

Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – June 13, 2018

Attendees: Alan Lulloff, Thuy Patton, Carey Johnson, Steve Story

CTP events in Phoenix - We discussed the draft agenda. Ice breaker will work well at the first part of the meeting because some people may not show up until after the other policy committees finish at 3:30 pm. Thuy and Carey will finalize PPT and have sign in sheet that will have boxes to gauge interest to participate in CTP conference calls. Every other month the CTP conference calls would include those that express interest. Carey to set up online poll to gauge preferences for upcoming webinars. Carey asked everyone to send him suggestions on what to include in the poll.

Upcoming webinars

The preferences from participants that participated in the last webinar in order were: 2D modeling for base level engineering pilot projects, extracting building footprints from LiDAR, LiDAR acquisition & USGS 3DEP participation, LiDAR QA/QC.

Thuy asked if there is a reminder sent out before the webinars. Alan indicated there was not but the correct answer is that once people register the gotowebinar software sends out reminders 24 hours and 1 hour prior to the webinar.

Though both CO and KY have 2D BLE pilot projects underway – those would not be good candidates until completed next calendar year. The work in the Dakotas would likely be a better option.

Since USGS has just sent out an announcement regarding the next sign-up period – this would be good timing to be the next topic for the CTP webinars. USGS could lead the webinar and Thuy indicated she could provide a State perspective. Lidar QA/QC and 2D BLE could follow for subsequent webinars.

Best Practices

CO is using the CLOMR process to get community sign-off on updated hydrology for the Colorado River.

Alan suggested he could draft a write-up on Kentucky's process for passing updates to the CNMS stream vectors on to the State person that is the custodian for the KY NHD data layer. Carey concurred.

Alan is working with MN on a write-up for their process for working with communities when they map floodways. They suggest communities opt for zero-rise (full conveyance) floodways. If they go with the maximum allowed in MN (0.5 feet) they must add the amount to the State minimum requirement for 1 foot of freeboard resulting in a freeboard of 1.5 feet.

Long discussion on 2D and 2D floodways. Montana is using 2D modeling to inform for a 1D model – floodway is done in 1D. Boulder Colorado has an administrative floodway – mapping being redone with a 2D model which makes sense due to split flow issues. However, now floodway would be the full floodplain. This is problematic due to oil well issues since they are not allowed in the floodway.

Steve indicated that floodways are problematic in Montana since they are static and stream channels frequently move resulting in stream channels outside the floodway. The M&ES committee will be querying the audience on floodway approaches for 2D modeling. ASFPM has a project focusing on floodways. Alan indicated that since floodways are designed to limit encroachments he is interested in alternatives to floodways for dealing with ways to limit encroachments into the floodplain.