

Project Name:	<i>Pulaski County, Arkansas Physical Map Revision (PMR)</i>
Meeting:	<i>Initial Coordination Meeting</i>
Date:	<i>October 29, 2009</i>
Place:	<i>Metroplan Building, Jeffery L. Hawkins Conference Room, Little Rock, Arkansas</i>
Time:	<i>1:00 PM to 3:00PM</i>

Attendees: See attached attendance sheet

Agenda Items

1. Introduction/Sign-in Sheet

Mr. Guy Lowes, representing FEMA Region VI, began the meeting at 1:00 PM (CDT) with a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. 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. Lowes, indicated that RAMPP would compile the results of the Scoping Meeting in a report and enter the mapping needs captured at the meeting into needs database. The database would be used to justify funding from Congress for the future.

All meeting attendees introduced themselves and acknowledged that they had signed the sign-in sheet

National Flood Insurance Program Overview and Flood Mapping Process

Mr. Lowes provided a background of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and FEMA's role. He then presented information on the transition from Map Mod to RiskMAP and the goals to work with states, tribes, and local governments to perform the next round of mapping updates. All communities within this county participate in the NFIP.

Mr. Lowes provided an overview of the status of the levees in Pulaski County. Of the nine levees with Provisionally Accredited Levee (PAL) status, the 36th Street & Boyle Park Levee System has been fully 44 CFR 65.10 certified and remaining levees are in decertification status. The 65.10 certification package for the Fourche Island Drainage District No. 2 levee is currently in review. Pulaski County noted that they do not own or maintain any levees within the County.

Mr. Lowes 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.

2. 44 CFR 66 Discussion

Ms. Stephanie Routh, Study Manager with RAMPP, indicated that the main purpose of this meeting was to identify the community needs, discuss the proposed scope of work for the Physical Map Revisions (PMR) the study process, and to capture community concerns about existing flooding problems or areas of growth and development. She 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.

Ms. Routh provided compliance with requirements of 44 CFR 66 with a discussion of: the approximate date the proposed PMR would commence, the areas identified for study, the nature and purpose of the proposed PMR, the scope and methodologies for the proposed PMR and the intended use of data obtained for the PMR.

3. Study Overview

Ms. Routh noted that this study is a Physical Map Revision (PMR). Only those FIRM panels affected by changes to the status of the levees within the County will be updated and reissued. She provided a slide which showed the locations of the nine levees and noted that at this time, only one levee, the 36th Street & Boyle Park Levee System, has been 65.10 certified and will be shown as accredited on the FIRM.

The preliminary DFIRM database for Pulaski County and incorporated communities is vector-based. Therefore, the revised FIRMs will remain vector-based.

Topographic Data Acquisition

Ms. Routh provided an overview of the need for topographic data to prepare new flood maps. The State NFIP coordinator indicated that the state has 5m USGS Digital Elevation Models available. The communities indicated that their topographic data had been provided to FEMA when the previous update project started but that the City of Little Rock may have more updated topographic data.

Engineering Analysis

Ms. Routh 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.

Ms. Routh noted that RAMPP would be following FEMA's Procedure Memorandum No. 52, which provides guidance for the mapping the landward-side of levees; and Procedure Memorandum No. 53, which provides guidance for the notification of levees with expiring Provisionally Accredited Levee designations. Detailed studies will be conducted to develop the floodplains on the landward-side of the levees.

Mapping and DFIRM Production Overview

Ms. Routh provided slides showing an overview of the mapping process of merging base data, topography, flood data, and placing it on a DFIRM. She noted that the PMR will follow the same study stages as a first-time countywide study.

DFIRM and FIS Report

Ms. Routh noted that a DFIRM, in ESRI's Geographic Information System (GIS), has been developed in a county-wide format. The results of the new study will be incorporated into the DFIRM and FIS narrative, Floodway Data Tables (FDTs) and profiles will be updated. Only LOMRs on the revised FIRM panels will be incorporated. The LOMRs on unchanged FIRMs will remain valid and will not be superseded.

4. Levees – Risk, Accreditation, and Behind-levee Analysis

Ms. Routh provided an overview of the purpose of levees and the risks associated with flooding behind levees. She noted that FEMA does not certify levees. If the required certification documentation to demonstrate that a levee meets the requirements of 44 CFR 65.10 is provided to FEMA, then FEMA will accredit the levee as providing protection on the FIRMs. However, if the required certification documentation is not provided to FEMA, then the levee will be shown as not providing protection from the 1%-chance annual flood.

Mr. Lowes addressed questions regarding the behind-levee analysis and the timeframe for completing study. He noted that the new base flood elevations (BFEs) behind the levees may not increase significantly. The results of the detailed study would indicate the impact on the BFEs.

Mr. Lowes also noted that the floodways would not be automatically extended to the toe of the levees. The floodways will be developed from the results of the detailed analysis.

Mr. Lowes also addressed a question about why the PMR could not wait until construction of a levee was completed. He noted that FEMA has a schedule for the PMR that must be followed; but, the LOMR process is available at any time.

5. Post Preliminary Process and Map Adoption

Ms. Routh gave a brief overview of the steps that would be taken once the DFIRM process had been completed.

6. Outreach

Ms. Routh indicated there are outreach tools, materials, pamphlets, and websites from FEMA to assist in keeping the community informed about the process. She indicated that FEMA has asked RAMPP to be proactive in communications to the community which includes a monthly newsletter as well as a RAMPP website.

FEMA asked the communities for a primary point of contact for this project and they indicated that the Pulaski County would help coordinate with FEMA and RAMPP and the communities.

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

7. Community Risk Assessment

Ms. Routh indicated that every state, county, city, town has some level of risk from some threat. The difference is in how those risks are managed.

8. Mitigation Planning

Ms. Routh mentioned the importance of RiskMAP and integrating the identification of flood hazards and the ties to mitigation planning and Hazard Mitigation Plans (HMP). The communities each have HMPs approved by FEMA.

9. Needs Assessment

Ms. Routh indicated going forward needs will be captured via the Coordinated Needs Management Strategy (CNMS). CNMS is GIS driven. She noted that the next round of FEMA funding will be tied to the information that is input into CNMS and it is very important that the communities help us in the process of identifying areas where they have concerns on their existing maps and areas of new growth.

10. Scoping Presentation Summary

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

11. Community Needs Collection

The communities noted that there are about 20 appeals and protests to the preliminary FIS and FIRMs which need to be resolved.

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.

12. Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 PM