

**Region 3 Trinity Regional Flood Planning  
Group Technical Subcommittee  
Meeting  
Thursday, March 15, 2022  
12:00 p.m.**

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Technical Subcommittee held a meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Thursday, March 15, 2022, at 12:00 PM. Chairman Andrew Isbell called the meeting to order at 12:22 PM.

Members Present:

Andrew Isbell  
Craig Ottman  
Lissa Shepard  
Sarah Standifer  
Scott Harris  
Matt Robinson  
Galen Roberts

Members Absent:

7 members were present, constituting a quorum

Approval of minutes from the previous meeting

Stephanie Griffin, Halff Associates, stated that minutes were not included in meeting materials. Approval of minutes will take place at the April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022 meeting.

Acknowledgement of written public comments received

No written public comments were received.

Receive registered public comments

No registered public comments were received.

Update from the Region 3 Technical Consultant – Dr. David Rivera with Freese and Nichols:

- a. Task 5 Overview (10 min)
  - i. Purpose

The Technical Sub-Committee reviewed Task 5 to determine the process to recommend actions for FMEs FMPs, and FMSs based on Task 4b.

## ii. Process Overview (FME, FMP, and FMS)

### 1. Background context and findings summary:

The TWDB requirements for recommended actions will be reviewed. Examples of actions will be presented to the Technical Sub-Committee via an interactive dashboard. The interactive dashboard includes all FMEs, FMPs, and FMSs submitted to date. Currently, there are 284 FMEs, 33 FMPs, and 137 FMSs listed. The dashboard will continue to evolve throughout this process. The color scale, lighter to darker, means that the darker the color, the more actions proposed in one area.

Questions were posed to the Technical Sub-Committee to further aid in the recommendation of actions.

### 2. Questions for Technical Sub-Committee

- Decision-Making: The Technical Sub-Committee was asked to provide yes or no decisions regarding actions for FMEs, FMPs, and FMSs and provide supportive guidance on the yes or no decision.
- Selection Philosophy: The Technical Sub-Committee was asked what process should be followed to recommend actions for FMEs, FMPs, and FMSs. It was proposed that all actions that are eligible be recommended, as opposed to submitting a limited number of actions thought to have a good chance of being approved by the State.
- Local Sponsor: The Technical Sub-Committee was asked if recommended actions should require a sponsor. For example, should an entity be verified as willing to sponsor an FME, FMP, and FMS and/or should sponsors be assigned based on location to a project with an option to decline later. These projects can be multijurisdictional with multiple sponsors.
- Additions: The Technical Sub-Committee was asked to submit new FMEs or FMSs that the RFPG would like to recommend at any point in this process.

## b. FME (45 min)

### i. TWDB requirements:

Identify and investigate solutions to mitigate the 1% annual chance flood. Each action must be associated with a specific RFPG goal. Each action will most likely result in identification of potentially feasible FMPs or FMSs for the next cycle.

There was considerable discussion on where regulatory impact falls as a flood management activity. Currently, it is classified as an FMS.

ii. Sources:

Some survey responses have been received. Most have come from Hazard Mitigation Action Plans. Other sources were also covered including unfunded FIF submittals and submittals from RFPG based on data gaps. It was noted that Counties do not have Drainage Master Plans. Drainage is based on roads, expansion, and new development.

iii. Geographical distribution and categories

FME Categories required by TWDB Technical Guidance were presented. All categories are found within the Trinity River Basin. All counties have an FME action proposed. FME actions consist of past improvements, expansion, dredging for example. The majority of FME actions are Engineering Project Planning projects. Almost every County in the region is recommended to undergo flood mapping updates, except Tarrant and Dallas. This would require full H&H analysis, essentially defining zones as AE instead of zone A. The goal is to increase flood mapping by 25% for each flood prone area within each county.

iv. Flood Risk Indicators and Planning Level Costs

FMEs and others will be grouped to outline associated costs and scope.

v. Assessment examples

Examples were presented. No issues found in recommending FEMA mapping in previously unmapped areas. Issues found in recommending a flood study to determine parameters to raise a bridge since the project sponsor no longer was interested. It was noted that reaching out to each project sponsor is not feasible. Additional reasons for not recommending an FME would be that the study has already been performed or has already been allocated funding.

vi. Technical Sub-Committee guidance for recommendations:

The Technical Sub-Committee was asked if they would consider recommending flood mapping improvements in bulk. They were also asked if they would consider recommending FMEs without having conversations with Sponsors. Additionally, do they have any

other screening processes that should be used to determine not to recommend an FME.

There was considerable discussion on the process to recommend or not recommend actions. Projects will not be pulled, they are recommended or not recommended. Supporting documentation should be provided to outline reasoning behind recommending or not recommending a project. All projects identified in Hazard Mitigation Action Plans and other sources previously covered in this presentation will be recommended as well as any other projects, such as Special Studies, that were submitted through the proper channels. It was suggested that projects be recommended regardless if the sponsor has been contacted.

All SCS and public dam failure condition assessments will be recommended. Private are not considered. Steven Bednarz noted the following in the WebEx Chat feature:

I'm not sure dam breach (extreme rainfall and extremely rare events) is something we need to be considering in the flood plan. More important would be flood control dam repair where needed, to ensure the flood benefits are maintained. Restricting development in the breach area might be a good idea. There are about 2000 flood control dams built by USDA-NRCS in Texas. These are mostly small to intermediate sized dams that provide flood control benefits to local areas and communities.

1. Practical considerations and constraints for not recommending an FME

It was recommended that language be updated to show the plan is a living plan and elaborate on why there are different recommendation phases. A table matrix/flow chart that breaks down criteria for recommendation of a project or for no recommendation of a project currently exists for the region.

2. Propose additional FME (if needed)

Additional FME project proposed consists of real-time region wide flood inundation mapping.

Additional projects may be submitted throughout this planning phase as well as through an amendment phase at a later date.

- c. FMP (45 min)
  - i. TWDB requirements

Requirements build on FME requirements. Detailed H&H modeling must be available to determine impact and calculate benefit to project. FMPs cannot impose a negative impact downstream nor an impact on a neighboring community. The Technical Sub-Committee was asked to consider recommending FMPs that are mitigating a lower level of service than 100-yr flood. At a minimum, the FMPs should not impact a 100-yr flood event. No projects should be eliminated from the recommendation list until the state has issued guidance.

- ii. Sources
- iii. Geographical distribution and categories
- iv. Assessment examples

On example of a recommended project was presented that met all criteria. A new detention pond was proposed to mitigate a 100-yr storm and will be recommended for FMP implementation.

- v. Technical Sub-Committee guidance for recommendations

- 1. Practical considerations and constraints for not recommending an FMP

If an FMP impacts water supply, has a negative or adverse impact, and does not provide measurable reduction in flood impactions, the FMP will not be recommended. If an H&H model is insufficient the FMP will be demoted to FME. 33 FMPs have been identified and will be assessed. There was significant discussion on water supply. To date, no FMP impacts water supply at first pass. It will be looked at more closely for larger infrastructure projects. It was requested that the criteria to determine potential water supply impact be further examined.

- 2. Guidance for selecting FMPs to perform full analysis

- d. BREAK (10 min) – no break

- e. FMS (20 min)

- i. TWDB requirements –

Requirements similar to FMP requirements. FMSs that are education and outreach programs do not need as much detail in order to be recommended. Quantifiable flood risk reduction benefits are required as applicable. This may adjust later depending on what criteria is identified.

- ii. Sources

- iii. Geographical distribution and categories
- iv. Assessment examples

Two examples were presented that will be recommended as an FMS.

- v. Technical Sub-Committee guidance for recommendations
  - 1. Practical considerations and constraints for not recommending an FMS
  - 2. Propose additional FMS (if needed)

Consensus is that as long as the FMXs do not eliminate itself based on set criteria the planning group will recommend the project.

- f. Emergency Needs Assessment (30 min) – Laura Haverlah with H2O:

Two recommendations were presented. Areas that have a history of severe and/or repetitive flooding and Areas with critical structures within the 1% annual chance flood area.

- i. Areas that have a history of severe and/or repetitive flooding:

A graphic was presented displaying Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL). SRL was determined over a 10 year time frame. Actionable FMXs for SRL are acquisition, demolition, and/or elevation.

- ii. Areas with critical structures within the 1% annual chance flood area:

Schools, Emergency Shelters, Fire Stations, and Hospitals were displayed on the graphic. It was recommended to include the date of construction in the dataset. Actionable FMXs include acquisition, demolition, and/or elevation, infrastructure improvements, for example the access point to the critical facility is impacted by flooding, and floodproofing and/or retrofitting.

Additional recommendations were also discussed. One included examining disaster declarations over the last 21 years. Chambers and Tarrant County each had 6 disaster declarations, but there aren't actionable FMXs to mitigate. Geographically they will require different actions to mitigate disaster declarations. The second one consisted of examining grey infrastructure, stormwater infrastructure, levees, and dams. Currently, the conditions of dams, levees, and detention facilities are not available. Therefore, no actionable FMX can be provided. Finally, loss of life was examined. Historic loss of life data does not provide the location where the event occurred, for example, water crossings. NOAAs NCEI provides some information, but not the exact location where, for example, a car washed away. NCEI does provide where the car was found. Therefore, no action to mitigate loss of life was presented.

The definition of emergency need did not change: *“Areas that would sustain negative impacts within the foreseeable future were no measures taken”*. TWDB has not provided information on how they will use “emergency need” data. “Emergency need” is unlikely to have an impact on recommendations of FMXs.

g. Action Items (20 min)

Receive registered general public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

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

Announcements – none

Confirm meeting date for next meeting

April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 1:00 pm. Location to be determined.

Agenda items for next meeting –

Voting process for recommending each project. The RFPG is required to vote to recommend each project as outlined in the By-Laws, Article X Making Decisions, Section 3. RFPG Chair Glenn Clingenpeel will work with TWDB Richard Bagans to clarify the process.

Adjourn:

Motion: Craig Ottman moved to adjourn the meeting.  
Second: Scott Harris; Action: Motion approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:48 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 MARCH 15, 2022.

Craig Ottman  
Craig Ottman, Secretary  
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD  
PLANNING GROUP TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

5/4/2022  
Date

Andrew Isbell  
Andrew Isbell, Chair  
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD  
PLANNING GROUP TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

7/7/2022  
Date