

# CAPITOL-TO-CAPITOL

SACRAMENTO, CA WASHINGTON, D.C.

## FLOOD PROTECTION

**Team Leaders:** Eric Nagy, Larsen Wurzel & Associates, [eric@larsenwurzel.com](mailto:eric@larsenwurzel.com)  
Nicole Ortega-Jewell, MBK Engineers, [ortega-jewell@mbkengineers.com](mailto:ortega-jewell@mbkengineers.com)  
Scott Shapiro, Downey-Brand LLP, [sshapiro@downeybrand.com](mailto:sshapiro@downeybrand.com)

**Issue Experts:** Eric Nagy, Larsen Wurzel & Associates, [eric@larsenwurzel.com](mailto:eric@larsenwurzel.com)  
Nicole Ortega-Jewell, MBK Engineers, [ortega-jewell@mbkengineers.com](mailto:ortega-jewell@mbkengineers.com)  
Scott Shapiro, Downey-Brand LLP, [sshapiro@downeybrand.com](mailto:sshapiro@downeybrand.com)

---

## MODERNIZE FEMA'S NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

### Requested Action:

Include provisions in the reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) which ease those requirements of the NFIP that do not make sense when applied to agriculture:

- Allow umbrella policies where a farmer could bundle multiple low-value agricultural structures under a single policy; and
- Allow limited construction of new agricultural structures in a floodplain when elevation or floodproofing are not practicable.

Language addressing each of these issues was included in the bill that passed the House Financial Services Committee in the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress (H.R. 3167, sections 402 and 210).

### Business Nexus

The Capital Region also surrounded by agricultural lands that are protected by levee systems yet remains one of the most flood-prone in the nation. Agriculture is a huge economic driver for the country and essential from a national security perspective, but the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) interfere with the sustainability of this vital economic driver. Continued federal investment is needed to reduce flood risk.

# CAPITOL-TO-CAPITOL

SACRAMENTO, CA WASHINGTON, D.C.

Improvements to existing flood infrastructure and streamlined processes for local-led improvements are critical in reducing life safety risk, protecting tens of billions of dollars of existing infrastructure, and supporting economic growth. Changing FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program will be essential to mitigate risk, support California's agricultural industry, drive the economy, and provide food for the country.

## Background

In 1968, Congress established the NFIP. The NFIP has served the country well in reducing the risk of flooding through the implementation of essential floodplain management practices in exchange for federally backed flood insurance. The Sacramento Valley's levee system is a federal system administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). At the NFIP's inception, the Sacramento Valley levees were largely assumed to meet FEMA's base flood requirements, based on representations by USACE. In 2001, FEMA began the NFIP Map Modernization Program to digitally manage flood risk. As part of this process, most levees protecting rural communities in the Sacramento Valley were found to not meet FEMA's current engineering criteria for levees, and the lands behind them were mapped into the floodplain.

As FEMA updates Flood Insurance Rate Maps to show the new special flood hazard areas (SFHAs) behind previously accredited levees, sustainability of Sacramento Valley agriculture has become a major concern. There are two primary impacts when an agricultural area is mapped into an SFHA: land use requirements for elevating or floodproofing new and substantially improved structures; and a requirement to purchase a high-cost flood insurance policy for each structure that has a federally backed mortgage.

Application of the NFIP is significantly disadvantaging for farmers. Certain provisions of the NFIP, either original or from amendments, work well for suburban or urban communities, but are financially challenging for farmers, often removing the benefits of the program that would otherwise exist. Section 210 and 402 of H.R. 3167 came out of work done on H.R. 2170 (115th Congress and predecessor bills), in which local representatives worked with FEMA senior leadership and FEMA's drafting service. The result is sensible legislation that lifts the unfair burden on farmers while still allowing the successful implementation of the NFIP. Sections 210 and 402 of H.R. 3167 made two changes:

**Challenge #1:** The minimum flood insurance policy size and the statutory implementation of surcharges to reduce the NFIP debt are burying farmers. Congress required an annual \$250 surcharge for each commercial NFIP policy. But each ag structure requires a separate policy and a separate surcharge. Thus, farmers can easily have 10 structures, requiring \$2,500 in annual surcharges, before even paying for policies. Layered on top of that, many ag structures are worth less than the minimum available NFIP policy, and these structures are sometimes worth less than the minimum deductible,

# CAPITOL -TO- CAPITOL

SACRAMENTO, CA

WASHINGTON, D.C.

requiring farmers to pay for many policies for which they get no benefit.

- **Solution:** Section 402 of H.R. 3167 would have allowed bundling of structures under a single policy to allow farmers to use policies the way they were intended.

**Challenge #2:** The NFIP's prohibition on new or remodeled ag structures is preventing agricultural operations from adapting to the new economy. The NFIP sensibly precludes the construction of new structures in the floodplain, pushing people to build their homes in fully protected areas. But farming structures need to be where the farms are, which is often in the floodplain, and farmers need the ability to expand their operations to remain competitive in the global farming economy with remodeled or new facilities to support farming.

- **Solution:** Section 210 of H.R. 3167 would have allowed counties to grant variances for new or expanded facilities when it is impracticable to elevate or floodproof the structure.