

Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC)

In-person/Virtual Hybrid Public Meeting Notes

Thursday August 29, 2024, 8AM - 5PM ET

TMAC Members

Stephen Aichele, *USGS, Geological Survey Representative*

Stacey Archfield, *USGS, Department of Interior Designee*

Vince DiCamillo, *Stantec Consulting, Mapping Member, Chair*

Ataul Hannan, *Harris County Flood Control District, Local CTP Representative*

Maria Cox-Lamm, *South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, NFIP Coordination Offices*

William Lehman, *USACE, USACE Designee*

Jamie Reinke, *Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, State CTP Representative, Vice Chair*

Luis Rodriguez, *FEMA, FEMA Designee*

Brooke Seymour, *Mile High Flood District, Regional Flood and Storm Water Member*

Jonathan Smith, *Resource Inventory*

Division of Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Designee

Jeff Sparrow, *Moffatt & Nichol, Floodplain Management Member*

Subject Matter Experts

Doug Bellomo, *AECOM*

Kim Dunn, *T&M Associates*

Scott Giberson, *CoreLogic FloodServices*

Salomon Miranda, *California Department of Water Resources*

Government Attendees

John Ebersole, *FEMA, ADFO*

Brian Koper, *FEMA, DFO*

David Rosa, *FEMA, ADFO*

Cadijah Walcott, *FEMA, ADFO*

Support Staff

Christine Brittle, *ART PTS*

Sonia Clemens, *Compass PTS*

Cindy Corvalan, *ARC PTS*

Brian Koch, *ARC PTS*

Necolle Maccherone, *STARR II PTS*

Grace Morris, *STARR II PTS*

Mary Jo Mullen, *STARR II PTS*

Sloan Oliver, *PM Support*

Shobha Pathmanathan, *ARC PTS*

Tameka Simpson, *PM Support*

Ryan Slattery, *ARC PTS*

Dora Szalai, *ARC PTS*

Molly Tuttle, *Compass PTS*

Other Attendees

Cheryl Ander Dunne, *CERC*

Lisa Miller, *CERC*

Purpose

The objective of this meeting is to finalize initial thinking and finalize listening sessions including messaging and the anticipated participants.

Subcommittee Working Session

TMAC members participated in subcommittee meetings to refresh and debrief on materials related to the topics discussed during the meeting.

The TMAC then proceeded to the next agenda item.

Welcome, Roll Call, Administrative Items, and Opening Remarks

Mr. Brian Koper, TMAC DFO, introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the virtual and in-person public meeting. After the roll call, Mr. Koper explained the requirements and protocols associated with this public meeting compared to previous administrative meetings; he emphasized the procedures for public comments. He then handed it over to Mr. Vince DiCamillo, TMAC Chair, to review the agenda for the day.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Recap Outcomes from August Administrative Meeting

Ms. Mary Jo Mullen provided a recap of outcomes from the August Administrative Meeting. She walked the group through the 2024 TMAC Sprint Board in Miro. At the previous meeting, the group focused on formulating their initial thinking for Topic One and Topic Two. The groups discussed what they wanted to get out of the upcoming listening sessions, the group also discussed the presentations for the listening sessions.

Subcommittee One planned to have the draft listening session presentation completed by the conclusion of tomorrow's meeting. Subcommittee Two will focus on further refining their initial thinking over the next two days.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Updates from Subcommittees

Mr. Jeff Sparrow shared the subcommittee's progress in the last several TMAC meetings. Ms. Christine Brittle created a draft slide presentation for the listening sessions.

Ms. Maria Cox-Lamm provided the update for Subcommittee Two. Ms. Cox-Lamm and Ms. Jaime Reinke have worked together to create a contact list for State Coordinators for the listening sessions. The Certified Executive Recruitment Consultant (CERC) team is able to provide guidance to the subcommittees about change management techniques for these initiatives.

Ms. Brittle provided an update on the listening sessions. 90 potential participants have been identified to take part in the listening sessions at this time. Another 68 people have expressed an interest in participating in the listening sessions. Ms. Necolle Maccherone has identified several university Cooperating Technical Partners (CTPs) who may want to participate in the listening sessions.

Ms. Brittle reported that for Topic One, there may be possibly 12 different listening groups. For Topic Two, 62 people have expressed interest in participating in the listening sessions. Ms. Brittle encouraged the group to contact individuals to participate in these listening sessions.

Ms. Brittle presented Topic One “Listening Sessions to Inform TMAC’s Recommendations to FEMA” she provided a high-level agenda for the listening sessions. Ms. Brittle shared FEMA’s Topic One tasking question and including the subcommittee’s initial thinking including the statement that the TMAC believes a third-party validation of FEMA’s methodology is very important.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Break

The TMAC took a 10-minute break.

Change Management Presentation

Mr. DiCamillo introduced Ms. Lisa Miller and Ms. Cheryl Ander Dunne to the TMAC members. Ms. Miller and Ms. Ander Dunne are change management experts. Ms. Dunne is part of the FEMA CERC project team. Ms. Miller is the Senior Vice President and Program Director and is part of the Resilience Action Partners team on the FEMA CERC contract.

Ms. Ader Dunne and Ms. Miller discussed the significant changes organizations are experiencing, driven by shifts in leadership and technology. They noted that 73% of organizations anticipate change in the coming years, yet 70% of these initiatives are expected to fail. Effective change management requires more than just communication; it involves buy-in and effort from all levels of an organization. It is a long-term process that demands continuous support and reinforcement, focusing on managing the human aspect of change. Individuals progress through change at their own pace, requiring various forms of support. The Prosci ADKAR Model was introduced, outlining five key goals for successful change: Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability, and Reinforcement. Success in change management depends on active and visible sponsorship, sponsor coalitions, a structured approach, and frequent, open communication. The importance of having a dedicated sponsor for any change initiative was emphasized.

Ms. Ader Dunne explained that an organization needs to define its vision. It centers around the question of “Why? Why does this new approach exist? What? What question is it answering? How? How is this different than what’s been used in the past?” According to Prosci’s research, sponsors are the most important piece of the change management process. Initiatives that have a strong sponsor are 73 % more likely to be successful. This process will require additional sponsors. The next step below the executive sponsor or co-sponsor would be the subcommittee sponsors. Ms. Ader Dunne suggested that the TMAC would fall into the subcommittee sponsor role. FEMA will also want additional sponsors to support these initiatives. These individuals are called change champions. The change management champions are liaisons between the Executive Sponsor and front-line FEMA team members. The stakeholders are the colleagues, providers, and partners using the change. The sponsor and subcommittee sponsors want them to adopt and adhere to the change.

The next part of the change management process is stakeholder mapping. This process involves identifying potential stakeholders, including any group, team, or role that will be impacted by the change. Following stakeholder mapping, the group performs an impact assessment. Through

research, the group understands the level of impact across all of the key players, identifies potential areas of resistance, to tailor ways to address them using the available tools including communications, champions, enablement, and training. This process involves using personas and resistance mapping. The personas identify what step in the change management process the organization is stuck in. Then, accessing what levers are available to get this group unstuck. What are the key players' motivators? Who might influence the "Eager Beaver" persona to move forward? Other individuals defined as motivators and influencers can help the Eager Beaver move this initiative forward.

The Change Management Communications Strategy is focused on meeting stakeholders where they are in the change management process. This involves identifying who they are, their specific needs, who they need to hear from, what needs to be shared, specific tools that will be most helpful, and ways to monitor engagement impacts to inform needed strategy shifts. Tailored messaging should be compelling, consistent, customized, comprehensive, and continual. A rule of communicating is that it takes an individual seven times to hear the same message to retain it. The next step is around enablement and training for the change management champions and leader guides. FEMA must equip these individuals with the necessary skills and knowledge to understand how to use the new data and tools to see the benefits. Ms. Adler Dunne and Ms. Miller said they can help FEMA with the enabling and training process.

The change management plan and communications strategy are broken down into manageable phases, including timelines and key milestones. This may include recommendations around resources, defined responsibilities for implementation, pilot plan approach to test and refine, and ways to measure the impact and process in the change journey.

The final steps in the change management process are the feedback and reinforcement phases. In the feedback phase, the group will define how they will track progress against the established goals and gather information from key stakeholder groups. The reinforcement phase involves celebrating successes. Recognizing and rewarding individuals and teams for their efforts and achievements. Also, showing the impact the early adopter communities have seen in the new data offerings. Showing others what they can/could get out of change.

Ms. Adler Dunne and Ms. Miller wrapped up their presentation by reviewing the Components of Effective Change Management. They will share their presentation with the group. Mr. DiCamillo invited Ms. Adler Dunne and Ms. Miller to participate in Subcommittee Two Working Sessions today. He also invited them to participate in the larger TMAC meeting.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Guidance for Subcommittee Breakout Sessions

Ms. Mullen provided the group with guidance for today's working sessions. The group will be focused on preparing the presentation and script for the listening sessions. The group will focus on defining their topic, explaining why it is important, and providing any additional background that is needed. The group will also refine the goals for the listening session. Determine what feedback the group would like to get from the participants. Ms. Brittle shared the current TMAC listening session schedule with the TMAC members.

Mr. Rodriguez suggested that Subcommittee Two's TMAC Report define TMAC's role in the change management process. The TMAC supports NFIP's approach to move towards a risk-informed program.

Ms. Mullen advised the subcommittees to continue their work on Topic One and Topic Two in the Miro board. She suggested that Subcommittee One continue to build out their slides for the Topic One listening sessions. Subcommittee Two should continue to refine the “Whys” for Topic Two. Both groups should be framing out their Initial Thinking for Topics One and Two.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Subcommittee Working Session

The Subcommittee working session was conducted from 9:30 a.m. until 1:45 p.m. ET.

Lunch

The TMAC took a 60-minute lunch break.

Subcommittee 1 Brief Out and Discussion

Mr. Doug Bellomo, pointed out that Topic One, like Topic Two, also talks about validating the technological methodology for data validation.

Mr. DiCamillo transitioned back to the group’s earlier discussion about putting together a simple analogy to explain the concept of a risk versus a hazard to the listening session participants. Mr. DiCamillo and Ms. Reinke feel this is a major shift for communities to transition from focusing on the concept of a flood hazard to the concept of a flood risk.

Subcommittee 2 Brief Out and Discussion

Ms. Cox-Lamm, Subcommittee Two Chair, provided the brief. She explained that Ms. Mullen helped the group work through some challenging areas for Topic Two to get the best input and feedback from the listening sessions. Topic Two states recommend an approach, including milestones, to ensure the effective use of comprehensive flood hazard and flood risk data in a way that communities can use to effectively manage flood risk.

Ms. Cox-Lamm reported that the group has gotten down to three “Why” statements for Topic Two. These “Why” statements include the NFIP has implemented a risk-informed approach in the rate-setting process, the NFIP is working to implement a risk-informed approach in program areas, and the transition will increase the NFIP’s effectiveness in managing national flood risk, and flood risk management helps us better understand the consequences of flooding, economic impacts at all levels, and informed flood risk reduction decisions. These “Why” statements are not finalized. This is where the group has settled on them for now.

Ms. Cox-Lamm explained that a challenge for Subcommittee Two is asking questions that the listening session participants will understand. Subcommittee Two is working to explain to the participants how the advancement of flooding hazard science has vastly improved over the past fifty years. Subcommittee Two will share their work with Ms. Brittle. She will be facilitating the Topic Two listening sessions.

Mr. DiCamillo commented that Topic Two is the much more challenging and broader of the two topics. The stakeholder group for Topic Two is highly diverse. The Subcommittee Two listening sessions will be conducted in October. As mentioned earlier, Subcommittee Two is working very hard to make sure that they get high-quality feedback from the listening sessions. Mr. DiCamillo stated that it is important that the listening participants understand that these changes will benefit

property owners and taxpayers. This change does not benefit FEMA or the NFIP.

With no comments, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Break

The TMAC took a 15-minute break.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Koper began the public comment period at 3:30 p.m. ET. He opened the forum for those who would like to make a public comment. No public comments were made at this time.

With no comments, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Further Discussion on Report-Outs

Ms. Mullen suggested that Subcommittee One and Two spend more time working on the analogy for flood hazard versus flood risk. Subcommittee Two should continue their discussion about the Topic Two “Whys” they started earlier today. Ms. Mullen suggested that the group make the flood hazard versus flood risk analogy as simple as possible.

Mr. Bellomo provided an analogy to illustrate the distinction between flood hazard and flood risk, using two sides of a river as an example. One side of the river had a levee and was accredited, while the other side did not have a levee, but both were in compliance. He highlighted that the leveed side faced a significantly higher risk compared to the non-leveed side. In the event of a 101-year flood, catastrophic loss would occur on the leveed side, whereas the non-leveed side would experience minimal damage, such as an inch of rain without catastrophic consequences. Mr. Bellomo referred to this situation as "the tale of two cities," both of which remained in compliance despite the differing levels of risk.

Ms. Reinke said that communities want structural mitigation whether this be a levy or dam. City officials believe that a levee or dam will save their communities if a flood should ever happen. Levees or dams will not save these communities if there is wide-scale flooding. Cities in the U.S. make the mistake of building structures right behind levees.

Mr. Rodriguez made the comment that he does not think that FEMA is making an assertion that flood risk management will replace flood plain management. He thinks there are a lot of things to be decided on this subject. The flood risk management and floodplain management capabilities could exist together. TMAC does not want to communicate that flood risk management will replace floodplain management. FEMA has not decided about how flood risk management and flood plain management will function in the future. There is a regulatory framework that exists in the United States that FEMA has to follow.

Wrap-Up and Plan for Day 2

Mr. DiCamillo thanked the group for all the progress that has been made. He also gave thanks to the CERC team for joining and guiding the TMAC. He adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m. ET.

Technical Mapping Advisory Council (TMAC)

In-person/Virtual Hybrid Public Meeting Notes

Friday, August 30, 2024, 8AM - 5PM ET

TMAC Members

Stephen Aichele, *USGS, Geological Survey Representative*
Stacey Archfield, *USGS, Department of Interior Designee*
Vince DiCamillo, *Stantec Consulting, Mapping Member, Chair*
Ataul Hannan, *Harris County Flood Control District, Local CTP Representative*
Maria Cox Lamm, *South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, NFIP Coordination Offices*

William Lehman, *USACE, USACE Designee*
Jamie Reinke, *Nebraska Department of Natural Resources, State CTP Representative, Vice Chair*
Luis Rodriguez, *FEMA, FEMA Designee*
Brooke Seymour, *Mile High Flood District, Regional Flood and Storm Water Member*
Jonathan Smith, *Resource Inventory Division of Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Designee*
Jeff Sparrow, *Moffatt & Nichol, Floodplain Management Member*

Subject Matter Experts

Doug Bellomo, *AECOM*
Kim Dunn, *T&M Associates*
Scott Giberson, *CoreLogic Flood Services*

Salomon Miranda, *California Department of Water Resources*

Government Attendees

John Ebersole, *FEMA, ADFO*
Brian Koper, *FEMA, DFO*

David Rosa, *FEMA, ADFO*
Cadajah Walcott, *FEMA, ADFO*

Support Staff

Christine Brittle, *ARC PTS*
Sonia Clemens, *Compass PTS*
Cindy Corvalan, *ARC PTS*
Kayla Dottery, *ARC PTS*
Naemah Islam, *PM Support*
Brian Koch, *ARC PTS*
Necolle Maccherone, *STARR II PTS*
Grace Morris, *STARR II PTS*

Mary Jo Mullen, *STARR II PTS*
Sloan Oliver, *PM Support*
Tameka Simpson, *PM Support*
Dora Szalai, *ARC PTS*
Molly Tuttle, *Compass PTS*
Ryan Slattery, *ART PTS*

Purpose

The objective of this meeting is to finalize initial thinking and finalize the plan for the listening sessions including messaging and the anticipated participants. The group is working towards getting their initial thinking ideas cemented before the listening sessions.

Subcommittee Working Session

TMAC members optionally participated in subcommittee meetings for one hour to refresh and discuss related to the two topics being discussed during the meeting.

The TMAC then proceeded to the next agenda item.

Welcome, Roll Call, Administrative Items, and Opening Remarks

Mr. Brian Koper, TMAC DFO, introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the virtual and in-person public meeting. After the roll call, Mr. Brian Koper explained the requirements and protocols associated with this public meeting compared to previous administrative meetings; he emphasized the procedures for public comments. He then handed it over to Mr. Vince DiCamillo, TMAC Chair, to review the agenda for the day.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Recap Outcomes from Day 1 and Plan for Day 2

Mr. DiCamillo and Ms. Mullen asked the group if they had any questions about what they needed to complete in today's meeting.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Guidance for Subcommittee Breakout Sessions

Ms. Mullen encouraged Subcommittee One to refine anything that needed to be done with their listening session presentation. Subcommittee Two should focus on working through the initial thinking for the topic. The group should continue to develop questions for the listening sessions.

After no further comment or questions, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Subcommittee Working Sessions

The TMAC members joined their subcommittee working sessions to discuss their listening session presentation.

Lunch

The TMAC took a 60-minute lunch break.

Finalize Initial Thinking for Topic 1

Mr. Jeff Sparrow, Subcommittee One Chair, provided a report on the subcommittee's initial thinking. Yesterday, Subcommittee One worked through the listening session presentation that Ms. Christine Brittle had drafted. The group continued to update the listening session presentation. Subcommittee One modified and changed the listening session questions as needed. They then went back through the initial thinking slide and made changes where they were needed.

Mr. Sparrow shared the current version of the Topic One presentation entitled "Listening Sessions to Inform TMAC's Recommendation to FEMA." The next steps for Subcommittee Two include continuing to invite participants to participate in the listening sessions and cleaning up the presentation for the listening sessions.

Finalize Initial Thinking for Topic 2

Ms. Maria Cox-Lamm, Chair of Subcommittee Two, provided an overview of the subcommittee's preliminary work to TMAC. She presented the group's progress on the Miro board, emphasizing their careful attention to the wording used in the presentation to ensure clarity for all listening session participants. Ms. Cox-Lamm highlighted that Subcommittee Two's primary stakeholder group is floodplain managers, from whom they aim to gather feedback during the listening sessions or through alternative communication channels. Subcommittee Two has two key objectives: first, to avoid overwhelming participants with technical terminology, and second, to ensure participants understand that FEMA has not yet decided whether to implement Topic Two.

Ms. Jamie Reinke outlined the next steps, noting that a poll had been distributed to schedule the subcommittee's upcoming meetings. The team continues to refine their initial thinking and develop questions for the listening sessions. Mr. DiCamillo encouraged the group to finalize their questions promptly. Subcommittee Two is targeting the September Administrative Meeting for the completion of the Topic Two documents.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Koper began the public comment period at 3:30 p.m. ET. He opened the forum for public comment, no public comments were made during this time.

With no comments, the meeting transitioned to the next agenda item.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Ms. Mullen reported that the TMAC has completed the 2024 TMAC Design Sprint. Mr. DiCamillo Ms. Mullen and thanked the TMAC members for their engagement during the Design Sprint process.

In closing, Mr. DiCamillo and Ms. Reinke thanked the members for their time and commitment. Mr. DiCamillo adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m. ET.

Subcommittee Working Sessions (as needed)

Several subcommittee members continued to meet after the meeting was adjourned on a need-based status.