

# DC Flood Task Force Meeting Minutes



**DC Flood Task Force  
Meeting Minutes  
July 20, 2022  
Virtual WebEx Meeting  
2:00PM-4:00PM**

Meeting began at 2:05 pm with the following members, agencies, and support staff in attendance.

**Attending Voting Members and Support Staff**

**Deputy Mayor for Operations and Infrastructure (DMOI)**

1. Alan Propp (DMOI)

**District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water)**

1. David Gadis
2. Salil Kharkar
3. Apera Nwora
4. Barbara Mitchell
5. Adam Baron
6. Edward Waters

**District of Columbia Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE)**

1. Tommy Wells
2. Nicholas Bonard
3. Meredith Upchurch
4. Benite Lily Cheng
5. Andrea Limauro

**District of Columbia Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (HSEMA)**

1. Melissa Deas
2. Vermechia Alsop
3. Andrew Worrell
4. Anne Graf

**District Department of Transportation (DDOT)**

1. Ravina D. Ganvir

**District of Columbia Office of Planning (OP)**

1. Stephen Gyor

**District of Columbia Department of Insurance, Securities, and Banking (DISB)**

1. Philip Barlow
2. Philip Edmonds
3. Sharon Shipp
4. Angela King

**District of Columbia Office of Risk Management (ORM)**

1. Jedd Ross
2. Allison Pauly
3. Robert Preston
4. Jane Waters

**Department of General Services (DGS)**

1. Matt Floc

**Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**

1. Brent Sisco

**Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)**

1. Richard Livingstone

**Department of Public Works**

1. Timothy Spriggs (DPW)

**District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA)**

1. Christopher Bailey

**Attending Consulting Members and Support Staff**

**Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG)**

1. Steve Bieber

**Commission on Climate Change and Resiliency (CCCR)**

1. Uwe Brandes
2. Sandra Knight

**District of Columbia Building Industry Association (DCBIA)**

1. Cellerino Bernadino

**Federal Emergency Management Agency Region III (FEMA RIII)**

1. Hailey Stern
2. Siani Vargas

**Washington Gas**

1. Manuel Geraldo

**Facilitation Team - Monash Advisory Group**

- |                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Monte Monash   | 3. Rachel Kendrick  |
| 2. Adria Anderson | 4. Dylan Ross       |
|                   | 5. Kimberly Manning |

**Other Attendees**

- |                        |                  |                   |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Alex Cross          | 5. Noah Carter   | 8. Kenya Troutman |
| 2. Erin Garnaas-Holmes | 6. Imania Price  | 9. Sarah Edwards  |
| 3. Frank Mitchell      | 7. James Pittman |                   |
| 4. Gerald Robinson     |                  |                   |

There were 3 call-in participants that were unidentified.

## 2: 05 pm | Welcome and Opening Remarks

Monte Monash opened the meeting at 2:05 PM. She presented that this is the full Task Force meeting for July 2022. It was stated that the Task Force would be voting on a set of action plan items. Monte Monash stated that there will be a recap, opening remarks, a presentation of the consent agenda action plan for votes, a discussion about the next batch of action plans (taking place in two months), an update on district insurance options, and an update on a proposed schedule. The meeting will end with next steps and a close out.

Monte Monash stated that the Flood Task Force was established by the city administrator in 2021. It was stated that this is the fifth meeting of 2022. Ms. Monash stated that the Task Force meets every other month on the third Wednesday of the month, and that the next meeting will be on Wednesday, September 21, 2022.

At 2:09 Monte Monash presented David Gadis to offer opening remarks.

David Gadis is the CEO and general manager of DC water. David Gadis stated that 10 months ago DC water and DOEE launched the Flood Task Force. He discussed that there are 14 different agencies represented on the Task Force and that they have made it to a critical milestone in this initiative; developing projects and initiatives that inform the public about flood readiness and aid in protecting communities in the economy from the damage of floods. David Gadis discussed that flooding is a multiagency task that requires partnership. He then stated that the work that is being done by the Task Force as well as the recommendations there from, will be an example to other cities across the nation.

At 2:13PM DOEE Director, Tommy Wells reiterated that there is a responsibility that is shared regarding flooding. Mr. Wells shared his appreciation for all the groups involved, as this level of resiliency takes many groups. He stated that as our climate changes we must be able to deal with it [climate devastation, flooding].

[The Flood Task Force consists of 13 District of Columbia voting members and 16 Consulting Members (Federal + Public Partners). The proceedings are available to the public at [DCFloodTaskForce.Org](https://dcfloodtaskforce.org)]

## 2: 15 pm | Consent Agenda Action Plan Vote

Barbara Mitchell from the Department of Government and Legal Affairs of DC Water led the Task Force in this agenda item. Ms. Mitchell facilitated the vote of the first task force vote. Barbara Mitchell established the quorum, and the consent agenda. Barbara Mitchell asked Monte Monash at 2:15PM if they had a quorum. Monte Monash stated that there were all, but two agencies present and that they may be calling in by phone. Ms. Mitchell stated that the consent agenda enables members to vote on a group of items without a discussion. She stated that directors or other members will be able to vote “no” or “yes” or “abstain” (disapprove; approve; abstain- within the WebEx chat feature). Barbara Mitchell stated that they had the consent agenda before them as recommended by the various action teams. It consisted of:

- 3.1 Develop Program to Floodproof homes and Provide Resilience Upgrades
- 6.1 Update DOEE Floodplain Regulations
- ~~6.3 Pass DC B24-0410 “Flood Resilience Act” enabling to Action 6.1~~
- 7.3 Use results of 2020 USACE modeling to update Watts Branch FEMA Maps

- 7.4 Use results of 2019 USACE modeling to update Oxon Run FEMA maps
- 8.4 Conduct Yearly Interagency Outreach

Barbara Mitchell stated that action plan 6.3 had been completed because if it was already enacted by the counsel.

Barbara Mitchell asked if there were any objections to the consent agenda or specifically if any members would like to remove an item from the consent agenda and place it on the regular agenda for individual discussion.

At 2:18PM all members present said no.

Barbara Mitchell stated that in hearing no objections to the consent agenda that they would vote on the consent agenda. She stated that members experiencing technical difficulty could place their vote verbally.

At 2:21PM Monte Monash stated that there were no objections to the consent agenda action plans via the WebEx chat. She stated that the consent agenda action plans were approved unanimously by voting members. [Below is the voting results from the WebEx chat and verbal confirmations]

1. DMOI - Alan Prop = Yes
2. DCW - David Gadis = Yes (provided verbal response stated during his opening remarks to the task force; prior to voting)
3. DOEE - Tommy Wells = Yes
4. HSEMA - Melissa Deas = Yes
5. DDOT - Ravi Ganvir = No response (attended but did not vote)
6. OP - Stephen Gyor = Yes
7. DISB - Philip Barlow = Yes
8. ORM - Robert Preston = Yes
9. DGS - Matt Flocia = Yes
10. DPR - Brent Sisco = Yes
11. DHCD - Richard Livingstone = Yes (vote provided via WebEx chat after voting closed)
12. DPW - Tommy Spriggs = Yes
13. Chris Bailey = Yes

At 2:21PM the voting section of the agenda was concluded.

## 2:22 pm | Presentation of Next Batch of Action Plans

Salil Kharkar of DC Water began to presentations the new batch of action plans with Action Plan 4.1.

### Action Plan 4.1 Expand Backwater Valve Program

- Salil Kharkar stated that after the 2020 storm that there were several homes that could be flooded, and that there were homes constructed back in 2003 without backwater valves and that this program would help to decide, based on equity, how to prioritize the distribution of valves.

- Salil Kharkar stated that [they] applied for funding and that if it does not come through FEMA, they have other options. Mr. Kharkar stated that yesterday [July 19, 2022] they presented to FEMA.
- Phase 1 of 4.1 is to develop a list of homes that fall into the appropriate category and equity factors to prioritize this list. He then stated that when the funding started to come in, that they would install the backwater valves. Mr. Kharkar then discussed factors that helped to determine equity.
- After Phase 1 is complete they will move to Phase 2, which would be the actual installation of the valves. He then reiterated that Phase 1 was a documentation of homes and Phase 2 was the actual installation.
- Total time to complete this is around 36 months.
- Current estimate and request from FEMA was \$3 million over 36 months, beginning in January of 2023. He stated that there would be an outreach program once they knew if the funding was in place. Mr. Kharkar also stated that the requests that came in after the September 2020 floods that may have not been approved for back water valves, would be included in this project.

There were no questions received on this Action Plan.

#### **Action Plan 4.3 Require Backwater Valve Installation**

- Mr. Kharkar stated that in 2003 it was said that if there was plumbing above the street, that there was a requirement of sump pumps. He said this was the 1999 adoption of the 1995 IPC by DC. The 2003 adoption of the 2000 IPC by DC required installation of BWV per IPC.
- The implementation process, the difference in DC is that there are additional specifications beyond what is in the IPC, which he stated was a good addition by DCRA, making it easier for homeowners.
- From an equity perspective, this would benefit all DC residents. He stated that there is no more budget issue and that it follows the DC code update cycle (so that it is addressed in the DCRA process).
- Christopher Bailey said that this was going through review and open comment. He stated that there will be another [comment and review] in September of this year. He stated that they are going to make sure that these previous additions to the code keep moving forward. Mr. Bailey stated that this is something that is special in the district as it allows them to go forward with the [review] cycle and protect residents since 1999.
- Nicholas Bonard then expanded on the clarification stating that backwater valves going through the process now will have the qualifications that they want.
- Christopher Bailey then stated that there are two other supplemental codes for any project that increases the occupancy of a building or the additional use requirement for a connection to the city and utilities. He said that this would trigger the installation of backwater valves as well. He said any maintenance code, be it a sanitary line or a city sewer, would trigger this requirement as well. He stated that this goes back to the IPC (international plumbing code). Mr. Bailey said that this would allow the regulation that was just shown to be enacted.
- Nicholas Bonard then stated that they would hear about new plans and that these plans will be voted on officially in September 2022. He said that this is a chance to ask questions, hear about

them, and get a high-level overview.

No questions were received on this Action Plan.

### **Action Plan 5.1 Develop List of Capital Projects**

- Present by Alan Propp of DMOI, Mr. Propp stated that the goal was to develop a comprehensive list of capital projects that are directly or almost directly related to flood resilience across agencies.
- There has not been a process up until now to pull together a comprehensive list of resilience mediums, and capital skill projects; the flood task force is a good opportunity to pull this list together and get an opportunity of what the scale is of the projects that they are trying to accomplish.
- This includes the potential funding sources and how much it will cost over the next roughly 8 years. He stated that over the past few months they have been pulling a list together of current and future proposed projects and have tried to assign them a rough cost and timeline [meaning the earliest that construction could start], as well as understand agencies and organizations that would take these projects on.
- He then clarified what this action was not. Mr. Propp stated that they are not yet going to do a full prioritization of what the most important projects were because it would take more time.
- They wanted to establish criteria and a process for annually (or less than annually) going through the projects, updating, and reprioritizing; this has not yet been done.
- He also stated that they have done a lot of work to understand the world of funding sources but that they are not yet matching funding source to project and that this would be a sub sequential portion of this action.
- Alan Propp then presented a sample project list. He said that it is a lot longer than the one presented on the slideshow. The sample project list was laid out by infrastructure project, lead agency, earliest construction start, cost estimate, and funding source.
- The goal of the cost estimate and funding source is to get an idea of what the scope is of money that they are dealing with needing over the next 8 to 10 years, to create enough capital projects to consider themselves flood resilient.
- This project is big on equity. He stated that a lot of these projects are prioritizing resilience in vulnerable communities in the 100 and 500-year flood plain and that prioritizing projects beyond this will ensure that large dollar amounts come to the projects that have the most impact on vulnerable communities and protecting them.
- He stated that the budget at an early estimate is \$525 million-\$820 million, which may be low because some of the capital projects do not have a dollar amount assigned to them.
- The timeline ranges from upcoming projects, to already occurring, all the way to projects that will not occur any sooner than 2030.
- Public input was gathered through reaching out to agencies and organizations. He stated that this list is not fully complete; there may need to be additions of capital projects that are currently being done. He then posed a question about if there were any capital projects that were being worked on that were not on this list or if the projects listed seemed accurate, if the timeline seemed aggressive, if the money bucket was small, and that all comments were welcome because the goal of the list is to use it as a foundation for every year going forward.

- Meredith Upchurch added that for this particular action plan it is a list of projects, and basic elements for the projects. She stated that when they vote to approve this plan, that they are not necessarily approving to endorse all of these projects, because there is still work to do. She said though that part of the action plan was to develop criteria and understand how they prioritize the projects and that this is a beginning, but it is not fully developed. She said that this will be a big next step for the action plan.

Phillip Barlow asked about when they do these projects in the 100- and 500-year flood plain, if they are going to change what is considered 100- and 500-year flood plans or if it will just reduce the potential impact of damage.

Alan Propp stated that he thinks this is a great question but does not have the answer right now. He stated that it is beyond the scope of this action at this time.

Nicholas Bonard stated that this question gets into how they are deciding to prioritize. He stated that they know there is higher risk for 100- and 500-year, but it is hard to quantify the risk outside of these areas and that they want to recognize that in certain districts there is value for infrastructure in areas that are not in the flooding zone but are possibly susceptible to rainfall and that it is something they should think about.

Cellerino Bernardino asked if the areas in DC that see the grid is flooding if they are within a 500-year flood plain or outside of it.

Meredith Upchurch added that different projects are going to have different items that they are trying to achieve and commented that on the funding that they know these projects have huge price tags and they're looking to other action plans that they will discuss in the meeting in September.

Director Tommy Wells asked how many of these projects are on schedule to be included in the bipartisan infrastructure law.

Alan Propp stated that he does not know the answer to this off hand, but he will look through the list again and look at it with that filter in mind.

Meredith Upchurch said some of them have already been through application processes and are in the works.

Nicholas Bonard ballparked 20 to 50%. He stated that this list is a mix of things that they have well understood. He said that this is a kind of design or project that would not be ready to be in the infrastructure bill.

Alan Propp wrapped up saying that he knows there will be more developments and questions about this action plan so to take a close look when this goes out because it is a long list, but it is very important that they get it right.

#### **Action Plan 6.2 Update Construction Codes to I-codes**

- Presented by Christopher Bailey of DCRA
- Codes keep changing and innovations and issues are always in motion and that the codes must adapt and be changed to meet them.
- He stated that the CCC (construction code coordination) board is a board staffed by the DCRA and other agencies as well as the public to amend, modify, and adopt certain codes. He stated that in doing so the international construction codes are modified and that municipal regulations are what they go by to do reviews.
- They are updating to the new 2021 cycle of the construction codes and that these construction codes are being modified and will be adopted hopefully in the next year so that they will be somewhat on the same timeline as they come out in real time. In doing so, the updates will include the previous provisions that were carried forward so they can maintain the same level of protection.

No questions were received on this Action Plan.

#### **Action Plan 6.8 Amend Property Rules to Include Backwater Valves**

- It was stated that they can amend the residential real property seller proposal and include language that will protect individuals.
- Once the document is approved it will be signed. This does not take council action, but the Office of the Mayor and the Attorney General will need to weigh in.
- Mr. Bailey hopes that once they move down this road it will find its way into the DC official code and into record.
- This change updates the form for any seller of a property to identify if there is any actual knowledge or built-in protection for that property during the sale so that the buyer will then know that there is either a need for flood insurance or some sort of flood protection for the home [if there is a flood].
- This change will take some time but that they hope to move through this process.

There were no additional questions regarding the above items.

#### **Action Plan 8.1 Update DC Silver Jackets MOU**

- Alan Propp stated that it was last signed in 2014.
- The Silver Jackets are an inter-agency group that works on flood resilience long-term in the district. It consists of federal agencies, local agencies, academia, and more that meet on a regular basis.
- The goal of this action is to update the MOU to reflect the new agencies that have taken on flood work, as well as to expand to agencies that will be working on flood resilience in the district going forward.
- The goal is also to amend some of the agencies that signed on that are no longer needed. He then presented a brief overview of the agencies that will be added to the MOU (on presentation slides). He stated that this is a fairly straightforward action, it is just a matter of administrative time to get it done, but it will be important to make sure that they have broad coverage for the Silver Jackets geographically and for agency representation.

- Nicholas Bonard stated that they may want to use the Silver Jackets to help prioritize what the projects are because that can be a sort of continuation of the task force.
- Salil Kharkar asked if the Silver Jackets worked on areas where there was no federal interest. Alan Propp said yes.
- Nicolas Bonard said that they like to have federal partners there because sometimes they discuss projects they are working on that can impact the district. He said that in addition to working on federal land that they often support DOEE and in general have great knowledge about the region.

### **Action Plan 9.3 Install Flashing Warning Signs**

- Presented by Anne Graf for HSEMA
- The inclusion of flood sensors in this action plan is due to the following of the September flooding as there was a need identified multiple times as well as for refining procurement and installation of flashing signs.
- This project has garnered a lot of interest prompting the launch of a working group with key district partners as this project cannot be done by one agency alone. The key partners can be found on section 1 of the action plan.
- Objective to establishing this working group is that they will identify additional locations and that the equity in those most impacted places are prioritized.
- Identifying funding opportunities will occur as they become available to implement.
- Another objective of the working group is to identify locations and other similar equipment that has been installed to present a duplication of efforts given and that this is an action identified by the task force. She said that they will need to coordinate with the owners of 7.1 to make sure that duplication is avoided. She said the efforts of sensors and signs will inform other action items targeted by the Flood Task Force.
- Section 9.1 is regarding the establishment of early warning systems, 9.2 is updating and establishing procedures, and 5.1 is to develop a list of capital projects. She stated that for the equipment based on their prior research they would be able to provide two different appointments based on location needs. The first would be sensors at target water levels which function as switch triggering LED warning lights to warn commuters in real time. She said that these sensors ideally will send alerts through DC and hold water measurements for data acquisition.
- The second equipment which could be installed in flood prone locations near bodies of water and ideally would report on water levels and the sensors would automatically send warnings in real time to DC residents and district responsive agencies that flooding has occurred in a particular area. She then discussed the implementation.
- Ms. Graf stated that this project needs equity initiatives and that locations would be prioritized based on areas that had been severely impacted by flooding as well as other equity considerations as well when funding is made available to install the equipment.
- It was stated that they would work with a contractor to perform market research as well as procurement and installation of the equipment. She said that at this time the equipment vendor has not been identified but that the DDOT contractor was able to provide a cost estimate for procurement and installation which is roughly \$1.5 million.
- This budget will probably increase as additional locations are identified.

- HSEMA was able to identify a funding opportunity where they're able to allocate roughly \$400-\$500,000 to this opportunity through a federal share which would allow them to add four or five new locations. She said that they are currently applying for this funding.
- The goal is to begin early installation in 2023.
- Regarding the public, she stated that they will be utilizing an already established process to establish or gain input.
- In summary they are submitting to FEMA, they will be hosting a kickoff meeting with the working group in September to achieve the above objectives (including finalizing four or five locations to be this projects proof of concept) and establish for future opportunities.

Salil Kharkar asked if this would qualify for infrastructure funds.

Anne Graf said they have not applied for infrastructure funds and that they still have not identified the specific equipment and the vendor that would supply the equipment.

Vermecia Alsop stated that essentially, they are leveraging their federal partners at FEMA for the funding because it is not connected to the infrastructure funding.

### 3:06 pm | Updates on District Insurance Options

Philip Barlow of DISB stated that they have been working hard on insurance related options and that they drafted four flood resiliency related proposals and have been discussing them with the residential resiliency action team. He stated that they have gotten a lot of good feedback that they are incorporating into the plans and that they got additional feedback on the last call that they will begin incorporating. He said that they are planning to present at the next task force meeting. He then briefly discussed the four main proposals.

He said that the first proposal is a water damage remediation and grant assistance program for low-income residents. He stated that this is a program designed to get money to low-income district residents that are impacted by flood, and to get money to them quickly. He said that it is patterned on some programs in other locations such as Rockville, Maryland.

The second proposal is a remediation assistance program for low-income residents. It is a grant program insurance program. He stated that for this one they took some of the feedback and revised it into the highest deductible for low-income residents. He said it would allow them if they were to purchase NFIP policy to reduce their policy by selecting the highest deductible. He stated that this is a program that is designed to get money to low-income residents quickly after a flood so that they can do a remediation. He stated that they are continuing to get feedback and will be continuing to adjust as they go forward. He said that at some point they will have to decide whether they want to settle or move forward with both programs to see which one makes the most sense, but that for the time being they will continue to work on both of them even though they are both targeted at the same goal.

The next proposal he discussed was a water intrusion mitigation credit/premium discount program. He said that this is for a homeowner policy. The water intrusion mitigation credit/premium discount program would require homeowners and renters' insurance to offer discounts to policyholders who did some risk mitigation or who lived in homes that had risk mitigation items in them such as the back water flow valves or water sensors. He said that this one would require homeowners and renters' insurance to

offer discounts to policies to homeowners. He said that this would make it mandatory for them to use discounts. He said that this is not specifically targeted to low-income residents but that this would be available to any resident in the district who purchased a homeowner or renters' policy.

The fourth proposal titled "A Requirement to Make Available Enhanced Water Damage Coverage" stated that there are typically some optional coverages that homeowners and renters can get on their policy to provide additional protection for water damage. He said that sometimes they suspect that some homeowners may not be aware of these things and that they may be afraid of the cost. Mr. Barlow stated that what this would do is require insurers offering homeowners' insurance or renters insurance policies in the district that if they don't already include any of the specified enhancements, they would have to offer them as additional coverage and identify the additional cost. He said that they may want to go for an opt out decision instead given that this adds to the cost of the coverage they currently are opting to leave it as an opt in, but that they will monitor this and see what the uptake is if it doesn't seem like many people are opting and that they might want to revisit this. He then stated that they're discussing some other insurance related items that they may want to consider addressing but that they are further down the line in terms of development.

Director Tommy Wells asked how much of these mimics any other city's jurisdiction that are in a similar situation. Philip Barlow stated that they have looked at other programs that are doing similar things mostly on the two remediation programs, and that he is not aware of many. He said that they have gotten some information about programs such as the grant program as they did some research and based it on a couple of programs, one being in New York State and the other being in Maryland. He said that these programs offered a grant program and the other a remediation program and that they have learned about some of the things that are being done. They have some people who've attended the residential resilience task force meeting from the Wharton school who are very knowledgeable about the fact and told them about what is being done in other states.

Mr. Bailey said that they look to their expertise to help shape these programs but that they are looking to see what else has been done as they design for the district.

Tommy Wells asked if any programs have triggered the anti-deficiency act. It was stated that if it triggers an anti-deficiency act it will knock the option out, so he was wondering if it knocked the option out. Philip Barlow said that they have tried to structure the program where the cost of them (although admittedly work) will need to be done to determine the cost, and that they have tried to think about things that make the costs more fixed and determinable. He said that he thinks it is something that will hopefully become something they can reasonably budget for to prevent issues. But he says they have not specifically tried to address this.

### **3:21 pm | Update on Proposed Schedule**

Nicholas Bernard took a question about the flashing lights program. It was stated that it seems like what they are trying to do is prove a concept, but they are curious in knowing if the roads that are under federal control such as canal and some of the roads on the mall, if they at some point will be wrapped into this 9.3 action plan. It was stated that they are going to always consider alternative locations when it comes to flooding and that this is something they can consider as they look at their ongoing list. Nicholas Bernard presented a follow up regarding the national mall and said that he thinks these roads are DDOT and he wonders if what they need to think about is if these signs need to be on dealer

property or if this is a restriction. Vermechia Alsop said yes; for the pilot this would need to be in the routes authority. They will think through this as a working group.

Nicholas Bernard at 3:24 PM stated that since they last spoke, they shifted how they are going to do the approvals of the action plans. He referenced the approval cycle of one action plan. He said that the approval cycle spans three or four task force meetings, so it does take time to present an approved one. For example, the plans that were approved today were presented in a previous Task Force meeting, that today they were initially voted on, and the next step is that for the plans they voted yes on they will all become open to the public so that the public can comment on them for a month. After the month, they will take two weeks to make any updates and two weeks for the task force to review any changes. He stated that the intent is that the third meeting will be the final approval of the action plans. He stated that he understands it is a lot of voting for an action plan but that they must do it to make sure they have agency comment as well as public comment to give the task force one more chance to approve it. He stated that they will be doing action plans in three batches. He said that they may need to extend the task force to January 2023 to make this possible.

Tommy Wells brought up the fact that timing may be an issue with the budget season for FY24.

Meredith Upchurch responded to Tommy Wells saying they can do this. She said that they will have drafts of all the action plans by the end of September or the middle of October. She stated that they will have lots of recommendations, plans, and budget proposals ready to go and be submitted through the FY24 budget proposal. She stated that they will be making their way through reviews and notes, but they will have all the ideas done by September or October.

### 3:30 pm | Next Steps Closeout

Nick Bernard stated that either tomorrow July 21 or Friday, July 23 that they will email out links to all of the action plans that were discussed today. He stated that this will give agencies the first chance to comment on them and give feedback. He said that they also sent out the five action plans that they voted on today and made them public on the website and notified any stakeholders that prioritize in the listening sessions as well as groups that are interested in the task force in general.

He said that there are two parallel processes- one being telling the public that they approved, and to give everyone on this call and the agencies a chance to review what was presented today. He also gave a heads up that in September they will be presenting the last batch of action plans. He then stated that the next upcoming task force meetings will be the next full task force meeting which will be September 21, 2022 from 2 PM to 4 PM.

He presented that to the task force they can discuss how to bundle plans so that agencies can become aware of how they may need to work these into their budgets.

**The meeting ENDED at 3:33 pm.**

#### **Additional Materials**

A copy of the staff presentation used during the meeting and the meeting recording can be accessed at [dcfloodtaskforce.org](http://dcfloodtaskforce.org).

VOTING: From WebEx Chat Transcript

VOTE 1

from Philip Edmonds to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**Yes.**

from Melissa Deas to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**HSEMA - Yes**

from Manuel Geraldo to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**Yes**

from Alan Propp to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**Yes (DMOI)**

from Uwe Brandes to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**yes**

from Stephen Gyor to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**OP - yes**

from Tommy Wells to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**yea**

from brent sisco to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**DPR - yes**

from Matt Floca (DGS) to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**DGS - Yes**

from Christopher Bailey to Everyone: 2:19 PM

**DCRA- Yes**

from Robert Preston to Everyone: 2:20 PM

**ORM: Yes**

from Sandra Knight to Everyone: 2:20 PM

**DCCCR (yes - if uwe isn't on)**

from Uwe Brandes to Everyone: 2:21 PM

**Just confirming Sandra's vote: yes from DC-CCCR**

from Richard Livingstone to All Attendees: 2:45 PM

DHCD: 8.4 - yes; 6.1 - yes; 7.3 - yes; 7.4 - Yes; 8.4- yes.

from brent sisco to Everyone: 3:17 PM

Yes, thanks for the great info!

from Jed Ross to All Attendees: 3:17 PM

Appreciate the efforts from DISB and All