

Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Hybrid Meeting
September 23, 2021
1:00 PM to 3:30 PM
North Central Texas Council of Governments
Regional Forum Room
616 Six Flags Drive
Arlington, TX 76011

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group held a meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Thursday September 23, 2021 at 1:00 PM. Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

Voting Members Present:

Melissa Bookhout
Lissa Shepard
Sano Blocker
Jordan Macha
Rachel Ickert
Matt Robinson
Sarah Standifer
Andrew Isbell
Glenn Clingenpeel
Chad Ballard (absent)
Mike Rickman (absent)
Scott Harris

Nine voting members were present, constituting a quorum.

Ex Officio Members Present:

Adam Whisenant
Rob Barthen (absent)
Andrea Sanders
Rory Halpin (alternate TDEM)
Steve Bednarz – alternate Allen Nash
Brooke Bacuetes (absent)
Richard Bagans
Kevin McCalla (absent)
Greg Waller (absent)
Ellen Buchanan (absent)
Todd Burrer (absent)
Jerry Cotter (absent)
Lisa McCracken (absent)
Diane Howe (absent)
Edith Marvin (absent)
Justin Bower
Lonnie Hunt (absent)

Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to approve the minutes as presented;
Second: Matt Robinson; Action: Minutes were unanimously approved.

Acknowledgement of written public comments received

No written public comments were received.

Consider resignation for Water District Category

Mike Rickman is retiring from the North Texas Municipal Water District and has resigned as NTWD representative on the committee, conditional upon appointment of a replacement. Mr. Clingenpeel asked the group to act upon that resignation with his alternate serving until such time as the Nominating Committee is prepared to recommend his replacement.

Motion to accept Mr. Rickman's resignation; Scott Harris motioned to accept; Second: Matt Robinson; Action: Motion was accepted unanimously.

Appoint Nominating Committee

Glenn Clingenpeel stated that since there was a standing Nominating Committee, he asked Scott Harris if he would be willing to serve as chair for that committee. Mr. Harris agreed and stated they would move to recommend a replacement for the Water Districts position.

TWDB Update

Richard Bagans with TWDB gave an update on what happened in the Legislative Session. Additional funding was approved by their Board. Region 3 was awarded an additional \$756,000. Mr. Bagans stated that more details would follow. He further stated that they are currently working on an amendment for that funding, which would be used to help identify more flood mitigation projects. He reiterated that some of the deliverables for the Technical Memo have been extended until March for the existing conditions analysis (GIS deliverables). Mr. Bagans also mentioned that the Trinity River Authority as well as Kaufman County had received commitments in April from the Board for Flood Infrastructure Fund (FIF) funding and that they are working on executing those agreements before October 22, 2021, but expected to execute their agreement with Dallas County within the next week.

Update from Region 3 Technical Consultant

Stephanie Griffin outlined the updates to be covered in the meeting stating that no action was needed at the time on the updates. She stated that they would be sending out chapters as they were ready for the group's

review and feedback but clarified that each chapter would not need to be approved individually. She said she expected the first Chapter to be sent out early October.

a. Chapter 1 Planning Area Description:

- i. Kimberly Miller, Halff Assoc. gave update on some of the new content. They gathered as much information on dams, levees, and low water crossings as possible to look for potential flood implications. Ms. Miller went over the types of Flood Mitigation Projects, from data collection, that were thought to be needed.

b. Chapter 2 Flood Risk Analyses – presented by Sam Amoako-Atta, Halff Associates. Mr. Amoako-Atta went over existing Floodplain Mapping, Data Gaps, Exposure/Vulnerability Assessment, Approach to Future Conditions and Maps of current 100-yr and 500-yr floodplains. He explained how their mapping process works and where they get their information. Some of their data sources include FEMA, TWDB, FAFDS, USACE and other Federal data, regional stakeholders, and FATHOM. Also covered was:

- Existing Flood Hazard
- Exposure
- Inventory – buildings, population, critical facilities, utilities, and agriculture.
- Vulnerability – social impacts

Jarred Overbey, with Halff Associates spoke on future flood hazards such as population increase and urbanization, climate change impacts on extreme events, future conditions assessment, and the proposed future conditions methodology. Reem Zoun, with TWDB weighed in on clarification of future risk analysis methods. She stated that there are several alternative methods presented in TWDB's guidance document, and that the purpose is to identify future conditions of flood risk.

Glenn Clingenpeel raised a question about some of the methodology and its impact on future flood projections. He also stated he would not be in favor of using the current 500-yr as the future 100-yr methodology. Scott Harris agreed. Mr. Clingenpeel proposed to have a range where the potential future condition would be a range between no change (current 100-yr floodplain is the same as the future 100-yr floodplain) to the current 500-yr floodplain being the new 100-yr floodplain.

Andrew Isbell also voiced his concern on being cautious when basing a prediction on a 30-40-year projection. There were also concerns voiced that even though this is a planning map and not a regulatory map, there would be the potential for it to be inappropriately used for funding allocations and regulatory compliance. Halff Associates stated that they would compile a memo describing the proposed future conditions methodology, and would submit it to the TWDB for approval.

c. Chapter 3 Floodplain Management Practices and Goals – presented by Kimberly Miller, Halff Assoc.

i. Ms. Miller led a discussion on the consideration to approve floodplain management goals for inclusion in the regional flood plan. The goals considered included:

- **Goal 1. Improving Flood Warning & Public Safety** – increasing public safety and low water crossings.
- **Goal 2. Improving Flood Analyses** – Increase the number and extent of regional flood planning studies (FMEs) and analysis to better prepare communities for implementing flood mitigation projects.
- **Goal 3. Reducing Property Damage & Loss** – Increase the number and extent of protective regulatory measures and programs to limit future risk and reduce flood damage in the flood planning region.
- **Goal 4. Floodplain Preservation** – Maintain the natural and beneficial functions of floodplains by preservation and conservation programs.
- **Goal 5. Flood Infrastructure Improvement** – Reduce flood risk and mitigate flood hazards to life and property through the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure and implementation of new flood infrastructure projects.
- **Goal 6. Expanding Flood Education & Outreach** – Increase the amount of flood education and outreach opportunities to improve awareness of flood hazards and future participation throughout the flood planning region (FPR).

Scott Harris suggested that the group consider adding an increased funding goal. The group agreed to add this as a goal.

ii. There was a discussion of potential floodplain management practices within the region. Data sources provided by the consultant team included:

- City ordinances
- County court orders
- National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) participation
- Community Rating System (CRS)
- Survey responses
- TWDB Guidance Document

iii. Consider approval of recommending or adopting (requiring) specific floodplain management practices – Ms. Miller asked if the group had an interest in recommending any specific or minimum standards across the region. She noted that in the survey the two highest ranking options were participation in the NFIP or adoption

of equivalent standards, and regulating development in the FEMA floodplain or other local floodplains designated by local jurisdiction.

Glenn Clingenpeel suggested that the group recommend the floodplain management practices, rather than require them. He suggested the group could help get resources to develop and implement them and at some point in the future, they could become requirements. Scott Harris suggested that the group recommend the full list, go through the public input meetings to see what comments are received and then have this for an item of discussion at a later date.

Scott Harris made motion to recommend all of the listed practices; Second; Sarah Standifer; Action; unanimously approved.

- d. Chapter 4 Flood Mitigation Needs and Potentially Feasible Solutions – David Rivera, Half Associates gave an update this chapter. He showed a series of examples of what they will be using (HUC 12 will be used as a unit of analysis) for the areas of evaluations in order to find hot spots. He stated that they will also be using the Social Vulnerability Index as a criticality factor. The results will be collected and input into a map to show the areas that are high risk.

- i. Consider approval of process to identify potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs – Mr. Rivera gave a brief recap of the process. Mr. Rivera stated that at this stage they need to look into the survey, determine what is available in terms of modeling, and use that to generate the project.

Andrew Isbell asked how big of a weight the SVI would be given. Mr. Rivera stated that they were planning on using the SVI as a factor or a multiplier. Glenn Clingenpeel asked if there was a motion to approve this process, or if the group would like to consider it at a subsequent meeting. After discussion, it was decided to table the item until the next meeting.

- e. Chapter 8 Administrative, Regulatory and Legislative Recommendations – Stephanie Griffin gave a brief overview on this chapter as a discussion item only. Ms. Griffin went over the schedule for upcoming deadlines. She stated that Chapter 1 should be sent out for review in early October, followed by Chapter 3 in the latter part of that month. She stated that the Technical Memorandum would need to be approved in December in order to be submitted to TWDB in January of 2022. Chapters 2 & 4 are to be reviewed in February along with the Technical Memorandum addendum, which is to be submitted in March.

Updates from Liaisons Region 5 and 6

Region 5 Neches RFPG – Andrew Isbell stated that Region 5 was reviewing the same chapters with some of the same questions with which the Region 3 group is struggling.

Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG – Scott Harris said they were also in the middle of narrowing down their goals and expected the group would take a vote during their next meeting. He stated that their last meeting was on September 9, 2021, and that they held their first public preplanning meeting on August 31.

Update from Planning Group Sponsor

There was no update from the planning group sponsor.

Review administrative costs requiring certification

There were no administrative costs requiring certification.

Receive general public comments

Mr. Clingenpeel opened the meeting to public comments. No members of the public indicated they wished to make comments, and the public comment period was closed.

Announcements

It was announced that the TWDB Texas Water conference registration was open through September 24.

Meeting date for Next meeting

The meeting (contingent on finding a location) was set for Thursday, November 18, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. Clingenpeel stated that it would be a hybrid meeting again.

Other Business

There was no other business brought before the group.

Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING ARE CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
HELD SEPTEMBER 23, 2021.

SCOTT HARRIS, Secretary
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP

Date

GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP

Date