Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Hybrid Meeting Thursday, November 18, 2021 10:00 a.m. Cook Education Center at Navarro College Meeting Room 3100 W. Collin St. Corsicana, TX 75110

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group held a meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Thursday, November 18, 2021 at 10:00 AM. Acting Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

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
Galen Roberts (alternate)
Scott Harris

Ten voting members were present, constituting a quorum.

Ex Officio Members Present:

Adam Whisenant Rob Barthen Andrea Sanders Steve Bednarz **Brooke Bacuetes** Richard Bagans Humberto (Bert) Galvan Greg Waller Ellen Buchanan Todd Burrer (absent) Jerry Cotter Lisa McCracken Diane Howe (absent) Edith Marvin (absent) Justin Bower (absent) Lonnie Hunt

Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to approve the minutes as is; Second: Galen Roberts; Action: Minutes were unanimously approved.

Acknowledgement of written public comments received

No written public comments were received.

Receive registered public comments on specific agenda items – limit 3 minutes per person

No registered public comments were received.

TWDB Update

Richard Bagans with TWDB gave an update on a few changes since the last meeting. Additional Funding contracts, allocated by the Legislature, have been sent out to all the regions and will be discussed in agenda items 7 & 8.

TWDB hosted a webinar about contract amendments on November 2nd, slides and recordings are posted publicly on their website.

The Draft Technical Memo deliverables need to be reviewed and approved by January 7th before they are submitted. Specific deliverables regarding GIS files have received an extension until March. Technical Consultants were sent a clarification email regarding the Exhibit D deliverables.

The Draft Technical Memo will become the Final Technical Memo after it has been approved by the group.

<u>Discussion and potential action to authorize the Planning Group Sponsor</u> - to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Regional Flood Planning Grant contract with the TWDB, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope of work and budget.

Glenn Clingenpeel stated that the amendment would add extra money to the Group's contract with the TWDB that the Legislature had allocated specifically for the flood planning purpose. The money would be used to fund three additional tasks:

Task 11 – Outreach and data collection to support Tasks 1-9

Task 12 – Perform FMEs & Identify, evaluate and recommend more FMPs

Task 13 – Prepare and adopt Amended Regional Flood Plan

Motion: Sarah Sandifer moved to authorize the Trinity River Authority to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Regional Flood Planning Grant contract with

the TWDB, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope of work and budget.; Second: Lissa Shepard; Action: Motion approved unanimously.

<u>Discussion and potential action to authorize the Planning Group Sponsor</u> - to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Regional Flood Planning Grant subcontract with the technical consultant, Halff Associates, Inc, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope of work and budget.

Glenn Clingenpeel explained that TRA would need to amend their contract with the technical consultants to incorporate the additional funding and scope of work approved in the prior agenda item.

Rachel Ickert abstained from voting on this item due to a potential conflict of interest.

Motion: Scott Harris moved to authorize the Trinity River Authority to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Regional Flood Planning Grant subcontract with the technical consultant, Halff Associates, Inc, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope of work and budget; Second: Matt Robinson; Action: Motion approved unanimously.

Update from Region 3 Technical Consultant

- a. Chapter 1 Planning Area Description Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates gave an overview of Chapter 1. This covers Population Density, Land Use by Land Cover, Social Vulnerability Index and Flood Quilt. It is currently out for public and planning group comments and feedback.
- b. Chapter 2 Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses Jarred Overbey with Halff Associates gave a presentation on what Fathom Data is, how it works, and how it will be incorporated into the flood planning process.

Andrew Isbell asked whether this was future or existing conditions. Jarred stated that the data represent existing conditions and that they will base future conditions on those findings.

i. Update on Task 2B - Future Conditions Assessment - Jarred stated that the technical consultants had provided a memo to the TWDB outlining the process for identifying future conditions that had been discussed in the prior meeting. Specifically, the process would be to use a range of conditions, from minimum change (using the current 100 yr. floodplain as the future 100 yr. floodplain) to maximum change (using the current 500 yr. floodplain as the future 100 yr. floodplain). Richard Bagans stated that the memo had been received, and that it was being reviewed internally at the TWDB. He did note however, that the proposal to show future 500 yr. floodplains as a data gap would not be acceptable. The

- technical consultant team acknowledged this and stated they would propose a solution to the group.
- ii. Andrew Isbell and others brought up a concern on using the term minimum and maximum in regards to how that language would be perceived. As a potential solution, it was proposed that the wording be changed to "potential maximum" and "potential minimum" future 100 yr floodplains.
- c. Chapter 3 Floodplain Management Practices and Goals Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates
 - i. Update on Task 3B Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals:

The consultant team provided a summary of the goal development process, reminding the group that 7 overarching goal categories had been approved. The draft goals were posted to the Region 3 RFPG website, and copies were emailed to interested parties, for a 30-day review period. The comment period closed on October 27th, 2021, with no comments received.

- ii. Receive feedback on Chapter 3 The technical consultant team reported that they had not received any comments except from one of the cities that voiced support of the proposed draft goals.
 - Glenn Clingenpeel suggested to place this on the agenda at the next meeting to be voted on for approval.
- d. Chapter 4 Flood Mitigation Needs and Potentially Feasible Solutions Dr. David Rivera with Freese and Nichols, Inc.
 - i. Update on Task 4A Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis Process for Identifying Areas of Greatest Need (Screening Analysis) and Greatest Gaps in Flooding Risks. A Technical memo was submitted to the planning group in October that explained in detail how they would meet each TWDB recommended strategy. Dr. Rivera stated that HUC 12 will be used as unit of analysis. The scoring categories include:
 - 1. # of Buildings in the 100 yr floodplain
 - 2. # of low water crossings
 - 3. Agricultural areas at risk of flooding (mi2)
 - 4. # of existing critical facilities
 - 5. # of Locations where roads flood
 - 6. Communities not participating in the NFIP
 - 7. Social Vulnerability Index Rating
 - 8. # of reported flood concerns
 - 9. # of FEMA claims
 - 10.# of historical storms
 - 11. Damages from historical storms

12.# of Areas with a history of flooding

13.# of areas that need mitigation

14. % Inadequate inundation mapping

There was a question regarding the historic storms' frequency map and what the map included. Dr. Rivera stated that it was color coded based on NOAA's storm data, however, the definition of what constitutes a storm was not known. Greg Waller with NWS stated that the definition on storms needs to be in the documentation for clarification on how the dataset is used in regards to storm frequency.

Jerry Cotter, USACE, provided information on a team funded by GLO that is doing a storm study for Texas. He would like to know if this group can help the flood planning groups. For example, they are breaking the state into hydrologic regions and determining what storms match up with what areas.

Glenn Clingenpeel stated that the group needs clarification on what went into this dataset and requested that the consultant team clarify and send an email out to the group with an explanation.

Dr. Rivera continued with explanation of the scoring categories within the HUC-12 areas. He stated that a low score does not mean there is no flood risk. He further stated that the final map is based on all 14 categories and that a preliminary assessment showed 10% of the basin area was in the highest known flood risk category, with another 30% in the next highest,

Andrew Isbell and Rachel Ickert brought up the risk of flooding in areas that have potential of future growth, and suggested that these areas be highlighted somehow. There was general consensus on this point, and the consultant team was asked to look into and help the group identify areas with significant future growth and risks.

ii. Update on Task 4B – Process for Identifying FME, FMS, FMP - Consider approval of process to identify potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs – Dr. Rivera gave an overview of the proposed process

FMEs: sources of identified FMEs included survey responses, results of Flood Risk Evaluation (Task 2), results of Needs Analysis (Task 4A), Hazard Mitigation Action Plans (HMAP), FIF applications not chosen for funding, and County or City Drainage Master Plan.

FMPs: sources of identified FMPs included were potential project information from Master Plans/Drainage Studies from the City of Mont Belvieu, City of Burleson, City of Sachse, North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) and Corridor Development Certificate (CDC) Model.

Reem Zoun, Director of Flood Planning at TWDB, clarified that the FMSs were kept as a category as an opportunity for the group to identify potential flood risk reduction activities that did not exactly fit as an FME or FMP, and thereby provides flexibility.

Motion: Scott Harris moved to approve the process to identify potential FMEs, and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs.; Second: Rachel Ickert; Action: Motion approved unanimously.

- iii. Task 4C Technical Memorandum Stephanie Griffin updated the group on the Technical Memo. The memo is being put together and will be sent out to the group. There will need to be a meeting mid-December for consideration and approval on the Technical Memo. Tech Memo is due to TWDB January 7, 2022.
- iv. Task 4C Technical Memorandum Addendum Due to the delayed release of the Fathom Data, TWDB has allowed a few extra months to address three specific topics under Task 4C. Those three topics will be included in the Tech Memo Addendum and should be available for the group by the end of January. The group will need to approve the addendum in February in order to submit to TWDB by March 7, 2022 deadline.
- e. Task 8 Administrative, Regulatory and Legislative Recommendations Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates led the discussion.
 - i. Ms. Griffin stated that potential topics for recommendations in this chapter included:
 - Administrative
 - Regulatory
 - Legislative
 - Other

She asked the Group if there were any recommendations to be added. None were brought forward and there was no further discussion.

- f. Task 10 Public Participation and Plan Adoption Public Outreach Updates Colby Walton with Cooksey gave brief update.
 - i. E-newsletter inaugural edition is being developed, with a planned release date sometime in December of 2021.
 - ii. Media outreach Mr. Walton stated that they plan to use media in the basin area, speak to editors/editorial boards, local officials, and newspapers in the basin in order to increase public participation.

<u>Update on Future Deadlines</u> – Stephanie Griffin advised deadline dates in the coming months.

- Early December 2021 RFPG approves Tech Memo;
- January 7, 2022 (no meeting) Consultant submits Tech Memo to TWDB;
- End of January 2022 RFPG begins review of draft Tech Memo Addendum;
- Mid-February 2022 RFPG approves Tech Memo Addendum & Consultant introduces Chapter 5;
- March 7, 2022 (no meeting) Consultant submits Tech Memo Addendum to TWDB: and
- April 2022 RFPG review Chapter 2 and Chapter 4; Consultant provides update on Chapter 5; and Consultant introduces additional chapters.

Meeting date for Next meeting

The following dates were approved for the next three meetings:

December 16, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. – location to be determined February 17, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. – location to be determined April 21, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. – location to be determined

<u>Consider establishing Technical Subcommittee(s)</u> – It was determined that no subcommittees were required at this time. No action was taken.

Updates from Liaisons Region 5 and 6

Region 5 Neches RFPG – No update was provided from the Region 5 liaisons.

Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG – No update was provided from the Region 6 liaisons.

Update from Planning Group Sponsor

Glenn Clingenpeel stated that TRA had received a FIF grant that, while separate and apart from the Regional Flood Planning process, would nonetheless, feed a lot of information into the planning process. He stated that Halff Associates would bethe consultants for that grant as well, which would further help the flow of information from the FIF grant into the flood planning process.

Richard Bagans stated that Dallas County and Kaufman County had also received FIF grants.

Review administrative costs requiring certification -

Mr. Clingenpeel stated that he had received a request for reimbursement from one of the Group members. Mr. Bagans clarified that in order to be reimbursed, members must submit the exact mileage traveled for the meeting, and that a map showing an appropriate route was taken must be

included. He also stated that the member must state that they are not eligible for reimbursement from another entity for the miles travelled.

Mr. Clingenpeel stated that the request was in order, that there were sufficient funds available, and that the request was certified, pending receipt of a map and confirmation that the member was not eligible for reimbursement from another entity.

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

Stephanie Griffin stated FEMA had published an RFI with 18 points/topics in it on which FEMA is soliciting input. Specifically, they are looking for feedback and direction on the minimum standards for the FEMA Floodplain Program. Ms. Griffin stated that the Texas Floodplain Management Association is working on a response and offered to provide information on that effort to anyone who is interested.

Scott Harris stated that the voting position for Water Districts has been posted and is open until December.

Agenda items for next meeting –

- Travel policy
- · Approval of Technical Memo
- Technical Committee

Other Business

N/A

Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:32 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 NOVEMBER 18, 2021.

SCOTT HARRIS, Secretary REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

11/18/2021

Date

GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD

PLANNING GROUP