

Cooperating Technical Partners – ASFPM CTP subcommittee Monthly Call – September 11, 2019

Attendees: Alan Lulloff, Rita Weaver, Brooke Seymour and Carey Johnson

New name for UDFCD is Mile High Flood District. They have dropped the word control for obvious reasons. Brooke indicated that she would like to get on CTP webinar invite list. She has been forwarded the invites by a colleague.

We went through the draft listing of potential topics that had been distributed to the subcommittee last week. Some were consolidated and it was agreed that there should also be an opportunity for people to suggest topics.

Mentoring was suggested in the context of who has taken advantage of CTP mentoring. Carey mentioned that they have a task associated with mentoring and they have done some depending on what is defined as mentoring.

Also provided to the subcommittee was a very comprehensive survey that had been sent to CTPs about 5 years ago. It was felt that it would be a bit onerous so it was decided that we would focus on webinar topics at this time.

We have put the best practices submitted by Brooke into the FEMA template and are planning to submit one possibly two of them to FEMA.

We then discussed 2D floodways. Carey indicated that an IPT has been established in conjunction with the 2D white paper. HEC has been asked to develop tools for developing floodways in 2D HEC-RAS. There is a meeting scheduled in Davis, Cal. on Sept 24-25.

Brooke indicated that in CO they are looking to use an averaging technique to splice a 2D model into 1D modeling to evaluate potential encroachments. Averaging would be used across a cross section. At a structure averaging would not be allowed.

We also discussed the depth-velocity product for mapping areas most dangerous in the floodplain. Alan indicated that there are concerns because there is no direct correlation between  $DxV$  and surcharge. An impact assessment will still need to be conducted. In addition  $DxV$  will vary based upon stream slope. Seems it would be useful to supplement floodways but not replace them. In CO, the recommendation is to use  $DxV$  to guide placement of 2D floodways, which would be confirmed to meet surcharge requirements through an iterative approach: Step 1) identify trial  $DxV$  product for first iteration of floodway corridor, Step 2) enforce encroachments in 2D model, Step 3) evaluate surcharge against allowable rise, Step 4) adjust  $DxV$  based on results and repeat process as necessary to achieve allowable surcharge. This approach is repeatable and involves less judgement since it is based on a model derived product.

2D floodways are reported to be wider than 1D floodways. ASFPM would like to locate some case studies to quantify the difference for ASFPM leadership. Rita indicated that they have completed a case study comparing 1D and 2D. She indicated that they could share the case study once a short write-up is completed. The Colorado 2D Consortium (C2DC) 2D Floodway Recommendations Technical Memorandum also documents several test cases.

AL - 9/17/2019