

Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Meeting
Wednesday, August 6, 2025
10:00 a.m.

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group convened a public meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Wednesday, August 6, 2025, 10:00 a.m.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel opened the meeting at 10:00 AM.

Voting Members Present:

Chad Ballard, absent
Melissa Bookhout
Glenn Clingenpeel
Rachel Ickert
Scott Harris
Andrew Isbell, joined after roll call
Jordan Macha, absent
Galen Roberts, joined after roll call
Matt Robinson
Lissa Shepard
Eduardo Valerio, alternate for Sarah Standifer

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

Ex Officio Members Present:

Susan Alvarez, absent
Steve Bednarz
John Blount, absent
Elijah Casas, alternate for John Blount
Justin Bower, joined after roll call
Todd Burrer, absent
Humberto (Bert) Galvan
Diane Howe, absent
Lonnie Hunt, absent
Risa King, absent
Neely Kirkland
Manuel Martinez, absent
Katie Koslan
Andrea Sanders, absent
Matthew Lepinski, absent
Lisa McCracken
Greg Waller
Adam Whisenant, absent
Amanda Young, absent

Approval of the Minutes of the June 3, 2025, 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 – Katie Koslan, TWDB

Katie Koslan provided an update on behalf of TWDB. She announced a technical conference call scheduled for September 12, 2025, and requested that participants submit questions by September 5. A recent save-the-date email included links to potential topics, including the Flood Mitigation Evaluation (FME) program. Updates to Exhibit C technical guidelines were released and are available on the second cycle planning documents webpage. Additionally, TWDB confirmed that there would not be a third amendment to the 2023 Regional Flood Plans, as alignment has now been achieved with the 2028–2029 FIF cycle.

TWDB also noted that presentations on a new Nature-Based Solutions Manual, developed by Freese and Nichols, Inc. in partnership with TWDB, would be delivered to planning regions in person and online, with coordination expected to begin soon. While originally anticipated earlier, the presentation will be delayed until January 2026.

Koslan recapped a June 25 conference call that addressed FIF cycle planning, FMX cost guidance, FME program, and the emergency need definition. The recording and materials were posted online. Further updates were shared on July 14, including revisions to the emergency need descriptions and the addition of early flood warning systems as a valid infrastructure type. Updates were also provided regarding future conditions cursory floodplain input data, now available on the Flood Data Hub as of July 11.

On June 30, TWDB issued an updated Exhibit C for Task 5B, clarifying that work under this task is not contingent on a Notice to Proceed. Language was added to better support small and rural communities.

Koslan also acknowledged that a TWDB representative participated in a recent legislative special session on disaster mitigation and flooding, indicating that related discussions were ongoing at the state level. However, no formal recommendations or changes had been announced at that time.

Update from the Nominating Committee – Scott Harris, Gulf Coast Authority

a. * R3TRFPG member elections –

Scott Harris, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, reported on the status of member elections. The committee sought candidates to fill several positions in the interest categories of electric generating utilities, small business, river authorities, counties, agricultural interest, water districts, and the public. Despite outreach efforts, no candidates were identified for the electric generating utilities or agricultural interest categories. Melissa Bookout agreed to continue serving in the agricultural interest category until the position could be filled, resulting in one unfilled position.

Secretary Scott Harris called for a motion to approve the following incumbents currently serving in the categories of River Authorities, Counties, Water Districts, and Public:

Glenn Clingenpeel – River Authorities
Lissa Shepard – Counties
Galen Roberts – Water Districts
Andrew Isbell – Public

Motion: Scott Harris moved to approve the incumbents currently serving in the categories of River Authorities, Counties, Water Districts, and Public.
Second: Rachel Ickert; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Additionally, one new candidate, Sean Howard, was considered for the Small Business category. Following a review of his qualifications and confirmation that his employer, Plummer and Associates, met the small business criteria, having fewer than 500 employees, Mr. Howard was deemed eligible.

Secretary Scott Harris called for a motion to approve Sean Howard to fill the Small Business category.

Motion: Scott Harris moved to approve Sean Howard to fill the Small Business category.
Second: Matt Robinson; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Scott Harris then informed the group that the two voting member positions representing the electric generating utilities and agricultural interests were currently vacant. He committed to posting those positions promptly and encouraged members to suggest candidates. Melissa Bookout, who was currently filling the agricultural interest role, agreed to continue serving until a replacement was appointed.

b. * R3TRFPG officer elections – Glenn Clingenpeel, Trinity River Authority

It was noted that the officer election cycle had been revised from an annual to a biennial process to align with the current planning cycle. During the discussion, it was recommended that the existing slate of officers remain in place. Sarah Standifer confirmed, through both direct and secondary communications, her willingness to continue serving as Vice Chair. Scott Harris also expressed his willingness to continue serving as Secretary, unless others wished to volunteer for the role.

Chair Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to maintain the current officer slate: Glenn Clingenpeel as Chair, Sarah Standifer as Vice Chair, and Scott Harris as Secretary.

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to maintain the current officer slate.
Second: Lissa Shepard; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Updates from Region 3 Technical Consultant – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, reported that work had been actively underway on various components of the regional flood plan. An update was provided on the 2025 Amendment, which had been submitted in April, along with progress on Chapter 1, which was under review for approval by R3RFPG voting members. Additional follow-up actions were noted as forthcoming.

Mrs. Griffin outlined that Chapter 2 would be presented by Katie Overbey, while Chapter 3, divided into three sections, would be addressed by Sheena Providence, Freese and Nichols, Inc. (FNI), Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier, and herself. Chapters 4 and 5, though appearing extensive, were reported to be concise and limited to two slides. It was noted, however, that Chapter 3 was comparatively more detailed and substantive.

Finally, Mrs. Griffin indicated that Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications, would provide an overview of public outreach activities and present a forward-looking schedule to guide the next stages of the planning process.

a. 2025 Amendment update – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

The update on the 2025 Amendment indicated that comments had been received from the TWDB late the previous week. These comments were described as minor in nature and did not require any action from the planning group. The revisions primarily involved administrative clean-up tasks, such as correcting instances where projects that had advanced from flood management evaluations (FMEs) to flood management projects (FMPs) had not been fully removed from earlier lists. These issues were identified as straightforward corrections, and the Technical Consultants committed to addressing and resubmitting the amendment by the August 13th deadline.

b. Chapter 1 updates—Katie Overbey, Halff and David Rivera, FNI

Chapter 1 had been updated following the last meeting. No additional public comments had been received, but minor revisions were incorporated, including an updated chapter heading photo and small editorial edits. The chapter also integrated clarifications regarding infrastructure conditions and functionality in response to prior concerns.

The R3RFPG members reviewed the TWDB-developed methodology used to classify assets such as dams, reservoirs, levees, ponds, and wetlands by condition and functionality. The tool relied heavily on proxy indicators such as asset age or ownership. While these proxies aligned with TWDB guidance, R3RFPG members noted they did not always reflect actual field conditions. As a result, some facilities providing ongoing benefits were categorized as “non-functional.”

Definitions were provided: the condition of an asset referred to its physical state, categorized as deficient, non-deficient, or unknown. Functionality referred to an asset’s ability to provide its intended level of service. Non-functional designations were often assigned using low-confidence proxy indicators, such as assets older than 50 years or those not owned by entities providing water supply or power. This classification approach stemmed directly from TWDB guidance and was applied consistently through a spreadsheet-based tool.

R3RFPG members expressed concern that the term “non-functional” could be misleading. Facilities so classified were not necessarily failing but often did not meet modern hydrologic, hydraulic, or safety standards, such as those tied to NOAA Atlas 14. R3RFPG members cautioned that these labels, if left unexplained, might undermine public confidence in infrastructure and distort legislative or funding priorities.

Several members noted that decision-makers could mistakenly assume “non-functional” facilities required urgent replacement, while the greater need was often for assessment and verification of “unknown” assets. The group recommended clarifying language to ensure funding was not disproportionately directed to mislabeled facilities. Members emphasized that unknown and high-hazard assets should be prioritized for assessment, as this would provide the clearest picture of actual risk.

The discussion underscored the need for consistency between the TWDB’s methodology and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality’s Dam Safety Program. R3RFPG members urged alignment to avoid conflicting classifications and to strengthen confidence in reported results.

The R3RFPG members supported clearer distinctions between deficient, non-deficient, non-functional, and unknown assets, with emphasis on transparent reporting of limitations. They also highlighted the importance

of prioritizing funding for systematic assessments rather than relying solely on proxy-based classifications. NRCS flood retardation structures were cited as an example, with nearly 900 located in the basin, many of which remained functional, but required reclassification or upgrades to meet updated standards.

R3RFPG members acknowledged concerns about the broad use of proxy indicators but recognized that the methodology followed state guidance. Members agreed to approve the chapter with the allowance for minor editorial revisions.

- i. *Consider approving Draft Chapter 1 (Planning Area Description)

Chair Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve as presented with minor non substantive editorial changes or edits.

Motion: Scott Harris moved to approve as presented with minor non substantive editorial changes or edits.

Second: Galen Roberts; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

- c. Chapter 2 updates – Katy Overbey, Halff

- i. Task 2A Existing Conditions
- ii. Task 2B Future Conditions

Mrs. Overbey began with an explanation that each chapter would include an infographic at the outset to highlight key findings. For Chapter 2, the focus was on existing and future flood hazard conditions, with particular emphasis on exposure and vulnerability. Supporting graphics, including a word cloud, were used to reinforce the major themes of the chapter. Chapter 2 documented both the expansion of mapped flood hazard areas and the refinement of methods to project future conditions. These improvements demonstrated progress toward more complete and accurate identification of flood risk across the region.

Flood Risk Mapping

With respect to existing conditions, preliminary numbers were shared. In Regional Flood Planning Cycle 1, only the 100-year and 500-year riverine events were available, but in Regional Flood Planning Cycle 2, the 10-year event was added. Mapping coverage increased significantly, expanding from approximately 454 square miles in Cycle 1 to more than 1,100 square miles for the 500-year event in Cycle 2. When considering the 10-year and 100-year events together, the overall coverage exceeded prior totals, demonstrating more comprehensive mapping. The increase was attributed to broader use of datasets, including BLE (Base Level Engineering) and Fathom, which were applied in areas previously lacking coverage. As a result, more areas showed mapped flood risk, reflecting improved and more extensive assessments.

R3RFPG members raised questions about whether the data incorporated modeling results developed by the General Land Office (GLO). It was clarified that the GLO project was ongoing and the results not yet included in the TWDB database. The Technical Consultants planned to confirm this with partners actively coordinating with GLO to determine whether their data could be incorporated into the analysis.

Mrs. Overbey noted that exact figures were not yet available for future conditions. In Cycle 1, a 40-foot buffer had been applied based on existing conditions, but in Cycle 2, more advanced methods, including integration of improved digital elevation models data, e.g. *Cartosat-1 Stereo Level 3*, were being used. This was expected to yield higher values than those shown in the first cycle. It was also noted that technical issues had previously complicated the future conditions dataset, but recent updates indicated that projection errors had been resolved, at least in some regions.

Flood Exposure Estimation

Mrs. Overbey provided updated flood exposure estimates for both existing and future flood conditions. Compared to Cycle 1, the Cycle 2 analysis incorporated more stringent classifications, particularly with respect to critical facilities, which was expected to increase reported exposure figures. Overall, the Technical Consultants anticipated that all numbers would increase due to the availability of more comprehensive flood hazard data and higher projected population growth.

For existing conditions, exposure calculations were based on expanded hazard coverage, which included more mapped land area than in Cycle 1. The new analysis also introduced the 10-year flood event in addition to the 100-year and 500-year events. This addition was expected to adjust the distribution of reported exposure, likely reducing totals for the longer-recurrence events but providing a fuller picture of overall risk. Exposure data had been compiled at the county level, though a city-level breakdown was also being considered for the final report. With respect to future conditions, the same approach was applied, building on methods and examples from the first planning cycle. While the updated numbers were still being finalized, the integration of expanded hazard datasets and population projections was expected to show increased exposure across the region.

Vulnerability Assessment

The vulnerability assessment was updated to use the Texas Flood Social Vulnerability Index (TX F-SVI) rather than the CDC's SVI. This change was expected to produce somewhat different results, but the TX F-SVI was recognized as being more directly tailored to flood-related conditions rather than general social vulnerability. Mrs. Overbey noted that data gaps persisted in certain counties, such as Hardin and Hood, where their small geographic footprints had resulted in negative or missing values in Cycle

1. These issues were attributed to limited data availability in the earlier CDC SVI-based approach.

Flood Impacts

Flood impacts were also discussed in terms of loss of function, including estimates of structural damages, displacement, and related community effects. This analysis had been conducted for all counties during Cycle 1 and was planned again for Cycle 2, with updated results expected to be available by the next meeting.

In terms of graphic presentation, the group planned to update exposure and vulnerability maps. Similar to Cycle 1, bivariate maps would be used to display combinations of high or low exposure and vulnerability, alongside community-wide risk ratings. These maps would provide a visual summary of risk conditions and enable county-level comparisons. The updated results for both existing and future conditions were expected to be available in October, at which time Chapter 2 was tentatively scheduled for approval.

d. Chapter 3 updates

i. Task 3A Floodplain Management Practices – Sheena Providence, FNI

Ms. Providence provided an overview of floodplain management practices based on survey results, data collection, and the 2024 TFMA Higher Standards Survey. The effort compared findings from Cycle 1 to those from Cycle 2, with results compiled into the required Table 6 and supported by R3FPG recommendations. Task 3A documented steady NFIP participation across Region 3, with more than 85% of communities engaged and one new member, Town of Talty, added since Cycle 1. Adoption of higher standards remained consistent, though slightly lower overall, with two-thirds of entities implementing measures such as CRS participation and freeboard requirements. Enforcement practices showed notable improvement, with 72% of participants reporting high or moderate enforcement compared to 56% in Cycle 1. CRS participation included 20 entities, with Dallas achieving a class 3 rating, the highest in the region. Base Flood Elevation requirements remained varied but generally reflected higher protection levels. Overall, Cycle 2 showed incremental progress in enforcement and resilience practices, maintaining strong NFIP engagement and steady use of higher standards.

ii. Task 3B Mitigation Needs Analysis – Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier

Ms. Jones provided an overview of the flood mitigation needs analysis. Task 3B established and applied a comprehensive set of criteria to evaluate emergency needs and long-term flood mitigation priorities. The

analysis incorporated historic flooding, mapping adequacy, NFIP participation, and critical facilities, with the latter expanded to include schools, emergency services, utilities, and assisted living facilities. Scoring reflected both property damage and life-safety risks, including reported fatalities and injuries, and accounted for inadequacies in outdated FEMA mapping. All criteria were integrated into a matrix that generated risk scores, providing a consistent framework to prioritize vulnerable areas and guide mitigation strategies across the region.

11:30 AM – 11:40 AM Break

iii. * Task 3C Goals and Residual Risks – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

The R3RFPG reviewed Task 3C goals from the 2023 Regional Flood Plan and 2025 Amendment to refine metrics and align them with updated baseline data for the 2028 Regional Flood Plan. Two goals were recommended for removal due to verification challenges: Goal 2.C, which required communities to use the latest precipitation and land use data, and Goal 5.D, which called for regular inspections of dams and levees but relied on inaccessible records. Their removal did not affect FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs, as projects were already aligned under other goals.

Several goals were revised to improve clarity and measurability. In summary, the revisions emphasized removing unmeasurable goals, clarifying definitions, and establishing concrete baselines and metrics. Residual risks included reliance on self-reported data, definitional inconsistencies, particularly for nature-based solutions, and consistent tracking across planning cycles.

The RFPG tasked the Technical Consultant with providing a handout of recommended changes to the goals to the RFPG prior to the October RFPG meeting. Task 3C will be discussed once more and approval of modifications to Task 3C Goals and Residual Risks was scheduled for the October RFPG Meeting.

e. Chapters 4 and 5 updates – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

i. Task 4A Potentially Feasible FMEs, FMPs and FMSs

Task 4A centered on identifying potentially feasible FMXs. Outreach was conducted to entities included in the 2023 Regional Flood Plan to confirm the status of recommended actions and determine whether projects had been completed, updated, or remained unchanged. Additional outreach, at the direction of the Technical Subcommittee, extended to entities with hazard mitigation plans adopted since 2022 to explore incorporating flood- or stormwater-related actions into the 2028 Regional Flood Plan. Five

counties expressed interest in including such actions, though further clarification was needed due to the general nature of the mitigation plans.

As of the reporting period, 32 potentially feasible FMXs had been submitted, with one from TRA expected. The majority of new submissions came from the Dallas–Fort Worth area, while the middle and lower basin regions remained underrepresented. Entities that did not respond were assumed to carry forward projects listed in the 2023 Regional Flood Plan, as no instructions were received to remove any items. The solicitation period for new FMXs remained open through September 30, supported by email notifications and social media announcements.

ii. Task 4B Tech Memo

Task 4B involved preparation of a Technical Memorandum (Tech Memo), which was scheduled for submittal to the TWDB by January 7, 2026. The memorandum served as a snapshot of progress in assembling the 2028 Regional Flood Plan at that point in time. Although the formal checklist of requirements from the TWDB had not yet been received, it was anticipated that one would be provided to clarify expectations. The 2023 Regional Flood Plan Tech Memo checklist had primarily emphasized GIS information related to Tasks 1 and 2, as well as Task 3C goals. The purpose of the Tech Memo was to ensure the project remained on track and aligned with TWDB's requirements.

During discussion, it was also noted that the Technical Subcommittee could see changes in membership, with several new board members anticipated. Flexibility in participation was acknowledged, and opportunities for interested members to join the Technical Subcommittee were highlighted.

iii. Task 4C Performance of FMEs &

iv. Task 5B Recommended List of FMEs to be Performed by TWDB

Task 4C focused on converting FMEs and FMSs into FMPs. Existing and newly submitted FMEs were scored to assess their alignment with Flood Infrastructure Fund scoring criteria. During a TWDB hosted Technical Consultant Call in late June, Exhibit C language was clarified, particularly regarding eligibility requirements. It was emphasized that FMEs recommended to be performed by the TWDB must be for rural or small communities, specifically those without sufficient staff capacity to conduct studies independently. This clarification shaped the approach for preparing the list of FMEs recommended for advancement.

The discussion also distinguished between two paths of conversion: (1) advancing FMEs where studies had already been largely completed but required additional modeling or documentation to qualify as FMPs, and (2) initiating new FMXs to better understand flood risks and mitigation needs. While some R3RFPG members expressed disappointment that fewer

FMEs would be conducted than originally anticipated, the Technical Consultants confirmed that financial constraints would limit the number of TWDB performed FMEs, likely to be one per region. The R3RFPG Technical Subcommittee was expected to reconvene after the September 30th submission deadline, with further deliberation anticipated in January 2026 to finalize recommendations and ensure the appropriate categorization and ranking of FMXs.

f. Task 10 Outreach updates – Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications

Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications, provided an update. Public outreach and engagement efforts continued with regular updates to the stakeholder contact list, drawing from email notifications, website sign-ups, and meeting participation. Notifications were distributed regarding nominations for R3RFPG voting positions, announcements were issued for the Technical Subcommittee meeting, and solicitations for FMXs for inclusion in the 2028 Regional Flood Plan were distributed. The Nominating Committee and R3RFPG meetings were also supported by targeted communication efforts. Media advisories were distributed to encourage coverage of the FMX solicitation process and upcoming meetings, and the media list was actively maintained to expand outreach opportunities.

The R3RFPG website was updated with current meeting information, revised statistical content, notices for FMX solicitation, and uploads of draft Regional Flood Planning documents. Social media engagement was maintained through posts on LinkedIn and X (formerly Twitter), which increased visibility and encouraged new stakeholder participation in the LinkedIn group. While no direct media inquiries followed the July 4th flooding, the R3RFPG determined it was appropriate for local representatives in the affected area to serve as primary contacts for coverage. Overall, outreach and communication activities ensured stakeholders, media, and the public were kept informed and engaged throughout the Regional Flood Planning process.

g. Project schedule – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, provided the look-ahead schedule that outlined key milestones through early 2026. For the October R3RFPG meeting, Chapter 2 was scheduled for review along with the completed future exposure analysis, substantial updates on Tasks 3A–3C, and the revised goals discussed during the meeting. A Tech Memo update was also planned, contingent upon receipt of the anticipated checklist from the TWDB. By December 2025, the group expected to seek approvals for Chapter 3 and the Tech Memo, while also revisiting the FME lists assigned to both the R3RFPG and the TWDB.

The Tech Memo was due for submission to the TWDB by January 7, 2026, accompanied by a R3RFPG Technical Subcommittee meeting that month. In February 2026, efforts were to focus on advancing FMEs into FMPs with recommendations prepared for the R3RFPG. March 26, 2026, is the deadline for submitting to TWDB the finalized list of FMEs to be advanced to FMPs, maintaining alignment with reporting and planning requirements. These milestones ensured the planning process remained on schedule and responsive to technical and administrative needs.

Updates from liaisons for adjoining coastal regions

- a. Region 5 Neches RFPG: Katie Koslan, TWDB, stated R5RFPG were meeting every month.
- b. Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG: Scott Harris, Gulf Coast Authority, stated there were no updates.

Update from Planning Group Sponsor – Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel, TRA

A reminder was given to vote on the October R3RFPG meeting date and time poll.

Receive registered public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

No registered public comments were received.

Announcements

No announcements were made.

Confirm meeting date for next meeting


Friday, October 3, 9:00 AM at the Trinity River Authority of Texas General Office
5300 S Collins Street, Arlington, TX 76018

Consider agenda for next meeting

Adjourn

1:10 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 AUGUST 6, 2025.



SCOTT HARRIS, Secretary
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

12/10/25
Date



GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

12/23/2025
Date