEMA broke-out with each community and began a discussion of community needs. The communities were asked to identify any potential flooding issues that needed to be addressed. It was reiterated that each community has many needs but there is limited budget. The communities were informed that they needed to provide all their mapping needs so they are captured now and put into a database.

RAMPP worked with the communities to develop their mapping needs, the data included the requested stream name; length of water course in feet; requested level of study; name of person who made request; and the prioritization for study. The data has been captured in GIS format and will be added to the Scoping Report. Mayor Henry Nalls provided digital photographs of flooding from a recent storm event.

13. Meeting Adjourned at 10:30 AM