[Question 8]

What legal risks arise from floodplain map revisions, new floodway delineations, or updated flood studies that affect previously approved development?

Updated flood data can create risk both for the approving government and for the affected developer. The consequences are fact- and jurisdiction-specific; a prior approval is important, but it is not necessarily a permanent right to develop or rebuild under superseded flood-hazard assumptions.

- **Regulatory- or temporary-takings claims.** If a revision, new floodway, or study leads the government to bar, materially restrict, or suspend previously approved development, the owner may assert that the restriction is a compensable taking. The principal test weighs economic impact, interference with reasonable investment-backed expectations, and the character of the government action. A temporary restriction can also require compensation if it is ultimately found to be a taking. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, IV.B.5., Most Regulatory Takings: Penn Central Analysis, and IV.B.6., Temporary Takings.]

- **Due-process and vested-rights challenges.** A change that defeats an owner's previously lawful, substantially advanced project may invite a claim that the government acted arbitrarily or impaired a vested right—particularly absent a demonstrated health-and-safety rationale. Targeted actions affecting identifiable owners also may require notice and a meaningful opportunity to present evidence. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, IV.A., Fourteenth Amendment; II.E.1., State Police Powers.]

- **Nonconforming-development and rebuilding disputes.** Once a revised delineation makes existing development nonconforming, later repair, substantial improvement, or post-disaster reconstruction may have to meet current requirements; in some circumstances, rebuilding may be prohibited. The guide's Oswalt discussion shows the risk to government of applying a 50-percent-damage rule without the ordinance-required determination and reliable supporting evidence: the resulting condemnation was held compensable. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, II.E.2.d, "Rebuilding Limitations and Amortization of Non-conforming Uses.

- **Liability for allowing development to proceed despite the new risk information.** If officials honor or issue approvals after updated information indicates that a project will increase flooding on other property, neighbors may sue the permitting authority in

negligence, nuisance, inverse-condemnation, or takings theories. Courts differ on when permit approval creates liability, but following the permitting process is generally not a defense to a takings claim. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, II.E.2.e., Liability for Problems Due to Permitting.]

- **Floodway-specific restrictions are defensible, but not cost-free to administer.** Development in a regulatory floodway generally may not increase flood levels. In *Columbia Venture*, a court rejected a taking claim over restrictions that frustrated planned development, stressing the owner's awareness of preliminary FEMA maps and the public-safety purpose of floodway regulation. That decision illustrates that an updated map does not itself establish liability; documented risk, broadly applicable rules, and a genuine flood-protection purpose materially strengthen the government's position. [See e.g., https://no.floods.org/NAI-Legal, IV.B.5.b., Reasonable Investment-Backed Expectations, (discussing *Columbia Venture, LLC v. Richland County*); IV.B.5.d., Facets of 'Character of the Governmental Action.']

Summary. The central legal exposure is not the map revision itself, but how the government applies it to existing approvals: arbitrary or procedurally deficient reversal can generate due-process or takings exposure, while allowing harmful development to proceed can generate flood-damage liability. Clear transition rules, reliable technical findings, and individualized determinations required by the governing ordinance reduce both risks.

DRAFT