[Question 6]

What legal protections exist for floodplain managers facing personal liability, retaliation, or professional risk for enforcing regulations?

Floodplain managers have several meaningful—but limited and jurisdiction-dependent—legal protections when enforcing regulations:

- **Governmental and sovereign immunity.** A local government is generally immune when acting in a governmental capacity to protect public health, safety, and welfare. Regulatory floodplain enforcement commonly fits that public function, though immunity can vary by state and may not cover proprietary activities. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.4.a., Governmental vs. Proprietary Actions.]

- **Discretionary-function protection.** High-level policy, planning, and discretionary decisions are more likely to be immune from tort liability. By contrast, ministerial or operational actions may be subject to liability. This distinction is fact-specific and often unclear, so documented adherence to governing regulations and procedures is important. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.4.b., Discretionary versus Ministerial Actions; III.D.7, Summary.]

- **Public-duty doctrine in some states.** Where adopted, this doctrine can bar negligence claims based on a manager's duty to the public at large, because no individual duty is owed to a particular claimant. It does not protect against breach of a ministerial duty owed to someone with a direct, distinctive, and special interest. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.5., Public Duty Doctrine.]

- **Qualified immunity for constitutional claims.** Federal, state, and local officials may invoke qualified immunity in constitutional-rights cases. It shields officials from civil damages when their actions did not violate a clearly established statutory or constitutional right that a reasonable person would have known. Successful qualified immunity may end the lawsuit before discovery. Absolute immunity exists only for narrow categories, such as judges, prosecutors, legislators, and certain high executive officials—not ordinarily floodplain managers. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.1.b., Absolute and Qualified Immunity.]

- **Federal employees acting within their scope of employment.** Under the Federal Tort Claims Act, when a federal employee commits a tort within the scope of employment, the United States ordinarily becomes the defendant and pays any

damages rather than the employee. This protection is specific to federal employees and subject to statutory limits and exceptions. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.1.b., Absolute and Qualified Immunity.]

These protections are not complete shields from personal exposure. State officials may be personally liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for constitutional violations because vicarious liability does not apply to those claims. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.2.a., State Sovereign Immunity.]

Retaliation and professional risk, and specific whistleblower or anti-retaliation protection for floodplain managers who enforce regulations is beyond the land use focus of these narratives. State or community employees may use § 1983 to assert civil-rights claims, but these narratives are based on the NAI Legal Guide that does not analyze retaliation claims or provide employment-law safeguards. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, III.D.2.a., State Sovereign Immunity.]

Summary. The principal protections are immunity doctrines and scope-of-employment protections—not a standalone guarantee against employer retaliation or career consequences.

DRAFT