

**Region 3 Trinity Regional Flood Planning
Group Technical Subcommittee
Meeting
Thursday, February 10, 2022
2:30 p.m.**

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Technical Subcommittee held a meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Thursday, February 10, 2022, at 2:30 PM. Acting Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called the meeting to order at 2:35 PM.

Members Present:

Andrew Isbell
Craig Ottman
Lissa Shepard
Sarah Standifer
Scott Harris

Members Absent:

Matt Robinson
Galen Roberts

5 members were present, constituting a quorum

Consider selection of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary of Technical Subcommittee

Sarah Standifer nominated Lissa Shepard as Vice-Chair. Craig Ottman nominated himself for Secretary of Technical Subcommittee. Andrew Isbell nominated himself for Chair with the clear understanding that the Vice-Chair will need to step in at times. Stephanie Griffin noted that the subcommittee will meet 3 more times. The Chair will be facilitating and guiding meetings.

Motion: Scott Harris made a motion to approve selection of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary of Technical Subcommittee; Second: Sarah Standifer;
Action: passed unanimously

Update from the Region 3 Technical Consultant

David Rivera with Freese and Nichols updated the Technical Subcommittee on a proposed process to narrow down potentially feasible FMEs, FMPs and FMSs to final recommendation.

- a. Overview and approach to task: Task 4B and 5. The first portion of Task 4B was completed. The second portion of Task 4B and Task 5 still need to be completed. The current pool of potential FMEs, FMPs, and FMSs submitted as part of the Technical memo need to undergo a screening process. Halff Associates needs assistance from the Technical

Subcommittee to refine the pool in order to complete the analysis for remaining actions. Once the pool is refined by potentially feasible actions, the feasible actions can be evaluated and projects can be recommended under Task 5. There will be many opportunities to add FME's throughout this process.

- There was considerable discussion on the representation of counties and projects currently proposed. It was recommended that there be an option to addendum this document in the future.
- There was considerable discussion on responsibility of project Sponsors. Sponsor's help to refine the projects and provide a level of funding commitment. Half Associates requested that the Technical Subcommittee consider how to recommend projects that currently do not have Sponsor support.

b. Pre-screening of potential projects:

1. Process for Recommending FMEs: This 6 step process supports the technical guidance. The first 3 steps support the following guidance: *"Not every conceivable FME will be recommended. The RFPG and technical consultant must decide which identified potential FME will be recommended"*. The remaining 3 steps support the following guidance: *Overview of technical guidance: "Recommend FMEs that the RFPG determines are most likely to result in identification of potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs"*:

- I. Goals: FMEs have already been removed that do not support a specific goal of this plan.
- II. Contact Sponsors: Communication with Sponsors is critical in order to verify that an FIS has been completed, verify interest, and request additional data to refine FME Areas. As part of the Technical Memo there is an associated area in the database for each FME and that area needs to be discussed with the Sponsor. The area in the database represents the area that would benefit from the project. Therefore, communication with sponsors is critical.
- III. Analysis: Before Analysis can be completed, the FMEs need to be refined, Flood Risk Indicators populated, cost calculated, and areas of greatest need identified.
- IV. Evaluate: Use quantifiable results to identify FMEs with the most complete information and/or could result in the greatest benefits, have real potential to develop into FMP next cycle, and be promoted to FMP.
- V. Goals: ensure short-term goals are met by selected FMEs, develop additional FMEs to cover missing-short-term goals, and identify Sponsors.
- VI. Recommend FMEs
 - There was considerable discussion on ranking. Statewide project ranking criteria is available, but the process has not been solidified, it will go out for public comment regarding what criteria is used and will be based on data submitted

from regional flood planning groups. It was recommended that there be an option to addendum this document in the future.

2. Process for Recommending FMPs: This 10 step process supports the technical guidance: *“The RFPGs will recommend specific FMPs in the regional flood plan. The primary function of each recommended FMP must be flood risk reduction and they must include quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits.”*:
 - I. Goals: FMPs have more requirements than FMEs. Currently, FMPs have been removed that do not support a goal.
 - II. Unfeasible: FMPs must be a mitigation project. They must provide mitigation in 100 yr flood event and not be dependent on another action identified as unfeasible. This step needs to be completed before communicating with Sponsors.
 - III. Contact Sponsors: Sponsors need to be contacted to verify project and request additional data. Half Associates requested that the Technical Subcommittee consider the removal of FMPs if Sponsor is not interested.
 - IV. Initial Analysis: FMP areas will be refined, Flood Risk Indicators populated, reduction in Flood Risk analyzed, and cost estimate calculated.
 - There was considerable discussion regarding the number of projects that should be submitted and how they should be submitted. It was suggested that projects currently awarded under TWDB Category 1 funding be reviewed. It was recommended that there be an option to addendum this document in the future.
 - V. Evaluate: RFPG Subcommittee will determine which FMPs to perform full analysis.
 - VI. Full Analysis: Determine negative impacts and conduct a benefit-cost analysis.
 - VII. Unfeasible: FMPs could still be unfeasible, therefore this step in the process will allow for reevaluation.
 - VIII. Demote: This step allows for determining if FMPs need to be demoted to FME.
 - IX. Evaluate: Use quantifiable results to identify FMPs with the most complete information and/or could result in the greatest benefits, and aids in identifying FMPs located in areas of greatest need.
 - X. Final FMP recommendations

3. Task 5 and Sub-Committee Meeting Schedule

March 15-17, 2022

April 4-6, 2022

April 20-22, 2022

May 12, 2022 submit Chapter 5 Draft to RFPG for review

- c. Potential Project Sponsors: Half Associates requested that the Technical Subcommittee consider how to identify potential project

Sponsors. It was proposed that Halff Associates with the assistance of the Technical Subcommittee screen and identify projects that need additional data, then contact Sponsors via phone, email, and mail to solicit interest in being a Sponsor. A map with the area and short description of project would be provided.

Receive registered public comments

Mr. Isbell opened the floor for public comments.

Kathy Jack, The Nature Conservancy: Her organization is currently working on supporting nature based solutions and natural areas being integrated for flood mitigation infrastructure. They are very pleased to see natural and nature based solutions well represented in the Draft Technical Memo and the goals of Region 3 and seeing them included as structural and non-structural flood risk reduction action types. Regarding the minimum criteria and screening process outlined for projects, they need to have the appropriate H&H models to pass the screening. Comment or concern was raised that language also be included to address the appropriate models for scale and land use, for example SWMM may be more appropriate for distributed LID or GIS projects in the urban footprint. How specific is the criteria and is the control up to Region 3 or TWDB? Additional comment regarding SVI, whether its SVI or another dataset that TNC would support data other than just income because of the substantial amount of research that includes other socio demographic influences on communities risk level in response to this type of disaster, including flooding, and not just the flood itself, but the ability to respond and recover after the floods. Finally, TNC has a couple of projects that should be brought to the committee's attention because the goals of these projects should be conducted in a manner that supports the Region 3 Flood Planning Region. An email will be sent to the committee detailing the projects. TNC is collaborating with the USACE Silver Jackets Fort Worth District to adapt TNCs floodplain prioritization spatial tool to the Trinity. The goal is to help stakeholders in the region identify floodplain areas to protect or restore, primarily for flood mitigation benefits, but also habitat and water quality. TNC wants to make sure that they develop the tool using similar data of Region 3 to make it consistent with the goals of Region 3.

Announcements – none

Confirm meeting date for next meeting

March 15, 2022 at 12:00pm – An in-person meeting space with hybrid capabilities needs to be reserved.

Agenda items for next meeting –

Agenda will be provided by Halff Associates

Adjourn:

Motion: Craig Ottman

Second: Scott Harris

The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 PM.

THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING ARE CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP
TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE HELD FEBRUARY 10, 2022.

Craig Ottman 5/4/2022
Craig Ottman, Secretary Date
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

Andrew Isbell 7/7/2022
Andrew Isbell, Chair Date
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE