

EXPLORING OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTEGRATED MAPPING AND FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF RIVERINE AND COASTAL FLOODPLAINS AND WETLANDS

A NATURAL FLOODPLAIN FUNCTIONS ALLIANCE AND WETLAND MAPPING
CONSORTIUM WORKSHOP

HELD ON APRIL 10, 2018

NEBAWWG – MAWWG Joint Wetlands Workgroup Meeting

Cooperstown, NY

November 14-16, 2018



SIGNIFICANT EVENTS IN 2017

- August 15: EO on Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure
 - Repeals FFRMS
- August 25: Hurricane Harvey
- September 10: Hurricane Irma
- September 20: Hurricane Maria
- Wildfires in CA, ID, MT, OR and WA



TMAC & NFIP

- FEMA's Risk Mapping, Assessment and Planning (MAP) Program
 - Generally only includes data on elevation, hydrology, infrastructure, hydraulics and land use for the purpose of informing NFIP rates
 - Many small streams in rural areas are not mapped at all
 - In VT 80% of streams and rivers not mapped for potential flood risk
- TMAC (Technical Mapping Advisory Council)
 - Moving away from 100 yr flood (1% risk) maps to structure-specific risk
 - Infers best and highest use of floodplain is development vs natural floodplain function
- NFIP (National Flood Insurance Program)
 - Up for reauthorization
 - Reached its \$30.4 billion borrowing limit




CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

- The regulatory environment is different for wetlands (dredge and fill) and floodplains (hazard mitigation, flood attenuation, property damage) both are regulated and functions are part
- Mapping and functional assessment techniques are being developed independently for features that occupy the same or similar geographic space and often interact.
- Assessment tools and functional correlations are being developed for both mapping needs yet they are not necessarily informing each other.
- Map products are generalizations of reality based on collected data and presentation. The underlying data and models are often more robust than the final generalized map product.
- Communication between agencies, regions, users, stakeholders and developers is often minimal or absent.
- With fiscal realities, partnerships are essential



Since the early mid 1990s, the wetland mapping community has been enhancing wetland data by adding LLWW descriptors to enhance the information in the existing wetland classification standard utilized by the National Wetlands Inventory by providing information on potential wetland function.

- landscape position (relation of a wetland to an adjacent waterbody)
- landform (the physical shape of the wetland)
- water flow path (the direction water flows into and out of the wetland)
- waterbody type (lake, river, stream, or pond).



Using Maps to Communicate the Benefits of Ecosystem Functions




Image credit: Earth Economics






HEY, WAIT A MINUTE...

Two ad hoc committees facilitated
by ASWM:

- Natural Floodplain Functions
Alliance (NFFA)
- Wetland Mapping Consortium
(WMC)



Let's Host a Workshop!

- Integrate wetland and riparian geospatial mapping techniques and data into floodplain mapping programs
- National classification standard?
- Attain multiple co-benefits, e.g., reduced flood risk, clean drinking water, wildlife habitat, recreational open space, etc.



[This Photo](#) by Unknown Author is licensed under [CC BY-SA](#)

Hey, Wait a Minute...

- Too ambitious for one workshop...
- Expanded to multi-year project
 - Year 1: Case For Support
 - Tuesday, April 10, 2018
 - Tommy Douglas Conference Center, Silver Spring, MD
 - Year 2: Technical Barriers, Possibilities, Needs
 - Year 3: Program & Policy Changes Needed



CHARGES FOR THE DAY

- 1) What if functional assessment efforts were integrated?
- 2) How can this be achieved?
- 3) What are the advantages and disadvantages?
- 4) How do we address initial data inventory?
- 5) How do we incorporate mapping innovation?
- 6) How do we fund map/data maintenance?
- 7) How can we share methods and data layers?
- 8) How do we promote safe, healthy communities?



CASE STUDIES

Management Implications of Vermont Wetland and
Floodplain Functional Assessment and Mapping:
Mike Kline, Vermont DEC Rivers Program

Functional Assessments in Current Wetland and
Floodplain Mapping: Sinan Abood, U.S. Forest
Service

Contributing to Riparian Area Management Using
Wetland Functional Assessment Data: Andy
Robertson, Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
Floodplain Mapping for Salmon Habitat Restoration and
Monitoring: Examples from the Pacific Northwest:
Tim Beechie, NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science
Center

From Functions to Ecosystem Services: The Economic Value
of Floodplains and Wetlands: Elliott Campbell,
Maryland DNR



CASE STUDY DISCUSSION: EMERGING THEMES

- Various agencies, groups and academics have been working on pieces of the puzzle for some time
- Similar collateral spatial data sets are being used for analysis: LiDAR, NHD, C-CAP, Shoreline, Land Cover, Wetlands, DFIRM, Flood Heights, Stream Gauge
- Models and automated tools are available to generate and analyze new data RBT, USFS Riparian Toolkit
- Available data being used in new ways to assess and assign functions
- Communication is lacking but essential. Synergies and partnerships are waiting to be developed



FEDERAL PANEL



Panelists: Megan Lang, FWS NWI; Maria Honeycutt, NOAA; Stephen Aichele, USGS; Luis Rodriguez, FEMA; Jay Thompson, BLM

Federal Panel Summary

- Provided excellent overview of mapping efforts and available data
- Summarized agency priorities for coastal and riverine floodplain/wetland functional assessment
- Identified how agencies are using their own data to address agency mandates
- Outlined plans for future development including opportunities, challenges and threats
- Reinforced the need for partnership efforts at all levels

BREAK-OUT SESSION – 3 GROUPS:

- 1) Areas of Overlap and Distinction
- 2) Key Challenges and Information Gaps
- 3) Opportunities to Leverage Resources.




This Photo by Unknown Author is licensed under [CC BY-NC-SA](#)

Within each group's assigned topic area, they had to develop 2-3 bullet points that described:

- 1) What are the needs based on our discussions?
- 2) What are some actions that can be taken to address the needs?
- 3) What are the challenges?

AREAS OF OVERLAP AND DISTINCTION



NEEDS

1. Take action to restore and avoid/protect
2. Historical context, current status and future conditions; be realistic

CHALLENGES

1. No one size fits all
2. Don't have consistent framework for making decisions; regulations don't work together, and no decision framework

ACTIONS

1. Specific communication strategy focused on two or three key gaps at all levels
2. Unlikely allies; need to work with new partners: industry, DOT, Chamber of Commerce, etc.



KEY CHALLENGES AND INFORMATION GAPS



[This Photo](#) by Unknown Author
is licensed under [CC BY-SA](#)

NEEDS

- 1) Consensus on mapping future conditions (CC impacts, stormwater, development, restoration opportunities)
- 2) Move beyond the 100 yr- line- show shades of risk (without sacrificing expansion of areas that are mapped)

CHALLENGES

- 1) Improved communications to decision makers and end users
- 2) Standardized methodologies for ecosystem service valuations

ACTIONS

- 1) Coordinated effort to tell better stories about the benefits of mapping investments
- 2) Encourage FEMA to allow states to include advanced mapping on flood hazard maps (i.e., VT including erosion hazard zones on their maps)

OPPORTUNITIES TO LEVERAGE RESOURCES

NEEDS

- 1) Hardware and/or hardware alternatives
- 2) Easy to use on-line data applications based on need or scope. Accessible and downloadable for GIS users.
- 3) Funding

ACTIONS

- 1) Leverage what already exists. Expand the utility of tools already being used. Know what you are trying to achieve.
- 2) Training and accessibility – YouTube! Make sure the data you have created is known. Communication – story maps and case studies – provide examples. Videos – video exchange on examples of how data is used.
- 3) Partnerships

CHALLENGE

- 1) Communication – make sure created data gets used. – looking for real needs for the data so it gets applied.
- 2) Continuity issues – data changes, people change. How do you make sure others aren't re-inventing the wheel.
- 3) Political environment – accessibility issues. Priorities. Limited resources. Inequity.
- 4) Challenges with partnerships. Feds – is that part of the mission? Trust.



[This Photo](#) by Unknown Author is licensed under [CC BY-SA](#)

FINAL THOUGHTS – COMMON THEMES:

- A need for improved communication among professionals, knowledge sharing, tools, models
- Partnerships, likely and unlikely, are critical to provide technical assistance, combine funding, expertise, etc.
- Digital data availability is important (identify who has it, where it is, and how to obtain it)
- Continuity of knowledge is key (stop reinventing tools and/or data that is already out there)
- Leverage existing mandates and legislative tools
- Clearly articulate use cases to demonstrate success and generate fiscal support
- Innovate and embrace technology while bridging the gap
- Tie mapping efforts to societal needs, hazards and costs
- Embrace social science to tell the story of social significance
- Make avoidance a priority
- Tools can be complex, but results should be easy to explain
- We need to provide clear, consistent, accessible, and consumable messaging about the benefits and enhanced decision-making tools provided by integrating maps and providing site specific information about natural floodplain functions and services



Next steps include:

1. Continuing to work with the Steering Committee.
2. Coordinating and attending in-person meetings with agencies: FEMA, TMAC, ACOE, DOI, EPA, USGS, Planning Committee members
3. Identifying existing tools that use condition and function (existing or potential) to inform land use decisions.
4. Planning for a second workshop in 2019 that will dig deeper into the technical challenges and opportunities.
5. Planning for a third workshop in 2020 to identify program and policy changes that need to be made to implement an integrated approach.



2019 Workshop:

- Will focus on the following:
 - Refinement of needs at various planning levels
 - Discussion of decision support
 - Identification of data sources, data and existing tools
- What are the data needs and application areas, what types of decisions are we trying to support at the national regional and local level?
- Fine and coarse resolution data sources: big data, national data sets vs. local and field collected data – what is available and what is it useful for
- How do we identify and incorporate near-term trends and emerging tech
- What is the value of open source data and how can it be used



THANK YOU TO:

ASFPM Foundation

- Doug Plasencia
- Brad Anderson
- Jerry Sparks

Workshop Steering Committee:

- Larry Larson and David Fowler, Association of State Floodplain Managers
- Andy Robertson, Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
- Eileen Shader, American Rivers
- Jared Saures, Earth Economics
- David Carlton, Dkcarlton & associates
- David Knipe, Indiana DNR
- Mike Kline, Vermont DEQ
- Maria Honeycutt, NOAA
- Megan Lang, US Fish and Wildlife Service
- George Xian, USGS



[This Photo](#) by Unknown Author is licensed under [CC BY-ND](#)



[This Photo](#) by Unknown Author is licensed under [CC BY](#)



QUESTIONS?

Marla J. Stelk

Assistant Director

Association of State Wetland Managers

marla@aswm.org

207-892-3399

Andy Robertson

Executive Director

GeoSpatial Services

aroberts@smumn.edu

507-457-8746

