

| | Public Safety Increase? | Cost of Damages Decrease? | Municipal Burden Reduced? | Natural Resource Improved? | Comments |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| S.213 - River Corridor and Floodplain section | | | | | |
| Expansion of FHARC for state permit authority in mapped river corridor | Yes, HIGH | Yes, HIGH | Yes, HIGH | Yes, HIGH | as unanimously supported by VT Climate Council in 2021 Climate Action Plan |
| Expansion of FHARC for state permit authority in floodplain | Yes, LOW | Yes, MED | Yes, HIGH | Yes, LOW | recognizing FTE suggestions by Agency and time needed to coordinate with FEMA, support phasing in |
| Mapping process includes ACCD, RPCs | N/A | N/A | Yes, MED | N/A | |
| ANR Proposed Changes to S.213 | | | | | |
| Mapping process does not include ACCD, RPCs | N/A | N/A | No; potentially exacerbated | N/A | without RPC and ACCD input, municipal "voice" isn't part of the process and will likely have negative impacts during mapping rollout, as occurred in the past |
| When Act 250 triggered in RC, DEC gets permit authority | No | No | No | No | does not improve/expand protection; however, reduces Agency-District back-and-forth, an efficiency gained |
| State Flood Hazard Area (floodplain) Standard | No* | No* | No; potentially exacerbated | No* | relies on municipal enforcement; even then impact negligible |
| "Encourage flood resilient communities" section | No | No | No, exacerbated | No | These "shoulds" fall on municipalities. <i>There is no incentive, no support, no impact.</i> |
| <i>Altogether does not address fluvial erosion (river corridor flooding) in any meaningful way. There is no expanded jurisdiction nor regulation of Vermont's #1 natural hazard area, where 80% of flood damages occur and where potential for loss of life and property is greatest.</i> | | | | | |