[Question 5]

What liability exists when floodplain managers rely on sealed engineering studies, elevation certificates, or FEMA approved analyses that later prove inadequate?

An engineer's seal, elevation certificate, or FEMA-approved analysis is not an automatic shield from liability. The answer is jurisdiction-dependent: liability turns on the government's own legal duty and conduct, causation, resulting damage, and available immunities—not merely on whether the manager relied on a professional or federally approved document. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.A.1., Elements of Negligence; II.E.2.e., Liability for Problems Due to Permitting.]

For the local government or floodplain manager, many jurisdictions do not impose negligence liability merely because staff reviewed an engineer's certification and issued a permit. In *Richardson*, where county review for code compliance did not make the county responsible for redoing the private engineer's work, the licensed private engineer was the more appropriate defendant when the system later failed. This reasoning strongly supports reliance on a sealed engineering study or elevation certificate when the manager follows the prescribed permitting process and has no independent duty to detect the defect. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, II.E.2.e., "Liability for Problems Due to Permitting.]

That protection is not universal to all states. Some courts find a duty to use reasonable care in reviewing development plans, and inadequate permit review or inspection can support negligence liability—especially where a "special relationship" exists between the government and the injured owner. A community may also face tort or takings claims if it authorizes development that foreseeably causes increased flooding or other damage; compliance with the permit process is generally not a defense against a takings claim. Whether a permit decision is protected as discretionary or, instead, treated as a ministerial application of required facts and rules, is another jurisdiction-specific question. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, II.E.2.e., Liability for Problems Due to Permitting; III.A., Negligence.]

A sealed study does not make the engineer strictly liable merely because the analysis later proves inadequate. Rather, engineers and architects are generally held to the profession's reasonable-care standard in negligence, contract, or implied-warranty actions. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.1., Federal Sovereign Immunity.] Engineer's liability ordinarily requires proof that the professional failed to meet the applicable professional standard, and that the deficiency caused actual loss. Industry custom is evidence of due care,

not conclusive proof; expert evidence may show that customary practice itself was inadequate. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.A.1.a., Duty of Care.]

FEMA approval similarly does not necessarily transfer or eliminate responsibility for a local permitting decision. Claims over FEMA mapping and flood-risk information can be barred by sovereign-immunity and related federal-law protections. But that does not prevent a claimant from pursuing a local government, developer, or private engineer if that party's own action or omission caused the harm. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.1., Federal Sovereign Immunity.]

Summary. Good-faith reliance on a properly prepared, sealed, or FEMA-approved document is important evidence against negligence, and in many jurisdictions it may defeat a claim based solely on plan review. It is not categorical immunity. Exposure remains where the manager or government

- had and breached an independent duty,
- negligently reviewed or enforced requirements,
- affirmatively caused or foreseeably worsened flooding, or
- failed to perform a mandatory ministerial duty.

A plaintiff must still prove duty, breach, causation, and damages, and sovereign or governmental immunity and the public-duty doctrine may bar some claims. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.A.1., Elements of Negligence; III.D.4.b., Discretionary versus Ministerial Actions; III.D.5., Public Duty Doctrine.]

DRAFT