

Project Name:	<i>Sebastian County, Arkansas Physical Map Revision (PMR)</i>
Meeting:	<i>Initial Coordination Meeting</i>
Date:	<i>October 26, 2009</i>
Place:	<i>Riverfront Amphitheater, West Room, 121 Cleighton Expressway, Fort Smith, Arkansas</i>
Time:	<i>1:30 PM to 3:30PM</i>

**Attendees:** See attached attendance sheet

## Agenda Items

### 1. Introduction/Sign-in Sheet

Mr. Guy Lowes, representing FEMA Region VI, began the meeting at 1:30 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 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 nature and purpose of the proposed PMR, and the scope and methodologies for the proposed PMR and the intended use of data obtained for the PMR. She noted that the new detailed study areas would be discussed during the meeting.

### 3. Study Overview

Ms. Routh noted that this study is a Physical Map Revision (PMR). The purpose of the meeting was to determine where the approximately 15 miles of new detailed study was needed. Only those FIRM panels affected by the new detailed study will be updated and reissued.

The current FIRMs for Sebastian County and incorporated communities have a planned effective date of May 2010 and are vector-based. This PMR will build upon the countywide DFIRM and be issued after May 2010. The revised FIRM panels 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. It was noted that 2-foot contour data is available for West Bend City and the Tax Assessor's Office has 2009-flight imagery.

#### **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.

#### **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. Since new Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) are anticipated from the new detailed study that will necessitate a 90-day appeal and protest period. So the entire study process will take about 2 years to complete. The revised FIRMs will be available from FEMA's Map Service Center website about 4 months prior to the new effective date; and the revised DFIRM database will be available about 1 month prior to the new effective date.

#### **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 the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) narrative, Floodway Data Tables (FDTs) and profiles will be updated. Currently, there are no FIRMs with a scale of 1"=500'. However, some FIRM panels may need to be broken into 1"=500' scale panels to show the results of the new detailed study.

Only LOMRs on the revised FIRM panels will be incorporated. The LOMRs on unchanged FIRMs will remain valid and will not be superseded.

#### **Incorporation of Engineering Studies by Others**

Ms. Routh asked the communities to provide any LOMRs or information about any other floodplain related engineering projects to RAMPP to ensure they are captured and incorporated into the maps.

### 4. 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.

## **5. 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 Sebastian County Floodplain Administrator 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.

## **6. 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.

## **7. 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.

## **8. 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.

## **9. Scoping Presentation Summary**

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

## **10. Community Needs Collection**

Mr. Daniel Houston of the City of Hartford requested copies of the upcoming effective FIRMs.

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.

## **11. Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 PM**