

Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Hybrid Meeting
Thursday, February 17, 2022
10:00 a.m.

North Central Texas Council of Governments
William Pitstick Conference Room, First Floor of Centerpoint II
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, February 17, 2022, at 10:00 AM. Acting Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM.

Voting Members Present:

Melissa Bookhout
Lissa Shepard
Sano Blocker
Jordan Macha (joined after meeting convened)
Rachel Ickert
Matt Robinson
Sarah Standifer (joined after meeting convened)
Andrew Isbell (absent)
Glenn Clingenpeel
Chad Ballard
Galen Roberts for Mike Rickman
Scott Harris

9 voting members were present at the time of roll call, constituting a quorum.

Ex Officio Members Present:

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

Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to approve the minutes as presented;
Second: Lissa Shepard; 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

No registered public comments were received.

TWDB Update

Richard Bagans with TWDB gave an update on a few changes since the last meeting.

In January 2022, Halff Associates submitted the Technical Memorandum Addendum to TWDB and it has been declared administratively complete. TRA and Halff Associates were sent notices to proceed with Task 5 which allows the RFPG to start recommending FMEs, FMPs, and FMSs. Technical Memorandum Addendum is going under internal review for more content and substantial comments and then will be returned to consultants and RFPG in late April. The comments will be informal and suggestions will include how to make the plan better for submission of draft plan in July or August. Deliverables were given an extension to March 7th and will be voted on today to approve to submit to TWDB. Contract amendments with additional funding were held up at TWDB with contracts and legal team, but the contract amendment with TRA is in DocuSign and awaiting a few more signatures before it is executed. The RFPG chair's meeting is Wednesday, March 2nd.

Officer Elections

Glenn Clingenpeel with TRA gave an update on Region 3 Trinity RFPG Bylaws adopted on October 27th, 2020.

Article VIII. Section 2 (b) Regular officers shall be selected biannually, at the first meeting of second year after the calendar year in which these bylaws were adopted. Written notice of the meeting to select officers shall be sent to all members of the Region 3 Trinity RFPG by the current Secretary thirty calendar days prior to the meeting. Nominations shall be made from the floor by voting members. The voting members shall select

officers from among the nominees by consensus, but not less than agreement of 2/3rds of the voting members present.

It was acknowledged that thirty days were not provided to nominate officers. A poll was sent out prior to the meeting to determine if voting members were still in favor of electing officers today or if they would like to postpone until the April 2022 meeting. Majority favored moving forward with elections despite the lack of notice. The question was posed again during the meeting with unanimous consensus to move forward with the election. Mr. Clingenpeel stated that the current officers were Glenn Clingenpeel as Chair, Sarah Standifer as Vice-Chair, Scott Harris as Secretary, and Andrew Isbell and Lissa Shepard as representatives at large. All current officers were asked if they are willing to continue serving in this capacity and present indicated that they were willing. There was a call for other nominations, and none were brought forward.

Motion: Matt Robinson moved to reelect the current slate of officers;
Second: Galen Roberts; Action: Motion approved unanimously

Update from Region 3 Technical Consultant – Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates

a. Chapter 2 Flood Risk Analyses – Sam Amoako-Atta with Halff Associates

I. Update on potential future flood risk conditions:

Task 2B - Future Flood Hazard determination methodology was accepted by TWDB on January 21, 2022. The methodology consisted of using existing 500 yr. flood hazard risk as future 100 yr. flood hazard risk and a horizontal delta buffer (about 40 ft) for the future 500 yr. flood hazard risk. The methodology also proposed zones of risk rather than hard lines, with minimum potential and maximum flood zones. Supporting data sources were presented. Currently, data is missing from the upper Trinity and the lower West Fork. The upper Trinity BLE is still in progress.

A public web map was created to generate public comments from communities and individuals on the current floodplain quilt that approximates the extent of existing flood risk in the Trinity Region. A demonstration of the public web map was provided with the map set to go live the week following the meeting.

Data gaps have been determined throughout data collection. They have found areas where modeling and mapping are absent or outdated and have been adding this data as part of the Task 2B submittal to TWDB.

II. Exposure and vulnerability assessment draft results:

The consultant team ran an overlay of existing flood exposure in communities and were able to produce a count of buildings, critical facilities, low water crossings, cropland, and livestock exposed to future flooding. After looking at existing flood exposures in communities, communities SVI were mapped to determine their risk of flood exposure and social readiness to respond to these flooding events. Countywide risk averages were then reported. The SVI information was provided from the 2018 CDC data set. The CDC data is not currently complete in some counties, in which case FEMA data will be used to determine social readiness. Fathom data will be used to leverage agricultural flood exposure areas where the 2017 USDA data set is not complete.

Draft maps that will be included in the Technical Memorandum Addendum to be submitted to TWDB in March were presented.

b. Chapter 4 Flood Mitigation Needs and Potentially Feasible Solutions

i. Definition of "Emergency Needs" - Laura Haverlah with H2O Partners:

Metrics and supporting data to determine "Emergency Need" were presented. Data came from NOAA, FEMA's map service center, National Flood Insurance Claim Data, Trinity Region 3 communities, TWDB, Homeland infrastructure foundation level data, TXDOT, and the NOAA National Center for Environmental Information.

Examples of "Emergency Need" were presented

- i. A significant factor in determining emergency needs among the FMEs was the lack of recent countywide data. Counties with older, smaller scale flood data were indicated as emergency need for that purpose. One FME example is in Trinity County. The city of Grovetown and the city of Trinity have not had floodplain mapping completed since 1985 and 1987. Paper maps from the 1980s are still being used.
- ii. Among FMPs, projects that are within areas that have had significant repetitive loss through NFIP claims were listed as emergency need as they indicate areas with the potential to be problematic soon. One FMP example is within the city of Arlington for potential drainage improvement projects. They had 216 flood claims through NFIP within the area. Drainage improvement projects are proposed in this area that could be designated as emergency need FMPs.
- iii. Similarly, FMSs were designated as emergency need when the areas of the strategies were indicated as costly as well as highly probable to have a flood claim in the future. This example shows the number of critical facilities within a flood prone area. This area had \$90 million in property losses due to flood events. The strategies would be to acquire flood prone properties as well as relocate structures out of the floodplain.

There was considerable discussion on the definition of “Emergency Need” and significant repetitive loss. The group was informed that the TWDB does not provide a definition of “Emergency Need.” The group requested that the definition be revisited during a future meeting, and that an explanation regarding the process involved in determining what constituted an “emergency need” be discussed.

II. Review Task 4C Technical Memorandum Addendum – Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates:

The Technical Memorandum Addendum was submitted to TWDB on January 6th. TWDB notified RFPG that the Technical Memorandum Addendum was considered administratively complete and they have permission to begin Task 5. TWDB will provide informal comments for consideration in the draft plan. It was noted that the data will continue to be refined.

III. Consider approval of Technical Memorandum Addendum to be submitted to TWDB by March 7, 2022, with understanding that attachments are being updated as appropriate– Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates:

Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve the Technical Memorandum.

Motion: Scott Harris made a motion to approve the Technical Memorandum Addendum to be submitted to TWDB by March 7, 2022, with the understanding that attachments are being updated as appropriate; Second: Rachel Ickert; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Task 4B Full Analysis Components - Dr. David Rivera with Halff Associates:

Under Task 4B, potential actions and solutions have been identified and are now candidates to look at in more detail and potentially be provided as recommendations in Task 5. In the Geodatabase, tables and associated polygons are provided to show how the FMEs, FMPs, FMSs, and associated actions will look spatially. Currently, planning level cost estimates are needed, and templates are being developed to estimate costs. Templates are being developed based on four or five typical FMEs seen throughout the Trinity Region. These calculations will end up being sent to potential sponsors so they will have an idea of expected costs of these actions. Planning level costs will be brought up to a 2020 cost analysis consistent with TWDB Technical Guidelines for Regional Flood Planning Exhibit C, Section 3.7 *“Estimated costs of FMSs, FMPs and FMEs in the plan.”*

The Region 3 RFPG Technical Subcommittee is currently determining a process to identify no negative impacts for FMPs. This is a critical item to deem FMP eligibility. The RFPG will need to certify that these projects show no negative impact based on Supporting Engineering Reports.

There was considerable discussion regarding the certification of no negative impact. It was noted that communities define no negative impact based on their rating under the NFIP program. TWDB Richard Bagans will bring this concern to management for further clarification. TWDB provides technical guidelines for the RFPG to define no negative impact in Exhibit C, Section 3.6 of Technical Guidelines for Regional Flood Planning. TWDB does recognize different definitions and provides guidance to adjust for differences. Concern was raised regarding the RFPG taking responsibility to certify Supporting Engineering Reports identification of no negative impact. It was proposed that when certifying the FMPs as no negative impact that the RFPG include a process that highlights what no negative impact means for FMPs by including the source and supporting documentation that identifies no negative impact.

FMPs require a Benefit-Cost Analysis. TWDB benefit BCR input interface and analysis tool works alongside FEMA's BCA Toolkit 6.0. Half Associates is working to understand this tool and the benefit-cost analysis. Justification will need to be provided if the benefit-cost analysis is 1 or less than 1. Sarah Standifer recommended that this item be put on an administrative or legislative initiative. It was also asked if TWDB is working with TDEM on recent submittal processes due to difficulties and challenges for communities that may have limited resources or financial capabilities to complete the forms. TWDB is working with TDEM on data storage and centralization of flood data, but in terms of the BCR tool, TWDB worked with a consultant who produced the BCR tool and it should work alongside the FEMA BCA toolkit. However, TWDB will follow up with management to determine if it is comparable with TDEM.

Adjourn for 10 minutes – 11: 50 am to 12:00 pm.

- c. Overview and approach to Chapter 5 Recommendation of FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs - Dr. David Rivera with Halff Associates:

The following information was presented to the Region 3 RFPG Technical Subcommittee in greater detail and can be found in the associated minutes. Two different strategies were presented to recommend FMEs and FMPs. Sponsors will need to be identified for every FME, FMP and FMS recommended.

- I. Process for Recommending FMEs: FMEs will be further refined by looking at all goals and making sure they connect to each action that the planning group selected. The RFPG will decide whether FMEs have the potential to be promoted to an FMP. If so, that

action would be performed during this planning cycle as part of Task 12.

- II. Process for Recommending FMPs: FMPs will be further refined by looking at all goals and making sure they connect to each action the planning group selected. The identification of unfeasible FMPs and demotion to FMEs will also be included in this process.
- III. The recommendation process for FMSs is similar to FMPs.

The next Technical Subcommittee meeting will be March 15th. The goal is to complete Task 5 by mid-May. This is an iterative process and additional recommendations can be made through an addendum process. It was noted that to receive funding FMEs, FMPs and FMSs need to be included in the plan. It was recommended that an expedited process be developed to recommend FMEs, FMPs, FMSs. It was recommended that there be an option to amend the regional flood planning document in the future. TWDB does expect an amendment process to be included, but the process is currently being refined.

d. Overview and approach to Chapter 6 Impacts of Regional Flood Plan - Dr. David Rivera with Halff Associates:

- I. Task 6A - Impacts of Regional Flood Plan: This task determines the relative reduction in flood risk that implementation of the plan would achieve within the region in regard to life, injuries, and property. The potential positive and negative socioeconomic or recreational impacts of the recommended FMSs and FMPs will be identified as well as the overall impacts on the environment, agriculture, recreational resources, water quality, erosion, sedimentation, and navigation.
- II. Task 6B – Contributions/Impacts on State Water Plan: This task determines if any FMP or FMS recommendations create a positive or negative impact to water supply and water availability. The consultant team will analyze impacts of the regional flood plan on the regional water plan.

e. Overview and approach to Chapter 7 Flood Response Information and Activities - Laura Haverlah with H2O Partners:

Four phases of emergency management were identified. This chapter's intention is to identify the current capabilities of entities within the region to respond to and recover from a flood event. Entities taken into consideration were identified. A survey was distributed throughout the region to identify the entities that respond to flood events, the plans they use when mitigation action is needed, and the mitigation actions taken or planned. Most responses identified the use of social media and public-facing websites, as well as barricades and gate closures, as mitigation actions taken or planned. This chapter will (1) detail the roles and responsibilities of the various involved entities, (2) reference the plans, ordinances, and relevant documents for flood

planning, damage prevention, and mitigation, and (3) look at capabilities and actions for flood prevention, response, recovery, and mitigation.

f. Discussion on Chapter 8 Administrative, Regulatory and Legislative Recommendations - Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates:

This is a standing agenda item to discuss potential recommendations for administrative, regulatory, legislative, or other topics and all recommendations will be included in Draft Chapter 8. The current list was presented in a memo to the packet. Recently added items include simplifying the grant application processes and including A/V equipment rental as an eligible expense for reimbursement through the RFPG grant. Additional items to be added include a simplified or expedited amendment process for FME, FMP, FMS recommendation. It was recommended that there be a specific reminder to review the memo within the agenda and meeting materials prior to the meeting.

g. Chapter 10 Public Outreach Updates – Colby Walton, Cooksey Communications

Future Hybrid Public Meetings should be scheduled as far in advance as possible to find and secure reliable venues. Currently, April 21st is scheduled to be hosted by Dallas, June TBD, July TBD, and September TBD.

There are technical requirements that are needed for Hybrid meetings. They are currently soliciting input from any city, county, COG, or similar entity that have a facility that meets these requirements and can be used in the mid-and/or lower basin. It was recommended that 2 or 3 venues be secured and used on a rotating basis. Edith Marvin can help with connections to other COGs. The desire of the group is to continue with the hybrid option.

The inaugural RFPG E-newsletter went out to over 900 regional stakeholders. The Trinity RFPG website was judged by the Association of Marketing and Communication Professionals and received a gold award from the 2022 AVA Digital Awards.

Updates from liaisons for adjoining coastal regions

- a. Region 5 Neches RFPG – no member present, no update provided
- b. Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG – no member present, no update provided

Updates from Planning Group Sponsor – Glenn Clingenpeel with TRA

TWDB is in the process of finalizing the contract amendment that will add \$756,000 to the work plan. This will add Task 11, 12, 13 and will extend our contract to end of 2023.

Review administrative costs requiring certification

The following costs associated with the administrative functions of the group were presented for consideration and approval:

- a. NCTCOG Transportation Council room rental cost incurred on 8/19/21 in an amount of \$262.52.
- b. Navarro College meeting room rental cost incurred on 11/17/2021 in an amount of \$315 with AV set up and operation in an amount of \$400 for a total cost of \$715.

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to certify the administrative expenses as presented;
Second: Scott Harris; Action: Motion approved unanimously.

Receive registered public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Mr. Clingenpeel opened the floor for public comments. No comments were received and the public comment section was closed.

Announcements

Stephanie Griffin with Halff Associates announced that TFMA 2022 calendars were available and can be mailed out if requested. Rachel Ickert with TRWD announced that the Central City Flood Control Project in Fort Worth received Federal funding from the USACE in January for \$403 million.

Confirm meeting date for next meeting

April 21st, 2022, Dallas, TX hosted by Sarah Standifer with the City of Dallas
June 2nd, 2022, location to be determined

Consider agenda items for next meeting

Review of Chapter 2 and 4
Updates on Chapters 5, 6 & 7
Introduction to Chapters 8, 9, 10, & 11

Adjourn

1:15 pm adjourned

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 FEBRUARY 17, 2022.



SCOTT HARRIS, Secretary
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP

5/31/22

Date



GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD
PLANNING GROUP

7/7/2022

Date