Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Meeting
Tuesday, June 3, 2025
9:00 a.m.

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group convened a public meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Tuesday, June 3, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel opened the meeting at 9:03 a.m.

Voting Members Present:

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

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

Ex Officio Members Present:

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

Amanda Young

Approval of the Minutes of the March 12, 2025, Meeting

Motion: Galen Roberts moved to approve the minutes as presented;
Second: Matt Robinson; 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, TWDB, provided an update. 2028 Regional Flood Planning Contract amendments were executed between the TWDB and the regional project sponsors. The sponsors were advised to coordinate with their Technical Consultants to determine whether their subcontracts required amendments to reflect the updated interim deadlines stated in the amended TWDB contract. If amendments were necessary, sponsors were asked to submit the executed amended subcontracts for review. The next quarterly payment request was expected to be submitted by Region 3 RFPG Sponsor within the following weeks.

On May 1, 2025, the future conditions cursory floodplain dataset became available on the TWDB Flood Planning Data Hub. While the document reflected a largely completed body of work, a small number of outstanding comments remained under review by the TWDB. Any significant updates were to be noted as needed. A conference call of RFPG Chairs was held on May 30, 2025, during which outreach lessons learned from 2023 Regional Flood Planning were discussed. Chairs were encouraged to participate and present in future calls.

The completed and accepted Category One reports for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2025 Flood Infrastructure Fund (FIF) were made available for download on the TWDB FIF website. The Board approved the prioritization list for Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs) and Flood Management Projects (FMPs) for the FY 2024–2025 FIF funding. Formal invitations to apply were issued to 17 FMEs and two FMPs. The next FIF Intended Use Plan was tentatively scheduled for public comment during the winter of 2025–2026.

Update from the Policy Subcommittee – Rachel Ickert, TRWD

The Policy Subcommittee has not met since the previous RFPG meeting.
No updates were provided.

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

Scott Harris provided an update. It was reported that while the Nominating Committee activity had not been intensive, candidates had been tracked as applications were received. The call for nominations remained open until June 20, 2025, after which the Nominating Committee planned to convene to review and recommend candidates for appointment.

Mr. Harris noted that three R3RFPG voting positions remained without candidates: electric generating utilities, small business, and agricultural interests. Nominating Committee members and R3RFPG voting and non-voting members were encouraged to forward the posting to any interested individuals and submit their names for consideration. No additional documentation, such as resumes, was required for existing R3RFPG voting members wishing to continue serving, as prior appointment records were deemed sufficient.

It was confirmed that R3RFPG voting member terms would expire in July. One seat was officially vacant, and two seats were tentatively available pending the current R3RFPG voting members' decisions to continue. One R3RFPG voting member expressed a desire not to continue, while the other faced a potential disqualification due to relocation. However, it was determined that the latter could remain eligible. The Nominating Committee's ongoing efforts to maintain and fill these seats were acknowledged and appreciated.

Updates from Region 3 Technical Consultant – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, provided an overview of the agenda. It was noted that Chapter One had been completed, and a draft was posted for review by R3RFPG voting members. Katie Overbey, Halff, was scheduled to present Chapter One and outline the timeline for final comments to ensure incorporation prior to the next R3RFPG meeting. Chapter One will be approved at the next R3RFPG meeting. R3RFPG voting members will review individual chapters separately to avoid overwhelming members with a full draft all at once. Ms. Griffin mentioned that Chapters Two and Three would likely be released in close succession. Ms. Overbey presented on Chapter 2, Task 2A Existing Conditions Flood Risk Analyses, followed by a presentation on Task 2B Future Conditions Flood Risk Analyses given by Sam Amoako-Atta, Halff and Dr. Nick Fang, UTA. Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier was assigned to present Chapter Three, Task 3B Mitigation Needs Analysis, while Chapter Four, Tasks 4A and Task 4C, would be presented by Audrey Giesler-Klump, Halff. The Technical Subcommittee met on May 14, 2025, to review Tasks 4A and 4C and planned to report their findings and request action, contingent on the presence of a quorum. In the absence of a quorum, informal direction from R3RFPG voting members would be requested. Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications, was expected to conclude the meeting with updates on public outreach.

a. Task 1 Planning Area Description – Audrey Giesler-Klump, Katie Overbey, and Sam Amoako-Atta, Halff; David Rivera, FNI; Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier

The discussion began with a brief review of Chapter One. The team explained that Chapter One included an infographic providing a regional overview in alignment with the content of each subsequent chapter. Notably, the Trinity region was characterized by a near-even split between urban development and working lands, such as cattle and row crop operations. Clarification was provided regarding the definition of "working lands," confirming these referred strictly to agricultural, ranching, and timber uses. Additionally, flood infrastructure and mitigation efforts introduced in Chapter One were highlighted as foundational elements for further discussion.

The presentation then shifted to changes from the previous planning cycle, notably the transition from the CDC's Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) to the Texas Flood SVI (TX F-SVI). The TX F-SVI incorporated 18 flood-specific factors, compared to 15 in the CDC's version, and included rural and urban distinctions previously omitted. It was noted that the TX F-SVI appeared to provide a more conservative assessment of flood vulnerability, particularly in areas experiencing significant growth. Questions were posed from R3RFPG members regarding the influence of rural housing density on social vulnerability scores, and it was clarified that higher numbers of rural housing units were assumed to indicate increased vulnerability.

An overview of infrastructure assessment tool and methodology was provided. The first flood planning cycle lacked sufficient data, prompting the TWDB to develop a standardized toolkit and guidance to improve assessments of infrastructure condition and functionality. Assets such as dams, levees, reservoirs, and wetlands were evaluated using this framework. Results indicated that 72% of dams in the Trinity region met expected service levels, while 28% were classified as non-functional. However, the R3RFPG members raised concerns regarding the terminology, as many of the assessments were based on low-confidence data that do not necessarily or even explicitly indicate a dam is not functioning as designed. R3RFPG members emphasized the need for clearer labeling and better public communication to avoid misinterpretation, particularly given the misleading implications of the term "non-functional."

There was considerable discussion regarding the use of the terms "functional" and "non-functional" in infrastructure assessments. It was acknowledged that these terms were prescribed by existing guidance; however, R3RFPG members expressed the need to clarify their meaning to prevent misinterpretation, particularly by the public and non-technical audiences. The Technical Consultants proposed including explanatory language to communicate that a "non-functional" rating does not necessarily indicate a complete failure of the structure but rather reflects limitations in meeting updated standards or modeling outcomes. It was emphasized that the condition of many structures had not changed, only the evaluation

methodology had evolved.

The R3RFPG members suggested communicating concerns to those responsible for the guidance, and Katie Koslan, TWDB, agreed to raise the issue with leadership, although she noted that the infrastructure toolkit had recently been finalized. There was general agreement that the terminology could be misleading and might prompt incorrect assumptions about system performance. R3RFPG members suggested incorporating clearer definitions and potentially comparing technical classifications to alternate terms in public-facing graphics to avoid public misinterpretation. **The Technical Consultants were asked to develop strategies for improving the messaging and presentation of assessment results.**

Further discussion focused on how assessments categorized structures as "deficient," particularly when no documentation existed but criteria such as age or ownership triggered the classification. Concerns were raised about the potential for overstated conclusions, especially when used in advocacy or public materials. The Technical Consultants discussed integrating hazard classification and usage type into reporting and agreed to continue refining the framework.

Finally, updates to Chapter 1 were presented, including the incorporation of additional project sources and hazard mitigation plans. Assumptions made during data compilation were documented, and clarifications were made regarding structural versus non-structural projects and local regulatory updates.

b. Summary of participation in Data Collection Tool – Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier

Ms. Jones provided an update on results from the Data Collection Tool. In addition to survey responses, the Technical Consultants reviewed city, county, and other entity websites to assess updates to flood-related regulations. Many communities had strengthened or expanded their regulations since the first flood planning cycle, contributing to higher regulation counts in this cycle. For entities that did not complete a new survey, the team relied on the information from the previous cycle unless updated information was found online. This approach ensured continuity and accuracy in capturing regulatory progress.

The data collection tool summary indicated that 24 communities completed the survey, with most indicating plans to pursue multiple types of flood mitigation projects. The most common project categories included storm drainage systems and tunnels, flood insurance participation (NFIP), and floodplain management ordinances. Nature-based solutions, levees, and flood walls were among the least selected project types. Data from hazard

mitigation plans showed a total of 996 specific projects, with *Equipment Procurement for Response* being the most frequently identified project, while *Buyouts and Acquisitions* were the least common. The draft chapter summarizing these findings was posted to the website for review, with comments requested from R3RFPG members by the end of the month in preparation for approval at the August meeting.

c. Task 2 Existing (Task 2A) and Future (Task 2B) Conditions Flood Risk Analyses Update – Katie Overbey, Audrey Giesler-Klump, Sam Amoako-Atta, Halff; David Rivera, FNI; Dr. Nick Fang, UTA

The Task 2A update on existing conditions flood risk analyses provided an overview of the current data and methodology used to assess flood risk across the region. The region was fully covered by Base Level Engineering (BLE) data, with two specific areas, Lower West Fork Trinity and Lower Trinity, having newly received BLE data from the TWDB. These areas were the only parts of the region using 2D BLE, while the rest remained covered by 1D BLE. FEMA's information and the National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) were also utilized, along with other datasets including pluvial flood modeling and existing data from previous analyses. The Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) cutoff date was set at May 31, 2025, to prevent continuous updates beyond the data deadline.

The analysis categorized flood types as riverine, coastal, and pluvial, with riverine being the most common across the region. A flood quilt was used to visualize and overlay flood types and events, and updates were ongoing to incorporate new BLE data, particularly for the Lower Trinity area. Unlike the first flood planning cycle, the current analysis also included 10-year flood event data for a more comprehensive understanding of flood risks. Some updates to flood extents were expected in Liberty County and coastal areas where new BLE data may supersede prior information.

A data collection survey was conducted to gather input from local entities. A total of 68 entities responded, with most completing the full survey. The responses were well-distributed across the region, resulting in a higher completion rate than the first flood planning cycle. The Trinity River Authority participated but was not shown on the map due to its coverage of the entire region. Despite multiple outreach efforts, the City of Fort Worth did not respond to the survey, though it had significant project representation from the first flood planning cycles.

During the update for Task 2B, Technical Consultants presented the preliminary results of the TWDB's FATHOM Future Conditions Flood Risk Modeling Study and sought feedback from the R3RFPG on the preferred approach for mapping future flood extents. The TWDBs study used

scenarios based on projected changes in temperature, rainfall, land use, and subsidence to generate a range of potential future flood conditions. Scenarios 1 through 3 were based on increasing levels of climate forcing: Scenario 1 reflected minimal forcing, Scenario 2 moderate, and Scenario 3 significant climate forcing. Scenarios 4 and 5 were structured to support sensitivity analyses, with Scenario 5 representing baseline existing conditions.

The Technical Consultants reviewed a comparison of the current base flood extent to the results from Scenario 3 and discussed modeling methods, data inputs, and assumptions. The R3RFPG raised concerns regarding the limitations of the TWDB study, including its broad geographic scope, generalized assumptions, and insufficient incorporation of localized conditions. Technical Consultants emphasized the importance of supplementing the TWDBs results with regional engineering judgment and local knowledge, noting that variations in upstream and downstream conditions were observed and that red flags warranted further scrutiny of the model's accuracy in specific watersheds.

The Technical Consultants explained that the modeling relied on a projected increase in temperature of up to two degrees Celsius by 2060. This projection was input into a general circulation model (GCM), producing an ensemble of rainfall outcomes. The 17th, 50th, and 83rd percentile results were used to define Scenarios 1, 2, and 3, respectively. It was clarified that while rainfall projections varied between scenarios, other parameters such as land use change and subsidence were held constant, based on USGS datasets. The R3RFPG members expressed concern that emphasizing climate-related uncertainty may inadvertently understate the inherent uncertainty in these static inputs.

Given these factors, the group supported a range-based approach for mapping potential future flood conditions, consistent with the method used in the first planning cycle. A new hybrid approach was proposed: **using the lowest inundation extent between Scenarios 1 and 5 to define the best-case future scenario, and Scenario 3 to define the worst-case.** Scenario 5 reflects current baseline existing conditions, while Scenario 1 includes minimal climate change. This hybrid method would capture both climate and land use uncertainty more effectively and provide a realistic depiction of potential flood risk for planning purposes. Katie Koslan mentioned that future flood risk scenarios were bounded by current conditions. Specifically, the future flood risk frequency/probability for a given location could not be less than the current frequency/probability.

R3RFPG members and Technical Consultants acknowledged the practical implications of expanding mapped flood zones, such as increased construction and insurance costs, and emphasized the need to communicate

uncertainty transparently. The approach of depicting flood risk as a range with appropriate caveats was favored for its clarity and credibility. Technical Consultants confirmed there were no major technical impediments to implementing the hybrid approach, though it would require additional processing time. The R3RFPG members and Technical Consultants concluded by agreeing to proceed with developing the hybrid "Scenario 1/5" for best-case mapping and Scenario 3 for worst-case mapping, pending technical confirmation and subsequent review of the resulting maps.

Adjourned 11:01-11:09 AM

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

Ms. Jones provided an update on Chapter 3, focusing on the flood mapping needs component of Task 3B Mitigation Needs Analysis. Ten criteria were reviewed, several of which had been discussed in previous meetings, including the Social Vulnerability Index and the definition of emergency need. The primary focus of this update was the existing modeling analysis used to determine mapping needs. Previously, the criterion for identifying mapping needs was based on the presence or absence of BLE data. However, BLE coverage is now available for the entire region.

Given the full BLE coverage, the group discussed revising the mapping needs criterion. The proposed approach was to categorize data based on the level and age of detail: (1) detailed studies less than 10 years old, (2) detailed studies more than 10 years old, and (3) approximate studies including BLE. This three-tier hierarchy would be used to score each HUC12, with higher scores assigned to areas with less reliable or outdated data, indicating a greater mapping need. The group also discussed but ultimately decided not to further subdivide BLE data by 1D versus 2D modeling, concluding that this distinction was already reflected in the current hierarchy.

The R3RFPG confirmed alignment on the revised criteria and agreed that these three categories would be incorporated into the updated mapping needs analysis for the region.

e. Technical Subcommittee Report on Tasks 4A & Task 4C – Audrey Giesler-Klump, Halff

Ms. Giesler-Klump provided an update on Task 4A, which involved identifying potentially feasible flood mitigation actions (FMXs: FMEs, FMPs, FMSs). The Technical Subcommittee met once in May and developed recommendations for this process. The purpose of Task 4A was to gather project ideas and determine whether they could be included in the regional flood plan. At this stage, no recommendations were made; rather, the focus was on solicitation and initial evaluation.

The Technical Subcommittee recommended a two-pronged outreach strategy: passive outreach through email blasts, website announcements, and posts on LinkedIn and X (formerly Twitter), and direct outreach to two specific groups. These groups included (1) entities with FMXs in the current flood plan, who were contacted to confirm continued inclusion or removal, and (2) entities with newly updated hazard mitigation plans since the first flood planning cycle, to ensure relevant projects could be submitted for inclusion.

The call for FMXs was scheduled to begin following approval of the process at the current (June 2025) R3RPFG meeting and was set to close on September 30, 2025. This timeline was necessary to meet the January 7, 2026, deadline for Task 4B (the Technical Memo).

i. *Consider approving sponsor outreach for 2028 Flood Plan (FMX solicitation) based on Technical Subcommittee recommendation

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve the process for identifying potentially feasible FMXs as presented.

Motion: Scott Harris moved to approve the process for identifying potentially feasible FMXs as presented.
Second: Galen Roberts; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

Task 4C, a new requirement from the TWDB was designed to advance Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs) to Flood Management Projects (FMPs) during the second flood planning cycle. The Technical Subcommittee met in May and developed a recommended process for this task. The process included methods for soliciting, prioritizing, and selecting FMEs for advancement. Both new FMEs submitted through the Task 4A solicitation and FMEs from the first flood planning cycle were considered.

FMEs were prioritized using the 2024 State Flood Plan ranking criteria to ensure consistency with statewide evaluations. In the event of a tie, preference was given to FMEs that had been in the plan longer. FMEs without an interested sponsor were removed from consideration. FMEs not selected for advancement would remain as FMEs in the 2028 regional flood plan. The Technical Consultants anticipated requesting a Notice to Proceed for Task 5 to allow modeling to begin, noting that while procedural language in the TWDB contract required FMEs to be "recommended" for modeling, precedent from the first flood planning cycle suggested flexibility.

Selected FMEs would be ranked on a single list, from which the R3FPG would undertake a portion, and the remainder would be submitted to TWDB for performance. This approach was intended to maximize the number of FMEs that could become actionable FMPs in the final flood plan.

TWDB confirmed that the Technical Consultants were permitted to work under Task 4C to perform FMEs for the purpose of identifying and evaluating additional FMPs that would ultimately be recommended under Task 5. This clarified that the recommended action would be the FMP, not the FME, thereby allowing such work to proceed under Task 4C.

ii. *Consider approving process to promote potential FMEs to FMPs based on Technical Subcommittee recommendation

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve the process for promoting potential FMEs to FMPs as presented.

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to approve the process for promoting potential FMEs to FMPs as presented.
Second: Lissa Shepard; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

f. Outreach update: Dorothy White, Cooksey

Ms. White provided an update. The Technical Consultants conducted stakeholder engagement by updating the contact list and incorporating information from previous data collection activities. The list included 971 total contacts, with 906 email subscribers. The Technical Consultants continued to add new contacts from website subscription requests, meeting attendees, and public commenters.

Email blasts were developed and distributed for various purposes, including R3RFPG voting member position nominations, the Technical Subcommittee meeting, and the R3RFPG meeting. The media list was also updated, and follow-ups were conducted to encourage media interest and increase public awareness of the planning process.

Website and social media platforms (LinkedIn and X) were regularly updated. Links related to data collection were removed following the conclusion of that effort, and current meeting information was posted. Drafting began for the next phase of outreach content. Email campaign performance metrics showed strong engagement, with open rates exceeding typical government standards (around 40–50%) and click rates ranging between 5–8%, indicating active user interaction with the provided content.

g. Project schedule: Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Ms. Griffin provided a look-ahead outlining key upcoming milestones. In August, they planned to request approval of Chapter 1 and present progress on Tasks 2A, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 4A. They also reported ongoing work on goals, specifically identifying baseline information that had previously been

marked as "to be determined." For October, they anticipated having Chapters 2 and 3 ready for approval. In December, they expected to request approval of Task 4A and the technical memorandum, which would summarize progress on the first four tasks, excluding Task 4C. The next meeting was scheduled for August 6 at 10:00 a.m.

Updates from liaisons for adjoining coastal regions

a. Region 5 Neches RFPG: Katie Koslan, TWDB, provided an update. Region 5 RFPG held a meeting in May and was working on Tasks 1 through 4, similar to the other regions. However, they had not yet prepared any draft chapters, indicating that Region 5 was slightly behind in comparison. Their next meeting was scheduled for July.

b. Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG: Scott Harris stated there was no update for Region 6 RFPG. No participants offered additional comments.

Update from Planning Group Sponsor – Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel, TRA

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel did not have any significant updates to report but noted they were working on scheduling the August meeting.

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

August 6, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. located at the Tarrant Regional Water District Richland Chambers Lake Office 140 Farm to Market 416, Streetman, TX 75859.

Consider agenda for next meeting

Adjourn

11:45 AM 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 JUNE 3, 2025.

SCOTT HARRIS, Secretary
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

12/18/25
Date

GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

12/23/2025
Date