OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

WATER RESOURCES BRANCH

Telecopier Cover Sheet

Fax Number 202-395-4652 / Office Number 202-395-4590

*** PLEASE VERIFY RECEIPT ***

Date: 12/23

Please deliver the following pages to:

NAME: Kathi Way **FAX #:** _____

AGENCY: WH - OPD

FROM: Bruce Lang

Number of pages to follow: _____

ADDITIONAL MESSAGES:

I have comments for you on the Flood open. I will bring them over and discuss at your convenience.

Thanks,

Bruce

ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH SAFETY COMMITTEE

FOR LONG-TERM RECOVERY FROM THE MIDWEST FLOODS

TO: Environmental and Health Safety (EHS) Committee (see distribution below)

FROM: Co-Chairs Sylvia Lowrance, EPA, Deputy Associate Administrator and Dr. Frank Young, DHHS-PHS, Director of Emergency Preparedness/National Disaster Medical Systems

RE: The next Environmental and Health Safety Committee meeting is scheduled for January 12, 1994 from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm in the EPA Emergency Operations Center. A meeting agenda will follow. Please call Kathy Jones at (202) 260-8353 if you have any questions.

FAX Distribution:

USDA
Dou von Wolffradt, SCS 202-690-1462
Gary Morgan, RDA 202-720-9719
Robert Nash, OS 202-720-2080

USACE
John Elmore, CECW-O 202-504-5095

DoC
Kent Lim, EDA 202-482-0995
Dr. Andrew Robertson, NOAA 301-713-4388

DoE
Leslie Thorton, OS 202-401-0596
Kathy Jovicich, OS 202-401-2854

DOE
Jim Gilliam, DOE 202-586-7974

EPA
Jim Makris, CEPPO 202-260-0927
Kathy Jones, CEPPO 202-260-0927

FEMA
Dick Krimm, SLPS 202-646-4060

HHS
Brian Flinn, ADMHA 301-443-1719
Kent Gray, CDC 404-488-7107
Philip Killam, HRSA 301-443-4203
Kevin Tonat, NIEHS 301-443 5146

HUD
Terrence Monihen, AMS 202-708-0299

DOI
Willie Taylor, OEA 202-208-6970

White House
Brian Burke, DPC 202-456-7028
Kathi Way, DPC 202-456-7028

FACT SHEET

1993 MIDWEST FLOOD AND RESPONSE

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

History

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) has been and continues to be an integral part of the multi-agency response to the Midwest flood and the Federal recovery effort. At the field level, this response is coordinated through Disaster Field Offices established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Corps workforce was taken primarily from the District offices in the affected geographic area[1], but included personnel from other offices who voluntarily accepted assignments to the flood area.

Corps flood fighting activities included the following:

- Provision of 31 million sandbags to use in support of levees, to increase the height of levees and to protect individual structures;
- Provision of over 400 pumps to pump out water from behind levees and other areas that had become flooded;
- Provision of technical assistance to affected communities and levee districts on flood fighting techniques such as sandbagging and other structural measures; and
- Provision of data and analysis of current and projected flood conditions.

The total cost of the flood fighting effort is approximately $25 million. The major source of funding was the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Relief From the Major Widespread Flooding in the Midwest Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-75), which is also being used for flood recovery (primarily levee repair). This Emergency Supplemental bill included $180 million for the Corps; $120 million made available at the time of passage of the Act, $60 million as a contingency. It is now clear that the Corps will need at least the additional $60 million (these funds were released by the President on December 10, 1993), and probably some additional funds to complete the job of flood recovery.

Corps flood recovery activities are focused primarily on repairing levees. Damages to the levees were substantial. In some cases the levees were breached because they could not withstand the pressure created by the flood. In many more cases, the levees were overtopped causing damage, not only to the land and structures

---

[1]- This includes District offices located in St. Paul, MN; Rock Island, IL; Omaha, NE; Kansas City, MO; and St. Louis, MO.

behind the levees, but to the levees themselves. By policy, Corps responsibility for levee repair has been limited to mainstem levees (primarily the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers) and then, only to those levees classified as "active" in the Corps program-- a program established under the Flood and Coastal Storm Emergencies Act (P.L. 84-99).

Levees can provide protection against flooding this Spring and because of the likelihood that some flooding will occur, levee repair has been a primary concern for Government officials, as well as the average citizen, in the affected areas. For this reason, the remainder of this paper focuses on the status of the levee repairs and the possibility of additional damages being incurred next Spring. It should be noted, however, that the Corps recovery efforts also included:

- Restoration of commercial navigation (barge operations), including dredging to assure adequate channel depth and testing to assure passage of tows past damaged flood control facilities without causing further damage;

- Repairs to Corps-operated flood control and navigation facilities, funded from the Corps regular Operations and Maintenance appropriation- this work includes structural repairs to river bank revetments, dredging work, and repair of spillways and outlet channels at lakes due to erosion;

- Work for FEMA under Stafford Act provisions- this work includes damage assessments, debris removal, technical assistance, potable water, and provision of water pumps and generators.

Status of the Corps Work

As stated above, by policy, the Corps of Engineers is not responsible for the repair of all levees damaged by the 1993 flood. In smaller watersheds (off of the mainstem rivers) the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) repairs Federally eligible levees (eligibility defined by SCS). Within the Corps geographic area, many of the locally constructed levees are not eligible for repair by the Corps (eligibility defined by the Corps[2]). The Corps received 543 requests for assistance. This includes both initial and final repair requests (most of the levees requiring both were

---

[2]- The eligibility criteria for the two agencies are virtually identical. SCS levees tend to be smaller and to protect agricultural lands primarily. There are, therefore, slight differences in the public sponsorship requirements. Additionally, the SCS cost benefit analysis is less formal, since it would make little sense to do extensive analysis on projects with substantially lower costs.

counted twice in this total). After an initial screening, 270 requests were turned down, because the levees were not eligible for assistance.

In order to address those cases where the likelihood of further flood damage is greatest, even from minor flooding events, the Corps instituted emergency procedures for making initial repairs. The levees in this category were either breached or damaged severely due to overtopping. The Corps has determined that initial repairs were justified under the expedited guidelines in 38 cases. The Corps has made significant progress in providing initial repairs where levees have been severely damaged and virtually all of this work will be complete by the end of February, 1994[3]. A state by state breakdown of initial repairs is included in Table One.

In all, there were 245 levees in the Corps program that are expected to be repaired using P.L. 84-99 funds. This includes the 38 levees for which initial repairs are being made (all will require additional repairs to return them to the pre-flood conditions). In a small number of cases, permanent repairs have started. By the end of the 1994 construction season, it is anticipated that construction will be completed on all of the levees.

Table Two present state by state breakdowns on the permanent and total levee repair program. The total cost of levee repairs (initial and permanent) is currently estimated to be $230 million. This amount exceeds the available funding from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (P.L. 103-75). Procedures for addressing this shortfall are currently under review.

Because of the number of ineligible levees within the Corps geographic areas of responsibility, completion of all Corps repairs, by itself, would not restore the area to its pre-flood condition. Nonetheless, virtually all of the major urban areas along the mainstem rivers are in the Corps program, as are a substantial number of primarily agricultural levees.

Outlook for Spring Floods

There is a general consensus among forecasters, that the probability for spring flooding is high. Whatever the amount of rainfall and snow runoff, the effects will be greater than normal because the ground throughout the Midwest is already in a supersaturated condition. The uncertainties of forecasting the

---

[3]- The one exception may be Louisa County IA, Levee #8. In this case, the local sponsor is considering a partial buyout of land behind the damage levee for inclusion in the SCS Wetlands Restoration program.

likely damages in the spring that normally are associated with weather forecasting are compounded in this case, because the exact nature of repairs on non-eligible levees is unknown. Nonetheless, even though the initial repairs on Corps levees should be virtually complete, there will still be many unrepaired levees and the possibility of significant damages should not be discounted.

The Corps is currently preparing a strategy for dealing with potential spring flooding in the Midwest. This strategy includes: (1) identifying potential contractors for emergency work related to flood fight activities; (2) pre-identifying sand, rock, and other borrow materials; (3) re-assessing sandbag inventories and pre-positioning sandbags where appropriate; (4) continued education of local and State governments concerning flood fight techniques; and (5) recommendation that our field staff meet with local officials with regard to Corps policies so there is a clear understanding of our policies before an event occurs.

Coordination is continuing with FEMA, SCS, and other Federal agencies as appropriate at the Washington level to identify potential problem areas related to response and recovery. Corps Water Control Management personnel with their forecasting capabilities are working with the National Weather Service to identify specific areas of concern where flood vulnerability and risks of significant damages or problems are highest.

TABLE ONE. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEE REPAIR, STATUS OF INITIAL REPAIRS.

STATE	NUMBER OF LEVEES ELIGIBLE FOR INITIAL REPAIR	NUMBER OF INITIAL REPAIRS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETE	NUMBER OF REPAIRS TO BE COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 1994	ESTIMATED COSTS ($000)
ILLINOIS	16	13	16	$44
INDIANA	0	0	0	$0
IOWA	3	2	3	$3
KANSAS	0	0	0	$0
MINNESOTA	0	0	0	$0
MISSOURI	19	13	19	$35
NEBRASKA	0	0	0	$0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	$0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	$0
WISCONSIN	0	0	0	$0
TOTAL	38	28	38	$82

TABLE TWO. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEE REPAIR, INITIAL AND PERMANENT REPAIRS COMBINED.

STATE	NUMBER OF LEVEES ELIGIBLE FOR REPAIR	NUMBER OF LEVEE REPAIRS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETE	NUMBER OF REPAIRS TO BE COMPLETED BY END OF 1994 CONSTRUCTION SEASON	ESTIMATED COSTS: INITIAL ($000)	PERMANENT ($000)	TOTAL ($000)
ILLINOIS	36	18	36	$44	$21	$65
INDIANA	4	0	4	$0	$3	$3
IOWA	48	11	48	$3	$25	$28
KANSAS	39	4	39	$0	$32	$32
MINNESOTA	15	1	15	$0	$9	$9
MISSOURI	63	26	63	$35	$30	$65
NEBRASKA	6	5	6	$0	$1	$1
NORTH DAKOTA	6	0	6	$0	$4	$4
SOUTH DAKOTA	17	1	17	$0	$11	$11
WISCONSIN	11	1	11	$0	$7	$7
TOTAL	245	67	245	$82	$143	$230 **

**- INCLUDES CONTINGENCY RESERVES OF $5 MILLION.

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(CIVIL WORKS)
Room 7126, Pulaski Building
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20314-1000

FAX TO: Kathi Way DATE: 12/17/93

OFFICE: DPC PHONE: 456-7777

FAX: 456-7739

SUBJECT: Flood Rehab Report - Complete

PAGES TO FOLLOW: 16

FROM: DR. ROBERT N. STEARNS
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY
(PROJECT MANAGEMENT)

PHONE: (202) 272-0126 FAX: (202) 504-4389

COMMENTS:

behind the levees, but to the levees themselves. By policy, Corps responsibility for levee repair has been limited to mainstem levees (primarily the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers) and then, only to those levees classified as "active" in the Corps program-- a program established under the Flood and Coastal Storm Emergencies Act (P.L. 84-99).

Levees can provide protection against flooding this Spring and because of the likelihood that some flooding will occur, levee repair has been a primary concern for Government officials, as well as the average citizen, in the affected areas. For this reason, the remainder of this paper focuses on the status of the levee repairs and the possibility of additional damages being incurred next Spring. It should be noted, however, that the Corps recovery efforts also included:

- Restoration of commercial navigation (barge operations), including dredging to assure adequate channel depth and testing to assure passage of tows past damaged flood control facilities without causing further damage;
- Repairs to Corps-operated flood control and navigation facilities, funded from the Corps regular Operations and Maintenance appropriation- this work includes structural repairs to river bank revetments, dredging work, and repair of spillways and outlet channels at lakes due to erosion;
- Work for FEMA under Stafford Act provisions- this work includes damage assessments, debris removal, technical assistance, potable water, and provision of water pumps and generators.

Status of the Corps Work

As stated above, by policy, the Corps of Engineers is not responsible for the repair of all levees damaged by the 1993 flood. In smaller watersheds (off of the mainstem rivers) the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) repairs Federally eligible levees (eligibility defined by SCS). Within the Corps geographic area, many of the locally constructed levees are not eligible for repair by the Corps (eligibility defined by the Corps[2]). The Corps received 543 requests for assistance. This includes both initial and final repair requests (most of the levees requiring both were

[2]- The eligibility criteria for the two agencies are virtually identical. SCS levees tend to be smaller and to protect agricultural lands primarily. There are, therefore, slight differences in the public sponsorship requirements. Additionally, the SCS cost benefit analysis is less formal, since it would make little sense to do extensive analysis on projects with substantially lower costs.

counted twice in this total). After an initial screening, 270 requests were turned down, because the levees were not eligible for assistance.

In order to address those cases where the likelihood of further flood damage is greatest, even from minor flooding events, the Corps instituted emergency procedures for making initial repairs. The levees in this category were either breached or damaged severely due to overtopping. The Corps has determined that initial repairs were justified under the expedited guidelines in 38 cases. The Corps has made significant progress in providing initial repairs where levees have been severely damaged and virtually all of this work will be complete by the end of February, 1994[3]. A state by state breakdown of initial repairs is included in Table One.

In all, there were 245 levees in the Corps program that are expected to be repaired using P.L. 84-99 funds. This includes the 38 levees for which initial repairs are being made (all will require additional repairs to return them to the pre-flood conditions). In a small number of cases, permanent repairs have started. By the end of the 1994 construction season, it is anticipated that construction will be completed on all of the levees.

Table Two present state by state breakdowns on the permanent and total levee repair program. The total cost of levee repairs (initial and permanent) is currently estimated to be $230 million. This amount exceeds the available funding from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (P.L. 103-75). Procedures for addressing this shortfall are currently under review.

Because of the number of ineligible levees within the Corps geographic areas of responsibility, completion of all Corps repairs, by itself, would not restore the area to its pre-flood condition. Nonetheless, virtually all of the major urban areas along the mainstem rivers are in the Corps program, as are a substantial number of primarily agricultural levees.

Outlook for Spring Floods

There is a general consensus among forecasters, that the probability for spring flooding is high. Whatever the amount of rainfall and snow runoff, the effects will be greater than normal because the ground throughout the Midwest is already in a supersaturated condition. The uncertainties of forecasting the

---

[3]- The one exception may be Louisa County IA, Levee #8. In this case, the local sponsor is considering a partial buyout of land behind the damage levee for inclusion in the SCS Wetlands Restoration program.

likely damages in the spring that normally are associated with weather forecasting are compounded in this case, because the exact nature of repairs on non-eligible levees is unknown. Nonetheless, even though the initial repairs on Corps levees should be virtually complete, there will still be many unrepaired levees and the possibility of significant damages should not be discounted.

The Corps is currently preparing a strategy for dealing with potential spring flooding in the Midwest. This strategy includes: (1) identifying potential contractors for emergency work related to flood fight activities; (2) pre-identifying sand, rock, and other borrow materials; (3) re-assessing sandbag inventories and pre-positioning sandbags where appropriate; (4) continued education of local and State governments concerning flood fight techniques; and (5) recommendation that our field staff meet with local officials with regard to Corps policies so there is a clear understanding of our policies before an event occurs.

Coordination is continuing with FEMA, SCS, and other Federal agencies as appropriate at the Washington level to identify potential problem areas related to response and recovery. Corps Water Control Management personnel with their forecasting capabilities are working with the National Weather Service to identify specific areas of concern where flood vulnerability and risks of significant damages or problems are highest.

Report on Individual Levees

The eligible levees in the Corps Emergency Repair program vary greatly by size, level of protection afforded, nature of the property protected, and the damages caused by the 1993 floods. Attached to this paper are examples of the problems faced and the Corps response. These examples are intended to give a picture of the flood recovery effort that the aggregate numbers cannot do by themselves.

TABLE ONE. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEE REPAIR, STATUS OF INITIAL REPAIRS.

STATE	NUMBER OF LEVEES ELIGIBLE FOR INITIAL REPAIR	NUMBER OF INITIAL REPAIRS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETE	NUMBER OF REPAIRS TO BE COMPLETED BY FEBRUARY 1994	ESTIMATED COSTS ($000)
ILLINOIS	16	13	16	$44
INDIANA	0	0	0	$0
IOWA	3	2	3	$3
KANSAS	0	0	0	$0
MINNESOTA	0	0	0	$0
MISSOURI	19	13	19	$35
NEBRASKA	0	0	0	$0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	$0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	$0
WISCONSIN	0	0	0	$0
TOTAL	38	28	38	$82

TABLE TWO. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LEVEE REPAIR, INITIAL AND PERMANENT REPAIRS COMBINED,

STATE	NUMBER OF LEVEES ELIGIBLE FOR REPAIR	NUMBER OF LEVEE REPAIRS UNDERWAY OR COMPLETE	NUMBER OF REPAIRS TO BE COMPLETED BY END OF 1994 CONSTRUCTION SEASON	ESTIMATED COSTS: INITIAL ($000)	PERMANENT ($000)	TOTAL ($000)
ILLINOIS	36	18	36	$44	$21	$65
INDIANA	4	0	4	$0	$3	$3
IOWA	48	11	48	$3	$25	$28
KANSAS	39	4	39	$0	$32	$32
MINNESOTA	15	1	15	$0	$9	$9
MISSOURI	63	26	63	$35	$30	$65
NEBRASKA	6	5	6	$0	$1	$1
NORTH DAKOTA	6	0	6	$0	$4	$4
SOUTH DAKOTA	17	1	17	$0	$11	$11
WISCONSIN	11	1	11	$0	$7	$7
TOTAL	245	67	245	$82	$143	$230 **

**- INCLUDES CONTINGENCY RESERVES OF $5 MILLION.

BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT
State of Missouri, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 8 June 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 24 July 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 49.53 Chester Gage 7 August 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 13 October 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 29 October 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 7 Mar 94

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: Fall 94

9. Area protected:

   a. acres - 25,900

   b. homes - 200

   c. people - 500

   d. towns - Belgique, Clancyville, Minfro, McBride, MO

   e. infrastructure - Chester Bridge (only Mississippi River crossing for 105 miles), 25 industrial/commercial activities

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $5,053,000

CHESTERFIELD MONARCH DISTRICT
State of Missouri, Missouri River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 100 year flood
2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 2 July 93
3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 30 July 93
4. Highest water level of record, with date: 39.3 31 Jul 93
5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 30 August 93
6. Date rehab construction started: 25 September 93
7. Date of completion of initial repairs: 12 November 93
8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: 30 Jan 94
9. Area protected:
   a. acres - 5621
   b. homes - 30
   c. people - 6000 (includes working people)
   d. towns - None
   e. infrastructure - Chesterfield Industrial Park, 500 private businesses, Spirit of St Louis Airport, US Highways 40 and 61
10. Estimated cost of repairs: $460,000

FT CHARTRES DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 8 June 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 2 August 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 47.0 (Brinkeys Gage) 5 August 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 11 October 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 20 November 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 27 Jan 94

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: Fall 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 15000

b. homes - 20

c. people - 50

d. towns - 0

e. infrastructure - roads, Union Pacific Railroad

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $1,539,000

11. Additional remarks: Union Pacific Railroad says it is losing $250,000 per day because of need to reroute due to track being inundated during flood, and now being subject to flood.

HARRISONVILLE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 6 June 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 2 August 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 47.0' Brinkeys Gage 5 August 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 11 October 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 11 September 93

7. Date of completion of initial repairs: 12 November 93

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: Fall 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 27800

b. homes - 450 (assessed value of $16.5M)

c. people - 900

d. towns - Valmeyer, IL

e. infrastructure - roads, Union Pacific Railroad

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $1,271,000

11. Additional remarks: Town of Valmeyer has applied for a major buyout to move most of the community to higher ground. Even so there are many farmsteads and 46,000 acres of farmland behind the Harrisonville/Stringtown/Fort Chartres levee system. Union Pacific Railroad was losing $250,000 per day because of need to reroute trains due to track inundation.

HUNT-LIMA LAKE DRAINAGE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 9 April 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 9 July 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 32.13' (centrally located Quincy gage), 12 July 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: November 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 6 October 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 1 Feb 94

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: July 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 28,500

b. homes - 70

c. people - 350

d. town - Town of Meyer, IL

e. infrastructure - roads, grain storage elevator

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $5,234,000

INDIAN GRAVE DRAINAGE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: April 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 12 July 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 32.13' (centrally located Quincy gage), 12 July 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: November 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 27 October 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 28 Feb 94

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: July 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 18,000

b. homes - 0

c. people - 50

d. towns - 0

e. infrastructure - nil

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $10,916,000

11. Additional remarks: Agricultural levee

KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: 8 June 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 22 July 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 49.53' Chester Gage 7 August 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 13 October 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 11 November 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 2 Feb 94

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: Fall 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 9,100

b. homes - 75

c. people - 190

d. towns - Pujol, IL

e. infrastructure - roads on island

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $2,640,000

CITY OF ST LOUIS FLOODWALL
State of Missouri, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 500 year flood
2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded:
3. Date of initial overtop/breach: none
4. Highest water level of record, with date:
5. Date water dropped below flood stage: 13 September 93
6. Date rehab construction started: Approx 15 Jan 94
7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 5 Mar 94
8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: Fall 94
9. Area protected:

a. acres - 3200

b. homes - several thousand

c. people - 500,000 plus

d. towns - St Louis

e. infrastructure - massive amounts of industry, 3 Mississippi River bridges, Metropolitan Sewer District, etc.

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $361,000

SNY ISLAND DRAINAGE DISTRICT
State of Illinois, Mississippi River

1. Levee's design level of protection: 50 year flood

2. Date flood stage was initially exceeded: April 93

3. Date of initial overtop/breach: 25 July 93

4. Highest water level of record, with date: 32.13' (centrally located Quincy gage), 12 July 93

5. Date water dropped below flood stage: November 93

6. Date rehab construction started: 20 September 93

7. Anticipated date of completion of initial repairs: 30 Dec 93

8. Anticipated date of completion of final repairs: July 94

9. Area protected:

a. acres - 44,200

b. homes - 0

c. people - 40

d. towns - 0

e. infrastructure - nil

10. Estimated cost of repairs: $4,441,000

Executive Office of the President
Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee
730 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20503

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE: March 28, 1994

TO: Brian Burke / Kathi Way

COMPANY:

PHONE:

FAX NO: 456-7028

FROM: Gerry Galloway

PHONE NO: (202) 408-5295

FAX NO: (202) 408-6839

MESSAGE: The attached information will be discussed at the Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force Meeting on 3/29/94.

NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET): 4

FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

GENERAL GOALS FOR USE OF THE FLOODPLAIN

Reduce risk to life and property
Preserve and enhance the natural values in floodplain
Use the floodplain in accord with its potential

FACTS

Floods will continue to occur
In Mississippi and Missouri Basins, valuable upland and bottomland habitats have been lost;
Most development patterns established pre-1930 (1900)
Some development connected with recent flood control and navigation activity
Upland land use actions impact on bottomland activity
Activity at one location in the floodplain can have impacts upstream, cross- stream and downstream
Some current human uses of the flood plain will continue for the foreseeable future;
Large urban and industrial settlement
Selected forms of agriculture
Recreation
Many existing flood control systems are needed for protection of life and property and, together with ongoing floodplain management activities, have prevented considerable damages
Residual risk exists for people and property protected by levees
The regulatory components of the National Flood Insurance Program have controlled considerable inappropriate development in the floodplain

SOLUTION AREAS

(Options shown are not necessarily mutually exclusive)

1. DIVIDE FLOODPLAIN AND RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES AMONG FED/STATE-TRIBES/LOCAL GOVERNMENT

A. Define division of responsibilities

01-Shared State/Tribal-Federal Role

States-Tribes:
Serve as principal floodplain manager
Develop state floodplain management program
Move towards achievement of state program
Support Federal statutes and policies for use of the floodplain
Serve as principal coordinator of Federal-Community relationships

Federal:
Ensure coordination and cooperation among states
Develop flood control projects IAW Congressional auth and state floodplain management goals

Operate selected interstate water activities
Provide incentives for and support of state floodplain management
Provide limited disaster emergency support and recovery ops
Support state mitigation activities
Provide a National Floodplain Insurance Program

Local Governments
Participate in State floodplain management activities
Actively participate in the NFIP
Develop and implement land use controls in the floodplain

02-Dominant Federal Role

Federal:
Establish National Floodplain Management Program
Develop flood control projects IAW Congressional auth and in coordination with states
Operate interstate water activities
Provide disaster emergency support and recovery ops
Provide a National Floodplain Insurance Program

States-Tribes:
Serve as floodplain manager IAW Federal programs
Support Federal statutes and policies for use of the floodplain

Local Governments
Participate in State floodplain management activities
Actively participate in the NFIP
Develop and implement land use controls in the floodplain

B. Share the risks and the costs among all levels of government

01- Federal government carries majority of risk
Cost share reduced or waived for major disasters
CDBG money used to match Federal money for buy-outs
No clear program concerning replacement of worn out infrastructure

02- Federal/State-Tribe/Local governments share the risk
Maintain cost share so that State and local governments have clear stake in minimizing flood damage
Encourage the purchase of NFIP flood insurance and private flood insurance on public facilities to minimize Public Assistance (e.g. Des Moines Water Works)
Withhold Public Assistance to communities which do not participate in the NFIP or state floodplain management program
Establish loan program to permit community upgrade of damaged infrastructure

C. Ensure national consistency among flood control, recovery and mitigation programs (cost share, construction standards, evaluation, environmental assessments)

O1- Continue Current Policies and Procedures
Agencies establish general standards and guidelines
Limited coordination among agencies
Levee construction
Buyouts
Other flood control
Compliance with Federal regulations
Flood fighting

O2- Develop Consistency and organizational efficiencies in like programs across agencies
Require equal standards and guidelines across similar programs
Limit number of agencies involved in an activity

O3- Adjust Programs on Case-by-Case Basis

2. REDUCE THE RISK

A. Define appropriate levels of protection for people and activity in the floodplain; adjust current flood control features as required and justified; develop new projects IAW specified standards

O1- Continue Existing Standards
Case-by-Case Determination
Allowable flood elevation increase-100yr plus 1 ft

O2- Establish New Standards- High Level
Urban areas and critical infrastructure -Standard flood
Non-relocatable rural communities - 100yr
Agricultural areas: Federal program - 10yr
Agricultural areas with critical infrastructure - Case-by-case
No increase in 500 yr flood elevation

O3- Establish New Standards - Medium Level
Critical infrastructure - Standard Flood
Urban and non-relocatable rural communities - 100yr
Agricultural areas: Federal program 10yr
Agricultural areas with critical infrastructure - Case-by-case
No increase in 100 yr flood elevation

B. Ensure the integrity of the flood control system

(1) Integrity of the infrastructure (construction, maintenance,renewal)
O1- Current: Federal Lead; link to locals; limited maint; no renewal
O2- Federal Lead; state intermediary; Fed/state maint/renewal
O3- State Lead; Federal construction; state local follow-up-renewal

(2) Knowledge of the hazards; determine and disseminate information concerning flood elevations and capabilities of flood control structures
O1- Federal Lead
O2- State Lead

(3) Management of mainstem MO/MS Rivers flood control activity
O1- Current; Loose linkage

3

O2- Establish Upper Mississippi/Missouri River Commission with operational responsibilities
O3- Expand jurisdiction of Mississippi River Commission -operational responsibilities
O4- Establish interstate led basin commission as coordinating body

C. Relocate buildings and activities out of the floodplain in areas of greatest risk; elevate buildings in areas of lesser risk.

O1- Current: Relocate modify when substantially damaged; use 404 program, Section 1362; coordination on an ad hoc basis

O2- Use 1993 Midwest "Patchwork Quilt" Model
Substantial damage regulations
Expanded 404 program
Section 1362
Large Supplementals to HUD, EDA, and others
Varying degrees of coordination by State/Federal Task Forces
Technical assistance through States, RPCs, EDA Flood Coordinators, etc.

O3- Block Grant Model
404 and Other Funds Provided to State as a Block Grant
State Distributes in Accordance with Broad Federal guidelines (and cost share?)
Substantial (and cumulative?) damage regulations

O4- Current Legislative Reform
Substantial damage regulations
Provide NFIP mitigation insurance for insured properties
States/Communities apply for 404 and NFIP mitigation funds at 75/25 match
State reallocates HUD CDBG funds as needed
Coordination by State/Federal Task Forces
On-going grant program for pre-active mitigation management
Funding for floodplain management and mitigation planning

D. Increase attention to watershed protection programs
O1- Increase funding of current watershed programs
O2- Consolidate or better coordinate existing watershed programs
Support state development of watershed plans
Provide framework to focus government and non-government efforts

3. MITIGATE DAMAGES

A. Insure all those in the floodplain (with and without protection)
O1- Current: Low participation in NFIP; exemption from insurance when protected
O2- Increase market penetration; require insurance for all in floodplain; limit post-disaster support for uninsured in floodplain

4

O3- Increase market penetration; continue to exempt with protection from insurance requirement

B. Protect new development from flood losses

O1- Current:
Enforce NFIP floodplain management regulations
Encourage and support adoption of more restrictive State requirements
Recognize exemplary community floodplain management programs through the NFIP Community Rating System
Fund States to monitor and provide technical assistance to NFIP communities
Federal agencies implement E.O. 11988

O2- Current plus:
Provide funding for floodplain management planning
Ensure that new levees do not induce floodplain habitation
States adopt enabling legislation so that all communities do land use planning and use available tools to avoid or minimize floodplain development
States adopt State Floodplain Management Act
FEMA floodplain maps adequately reflect risk

C. Mitigate the losses to agricultural activities in the floodplain

O1- Increase the level of flood protection

O2- Require participation in the crop insurance program
Construct/modify levees to minimize damages during overtopping
Support floodproofing of agricultural infrastructure
Provide Federal support of levee damage reconstruction
Voluntarily enroll non-farmable land into CRP, Wetlands or other programs

4. PLAN AND CONTROL FOR APPROPRIATE USE OF THE FLOODPLAIN

A. Set a Federal example

(1) Federal actions (EO11988)

O1- Remind agencies of EO11988

O2- Reissue a stronger, more forceful EO

O3- Establish OMB or other activity oversight of EO compliance

(2) Federal support of state actions

O1- Issue an EO requiring Federal program adherence to state FPM plans

O2- Issue memoranda from OMB directed to support of states

5

B. Streamline and Support Federal-State coordination activity

O1- Establish FPM Act similar to CZMA
Support state and local planning and regulation
Activate Water Resources Council or similar coordinating body; include EPA and FEMA participation

O2- Tighten coordination among agencies

C. Ensure Federal guidelines for water projects give more attention to non-structural and environmental approaches

O1- Revise P&G IAW Administration policies

O2- Retain current procedures; focus on NED objective
Provide for more exceptions to NED rule

D. Develop and share high quality information on floodplain and related watershed development and resources

O1- Establish Federally led and funded, state involved, FLOODPLAIN information system available to Federal agencies and to states; develop basin-wide hydraulic and hydrologic model

O2- Continue current individual agency data gathering and dissemination; improve coordination; develop basin-wide hydraulic and hydrologic model

E. Improve accuracy and timeliness of floodplain mapping program

F. Improve public education on floodplain management issues

5. INCREASE ATTENTION TO FLOODPLAIN ECOSYSTEMS

A. Identify and quantify long term basin ecosystem needs

O1- Current: No systematic approach

O2- Establish systematic ecosystem evaluation for basin

B. Acquire floodplain habitat consistent with national goals

O1- Establish and coordinate Federal program to fund acquisition following floods and on a programmatic basis, IAW state FPM programs

O2- Current: Limited coordination; piecemeal approach

B. Share use of floodplain among alternative uses

O1- Tie support of Federal flood control program to environmental accommodations

O2- Increase attention to ecosystem management in Federal O&M activities

C. Increase use of and flexibility in funding of existing Federal programs for environmental enhancement
Provide funding stream and support for currently authorized enhancement
Provide author emergency acquisition following floods (on lines of PL84-99)
Provide for greater OOI participation in post-flood alternative

Flood Meeting 3/4/94

Name	Organization	Phone
Jill Friedman	NAC	624-7790
MAUREEN CROCKER	IL	624-7760
Jim Solyst	NGA	624-7739
Mary Shechy	WI	624-5870
TOM LITJEN	NEB	508-3838
Shannon Cunniff	Floodplain Mgmt Review Cmte	(202) 408-5295
[illegible]	FEMA Congr.	646-4500
Kathy Jones	EPA	202-260-8353
Jim Makris	EPA	202-260-8600
Thomas Welsh	Floodplain Mgmt Rev Com.	408-5243
TOM HEBERT	USDA/NRE	720.7173
LARRY BABCH	USDA Soil Conservation Service	720-9482
Randy Weber	USDA/ASCS	720-6215
GERRY GALLOWAY	INTERAGENCY FP MGMT COMMTE	408-5295
JOHN P. ELMORE	HQUSACE	202-272-0194
Bruce Long	OMB - Natural Resources	202-395-4590
Ron Jones	OMB - Housing	202-395-7067
Phil Smith	Iowa	202 624 5442
Nancy Payne	Iowa	202/624-5443
Dol Patel	HUD	202/708-3587
Ken Williams	HUD/CPD	(202) 401-6567
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
David L McIlwain	EDA	(202) 482-5265
PHYLLIS AMON	HUD/CPD	(202) 708-1332
Keith Mason	WH-IGA	202/456-2896
Kathie McCrigler	N.V.	202-624-5368
WILBUR F. HAWKINS	EDA	202-482-4067

William W. Ginsberg	EDA	(202) 482-5081
Margie Siegel	NGA	634-5340
LCDR Kevin Tonat	USPHS/DHHS	301-443-1167 v
RADM Frank Young	DHHS	301-443-5146 f
Kathi Way	DPC	

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Federal Agencies		Executive Office of the President
Richard Krimm	FEMA	John Gibbons
Morrie Goodman	FEMA	Mark Schaefer
Stanley Genega	Army-CE	T.J. Glauthier
Ed Dickey	Army	Katie McGinty
Bob Stearns	Army	Will Stelle
Mollie Beattie	DOI-FWS	Brian Burke
Michelle Altemus	DOI-FWS	Kathi Way
Michael Huerta	DOT	Steve Redburn
Richard Sanderson	EPA	Gerry Galloway
David Davis	EPA-OW	Eric Lichtenburg
Oleta Fitzgerald	USDA	Chris Edley
Tom Hebert	USDA	Kevin Neyland
James McMullen	USDA-ASCS	Ron Cogswell
Karl Otte	USDA-SCS	Mark Weatherly
Tom Wehri	USDA-SCS	
Gene Morrison	HUD	
Truman Goins	HUD	
Kent Lim	DOC	
Al Judd	SBA	

10 pages to follow

Note: Enclosure/Attachment referenced in letters are not enclosed with this fax.

From: Renée (395-4590)

January 24, 1994

NOTE TO: SEE DISTRIBUTION LIST

FROM: T.J. Glauthier, Katie McGinty, and Jim Lyons

SUBJECT: Floodplain Management Task Force

The next meeting of our interagency working group has been scheduled for **Wednesday, January 26th, 10:30 - 12:30, room 248** of the Old Executive Office Building.

We intend to discuss three major items of ongoing interest to the task force:

1. BG Galloway, executive director of the study team, will be introduced. He will discuss progress made in establishing the floodplain management study team and developing a strategy paper for comprehensive recovery policy and program development. Mark Schaefer should update the task force on scientific and technical work, and Eric Lichtenburg should speak on the work of the economics team.

2. Each agency should be prepared to discuss levee/wetland progress to date and anticipated successes or problems in the near future. Summary material that can be used in briefing the National Governors Conference at their January/February meeting and others would be appreciated.

3. Each agency should be prepared to update the task force on their knowledge of the likelihood of spring flooding, and what preparations they are making to address this threat. Again, summary handouts would be appreciated.

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Federal Agencies

Richard Krimm	FEMA
Morrie Goodman	FEMA
Stanley Genega	Army-CE
Ed Dickey	Army
Bob Stearns	Army
Mollie Beattie	DOI-FWS
Michelle Altemus	DOI-FWS
Michael Huerta	DOT
Richard Sanderson	EPA
David Davis	EPA-OW
Oleta Fitzgerald	USDA
Tom Hebert	USDA
James McMullen	USDA-ASCS
Karl Otte	USDA-SCS
Tom Wehri	USDA-SCS
Gene Morrison	HUD
Truman Goins	HUD
Kent Lim	DOC
Al Judd	SBA

Executive Office of the President

John Gibbons
Mark Schaefer
T.J. Glauthier
Katie McGinty
Will Stelle
Brian Burke
Kathi Way
Steve Redburn
Gerry Galloway
Eric Lichtenburg
Chris Edley
Kevin Neyland
Ron Cogswell
Mark Weatherly

January 10, 1994

TO: BG Gerald E. Galloway, Jr.

FROM: Administration Floodplain Management Task Force --
T.J. Glauthier, Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget *Signed*
Kathleen McGinty, Director, White House Office of Environmental Policy *Signed*
James R. Lyons, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources *Sign*

SUBJECT: Directive on the Establishment of an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee

The purpose of this directive is to establish an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee and to designate you as Executive Director of the Committee. The Committee will undertake an intensive review to: determine the major causes and consequences of the Great Flood of '93; evaluate the performance of existing floodplain management and related watershed management programs; and, make recommendations as to what changes in current policies, programs, and activities would most effectively achieve risk reduction, economic efficiency, and environmental enhancement in the floodplain and related watersheds. As appropriate, the Committee should identify legislative initiatives that might be proposed by the Administration.

Because floodplain management involves a complex intergovernmental system of Federal, State, tribal, and local responsibilities, you will ensure outreach to and consultation with other levels of government and the public. You should conduct your activities and deliberations in an open environment.

The Review Committee will include a multi-disciplinary and interagency group of experts in fields relevant to floodplain management. The individuals listed at Attachment 1 have been assigned by their agencies to the Committee. As necessary, you are authorized to request additional assistance, on an ad-hoc basis, from those agencies and from activities not currently represented on the Committee. The Council of Economic Advisors staff will assist in coordination of economic analysis support. The Justice Department will provide legal assistance. FEMA will coordinate public affairs and Congressional and intergovernmental relations for the Committee. The Scientific Assessment and Strategy Team, which was established by a White House directive dated November 24, 1993, (Attachment 2), is further assigned to the Review Committee and will operate under the Committee's direction.

Resources to support the salaries of individuals assigned to the Committee will be provided by parent agencies. You will be provided an appropriate budget to support the travel and other activities of the committee. As coordinated by OEP and OMB, you will be provided a three-person administrative support staff, office space, and supporting equipment.

For the period of this study, you will be assigned to the White House and will report directly to us. You will serve as the primary representative of the Committee for purposes of public outreach and communications and will have executive responsibility for organizing and executing the work of the Committee.

Not later than February 1, 1994, you will submit to us for approval a detailed mission statement for the Committee and a time-phased work plan. The mission statement should reflect coordination with as broad a segment of interested activities as possible. Not later than May 1, 1994, you will provide a preliminary report to us on the results of the review. A final report will be issued t the public by June 1, assuming expeditious review by the Administration. Every 3 weeks, or more frequently if required, you will provide us with in-process-reviews of the effort.

Attachments (2)

January 10, 1994

TO: Mike Espy, Secretary of Agriculture
Togo D. West, Secretary of Army
Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior
Carol Browner, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency
James Lee Witt, Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency

FROM: Administration Floodplain Management Task Force --
T.J. Glauthier, Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget Signed
Kathleen McGinty, Director, White House Office of Environmental Policy Signed
James R. Lyons, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources Signed

SUBJECT: Establishment of an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee

As you may be aware, as a consequence of the disastrous Midwest floods of 1993, the Administration has established an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee. This Committee, operating under the direction of the Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force, will undertake an intensive review to determine the major causes and consequences of the 1993 floods; evaluate the performance of existing floodplain management and related watershed management programs; and, make recommendations as to what changes in current policies, programs, and activities would most effectively achieve risk reduction, economic efficiency, and environmental enhancement in the floodplain and related watersheds. As appropriate, the Committee will identify legislative initiatives that might be proposed. The Committee will operate with a deadline of June 1, 1994, for its final report.

Because floodplain management involves a complex intergovernmental system of Federal, State, tribal, and local responsibilities, the Committee will conduct outreach to and consultation with all levels of government and the public. Its operations will be conducted in an open environment.

The Committee includes a multi-disciplinary and interagency group of experts in fields relevant to floodplain management, and we thank you for providing members of your agency to serve on the Committee (Attachment 1 lists all members established to date). The Committee will be assisted by the staff of the Council of Economic Advisors, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Justice Department. An element of the Committee, the Scientific Assessment and Strategy Team, is working in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, to gather and analyze data related to the flood and its impacts.

We would ask your personal support of this important effort. Because of the short timeframe for the conduct of the study, it is essential that requests for information submitted to your agency be quickly addressed. We are sure that your agency will find the data developed by the Committee to be of immediate use and supportive of your activities in the affected areas.

We have also attached a copy of the preliminary mission statement for the Committee. Because of the intense interest in this review, we have decided to leave it open to comment until January 17, 1994, and would welcome any thoughts you might have.

We thank you in advance for your assistance. Questions should be addressed to BG G.E. Galloway, Executive Director of the Committee, at 202/395-3706.

Attachments (2)

cc: Jack Gibbons,Office of Science and Technology Policy
Mark Schaefer, Office of Science and Technology Policy
Laura Tyson, Council of Economic Advisers
Eric Lichtenberg, Council of Economic Advisers
Oleta G. Fritzgerald, Executive Assistant, USDA
Keith Collins, Acting Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA
Michael Dunn, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, USDA
Randy Weber, Acting Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA
R.D. Plowman, Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, USDA
Kenneth Ackerman, Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, USDA
Eugene Moos, Undersecretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, USDA
Bob Nash, Undersecretary for Small Community and Rural Development, USDA
Galen S. Bridge, Acting Chief, Soil Conservation Service, USDA
Edward G. Dickey, Acting Assistant Secretary of Army - Civil Works
Bob Armstrong, Assistant Secretary for Lands and Minerals Management, DOI
Ada E. Deer, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, DOI
George T. Frampton Jr., Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, DOI
Elizabeth Rieke, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, DOI
Sylvia Lowrance, Associate Deputy Administrator, EPA
James Makris, Director, Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention Office, EPA
Don Collins, Deputy Administrator, Federal Insurance Administration
Robert Volland, Acting Deputy Associate Director, Mitigation Directorate, FEMA
Richard Krimm, Associate Director, Response and Recovery Directorate, FEMA

January 18, 1994

Honorable Jim Edgar
Governor of Illinois
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Dear Governor Edgar:

As a consequence of the disastrous Midwest floods of 1993, the Administration has established an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee that will operate under the direction of the Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force chaired by myself; Katie McGinty, Director of the White House Office of Environmental Policy; and Jim Lyons, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This Committee will undertake an intensive review to determine the major causes and consequences of the 1993 floods; evaluate the performance of existing floodplain management and related watershed management programs; and, make recommendations as to what changes in current policies, programs, and activities would most effectively achieve risk reduction, economic efficiency, and environmental enhancement in the floodplain and related watersheds. As appropriate, the Committee will identify legislative initiatives that might be proposed by the Administration. The Committee will operate with a deadline of June 1, 1994, for its final report.

Because floodplain management involves a complex intergovernmental system of Federal, State, tribal, and local responsibilities, the Committee will conduct outreach to and consultation with all levels of government and the public. Its operations will be conducted in an open environment. Input from State governments will be especially critical.

The Committee includes a multi-disciplinary and interagency group of Federal experts in fields relevant to floodplain management. The Committee will be assisted by the staff of the Council of Economic Advisors, Council on Environmental Quality, Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Department of Justice. An element of the Committee, the Scientific Assessment and Strategy Team, is working in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, to gather and analyze data related to the flood and its impacts. (Sioux Falls is the site of the U.S. Geological Survey's Earth Resources Observation Systems Data Center.)

To ensure that the Review Committee maintains close contact with your office and that the views and experience of State and local agencies are available to the Committee, we would appreciate it if you would designate a point of contact for the Committee. The Executive Director of the Committee, BG Gerald E. Galloway, will be available to discuss any aspects of the study of interest to you.

We have enclosed a copy of the preliminary mission statement for the Committee, which was provided to you in early December through the National Governor's Association. Please provide any comments on the mission statement and the name of your point of contact to BG Galloway at 730 Jackson Place, NW, Washington, D.C. 20503, or through facsimile (202-395-3744) by January 20, 1994.

Sincerely,

Signed

T.J. Glauthier
Associate Director
Natural Resources,
Energy, and Science

Enclosure

Identical Letter Sent To:

Honorable Terry E. Branstad
Governor of Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0001

Honorable Evan Bayh III
Governor of Indiana
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Honorable Joan Finney
Governor of Kansas
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1590

Honorable Arne H. Carlson
Governor of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Honorable Mel Carnahan
Governor of Missouri
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Honorable Edward T. Schafer
Governor of North Dakota
Bismark, North Dakota 58505

Honorable Walter D. Miller
Governor of South Dakota
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Honorable Tommy G. Thompson
Governor of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53707

DRAFT

Honorable 1~2~
U.S. House of Representatives [OR UNITED STATES SENATE]
3~
4~

Dear Congressman [OR SENATOR]2~:

As a consequence of the disastrous Midwest floods of 1993, the Administration has established an Interagency Floodplain Management Review Committee that will operate under the direction of the Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force chaired by myself; Katie McGinty, Director of the White House Office of Environmental Policy; and Jim Lyons, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This Committee will undertake an intensive review to determine the major causes and consequences of the 1993 floods; evaluate the performance of existing floodplain management and related watershed management programs; and, make recommendations as to what changes in current policies, programs, and activities would most effectively achieve risk reduction, economic efficiency, and environmental enhancement in the floodplain and related watersheds. As appropriate, the Committee will identify legislative initiatives that might be proposed by the Administration. The Committee will operate with a deadline of June 1, 1994, for its final report.

Because floodplain management involves a complex intergovernmental system of Federal, State, tribal, and local responsibilities, the Committee will conduct outreach to and consultation with all levels of government and the public. Its operations will be conducted in an open environment.

The Committee will include a multi-disciplinary and interagency group of experts in fields relevant to floodplain management. The Committee will be assisted by the staff of the Council of Economic Advisors, Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Justice Department. An element of the committee, the Scientific Assessment and Strategy Team, is working in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, to gather and analyze data related to the flood and its impacts.

The Review Committee will maintain close liaison with your committee (OR FOR CONGRESSMAN< YOUR OFFICE). The Executive Director of the study will be available, at your convenience, to discuss any aspects of the study of interest to you.

We have enclosed a copy of the preliminary mission statement for the Committee. Because of the intense interest in this review, we have decided to leave it open to comment until January 20, 1994, and would appreciate any thoughts you might have. Questions should be addressed to BG G.E Galloway, Executive Director of the Committee, at 202-395-3706.

Sincerely,

T.J. Glauthier
Associate Director
Natural Resources,
Energy, and Science

Enclosure