

Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group Meeting
Tuesday, December 9, 2025
1:00 p.m.

The Region 3 Trinity Flood Planning Group convened a public meeting, in person as well as virtual, on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, 1:00 p.m.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m.

Voting Members Present:

Melissa Bookhout
Glenn Clingenpeel
Scott Harris, absent
Sean Howard, joined after roll call
Andrew Isbell, absent
Jordan Macha, absent
Rachel Ickert
Galen Roberts
Matt Robinson
Lissa Shepard
Sarah Standifer, joined after roll call

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

Ex Officio Members Present:

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

Approval of the Minutes for the October 3, 2025, Meeting

Motion: Matt Robinson 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

Cheryl Boggs Savage introduced herself as a Board Member of the Westwood Shores Community at Lake Livingston and noted that she was also a resident of the community. That was the extent of her comments.

TWDB Update – Katie Koslan, TWDB

Katie Koslan provided an update on behalf of TWDB. There was limited new information to report since the previous meeting. It was noted that the Technical Memorandum was due on January 7, 2026, and that a seven-day public notice was required prior to the meeting at which acceptance of the Technical Memorandum would be considered for approval by the R3RFPG. The TWDB had made adjustments to the Technical Memorandum checklist in response to issues identified by other regions, including the addition of Exhibit C Tables 12, 13, and 14. A Chair-Led conference call was held on December 3, 2025, to discuss regional approaches to Task 5B, and the recording and presentation materials were posted on the TWDB's [website](#). Additionally, a newsletter summarizing flood planning updates from August through November was distributed on November 18, 2025.

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

No update was provided.

Updates from Region 3 Technical Consultant – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, provided an overview of the progress on multiple chapters of the regional flood plan. Draft Chapter 2 had been prepared and was ready for R3RFPG approval. Draft Chapter 3 was also ready for approval, with several section updates to be presented prior to requesting approval. Chapter 4 included several updates that were presented for discussion. It was noted that the Technical Memorandum was due to the TWDB on January 7, 2026. Chapter 8, which contained a running list of items for potential consideration as proposed improvements for the third cycle of regional flood planning, was also reviewed. Additionally, public outreach activities and the project schedule were identified as topics for discussion during the meeting.

- a. * Consider Approving Draft Chapter 2 (Existing and Future Flood Risk) – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

It was reported that there was no new or substantially different information to present for Chapter 2, as it had been discussed over several meetings. The existing conditions and future conditions sections were finalized. The Chapter had gone through the public comment process, during which a small number of editorial comments were received and addressed. As a result, Draft Chapter 2 was complete and ready for approval.

The Technical Consultants recommended that the motion to approve Chapter 2 include flexibility to make non-substantive changes to the chapter as necessary to meet the requirements of the work plan and the onboard contract.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve Draft Chapter 2 as presented, to include flexibility to make non-substantive changes before inclusion in the 2028 Flood Plan

Motion: Rachel Ickert moved to approve Draft Chapter 2 as presented, to include flexibility to make non-substantive changes before inclusion in the 2028 Flood Plan;

Second: Matt Robinson; Action: Motion was unanimously approved.

- b. Chapter 3 Updates

- i. * Task 3A Floodplain Management Practices – Shena Providence, FNI

Ms. Providence stated the six Floodplain Management Practices and noted that the R3RFPG had been discussing the adoption or recommendation of consistent minimum standards across the region over several meetings. For background, it was explained that the concept was initially introduced in August 2025 and was discussed in greater detail during the October 2025 meeting, when the R3RFPG considered whether to adopt or recommend the standards on a regional basis.

It was reiterated that adopting the standards would make them a requirement, which would limit which entities could submit certain FMXs and would impose an additional requirement on project sponsors. In contrast, recommending the standards would be consistent with the approach used in Cycle One, allowing any entity to submit FMXs while keeping the standards advisory. It was also clarified that recommended standards could be stated generally, whereas adopted standards would require specific, prescriptive language that could be followed verbatim.

It was explained that if the R3RFPG chose to adopt, rather than recommend, any of the floodplain management practices, the Technical Consultant Team would recommend requiring only the first two practices.

This recommendation was based on the fact that participation in the NFIP is ultimately required to obtain FIF funding for FMXs. It was noted, however, that NFIP participation is limited to cities and counties that meet population requirements, which could exclude townships or small towns from submitting FMXs and may therefore present a limitation. Statistically, it was estimated that 12% of the region might be excluded, as approximately 88% of the region is currently participating in the NFIP.

Lissa Shepard, Dallas County, proposed that the first and second floodplain management practices be requirements, noting that they were closely related in her view. She emphasized that the first item was particularly significant to the TWDB. She concluded that, in her opinion, requiring these practices was important for maintaining eligibility for future funding.

Glenn Clingenpeel asked Katie Koslan to determine whether participation in the NFIP was required to be eligible for FIF funding, and if so, whether entities would still be considered eligible by the TWDB if they adopted standards separate from NFIP that were equivalent to NFIP.

Katie Koslan responded via comment in the chat function of the video conference that: "While floodplain management ordinances and regulations may vary significantly between communities, especially those that may have higher standards, the TWDB is simply verifying that the NFIP minimum standard is in place and primarily relying on the signed certification that active enforcement is occurring. Within Texas there are approximately 1,400 cities and counties and of those about 1,200 participate in the NFIP and thus have NFIP standards in place. Verification of NFIP-participating communities should be straightforward. Of the remaining 200 that do not participate in the NFIP, they may or may not have floodplain management standards in place. For those, TWDB will review the ordinances and regulations provided to assess if they are comparable to NFIP minimum requirements".

David Rivera, FNI, commented that if an entity was not participating in the NFIP, the application would need to include a statement committing to make an effort to become an NFIP member, which applies only to cities and counties. He noted that the eligibility of other types of entities was not addressed. He further stated that entities with equivalent standards should be able to apply for funding, but clarification from the TWDB would be required.

Rachel Ickert, TRWD, asked whether the region wanted to be in a position of implementing requirements that exceed what the TWDB mandates. She noted that this was primarily a question of principle and policy and observed that similar situations were currently occurring in the water planning sector, where regions were implementing measures beyond TWDB requirements. Rachel cautioned the R3RFPG that there could be

unintended consequences and identified this concern as her only hesitation.

Matt Robinson, BGE, stated that he supported the first and second floodplain management practices. Drawing from his development background, he suggested keeping the standards flexible to allow other semi-governmental entities the option to participate, provided they meet equivalent standards. He expressed hesitation regarding the fifth practice (Land use standards to reduce future flood risk.), noting that it could lead to unintended consequences potentially unfavorable to landowners. Overall, he indicated support for practices one and two.

Rachel Ickert, TRWD, asked what benefit the R3RFPG would gain by implementing requirements that exceeded those already established by the TWDB for all regions.

Glenn Clingenpeel responded that the benefit would be inherent in the practice being considered, as it provides the associated advantages of that particular practice. He noted that implementing additional requirements would give the group flexibility in how the flood planning process is carried out within the region. Specifically, it would allow the R3RFPG to encourage participation through incentives or guidance, though he clarified that this statement was not an endorsement of any particular practice.

Rachel Ickert, TRWD, stated that she was not opposed to the idea of additional requirements but expressed concern that it might position the R3RFPG as a regulatory body, which may not align with its intended role. She further noted that the TWDB already encourages, and in some cases quasi-requires, certain standards when entities submit applications for funding.

Glenn Clingenpeel stated that if there was no further discussion, the R3RFPG could entertain a motion on whether to adopt any or all of the proposed practices or, as done previously, carry them forward as recommendations.

The R3RFPG agreed to table the decision to allow time to obtain additional information, articulate the issues with greater specificity, and include relevant numerical details. The discussion will be revisited at a later meeting when the R3RFPG is better prepared to deliberate. It was noted that any future changes would not impact the submission of the Technical Memorandum.

- ii. Task 3B Mitigation Needs Analysis (example scoring) - Julie Jones, Nathan D. Maier

Ms. Jones shared that a review was conducted of the various scoring criteria. Statistical data from all basins were analyzed, median values were

calculated, and these were assigned to the mid-range score, with lower and higher scores adjusted proportionately to reflect relative conditions. The scoring framework from the previous cycle was used as the base file and was amended as needed to reflect current conditions, as some criteria required updates.

The R3RFPG previously approved scoring was reviewed, along with examples demonstrating how results from one HUC-12 across five basins would be applied, including fragmented HUC-12s. Significant effort was undertaken by the Technical Consultants to complete this work.

Flood risk knowledge gaps at the HUC-12 level were discussed, noting substantial uncertainties. It was indicated that completion of comprehensive flood mapping would significantly reduce these uncertainties.

- iii. * Consider approving Draft Chapter 3 (Floodplain Management Practices, Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis, and Flood Protection Goals)

The R3RFPG agreed to retain Chapter 3 in draft form, as the Task 3A floodplain management practice was tabled for discussion during the meeting.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve Draft Chapter 3, sections 3B and 3C and revisit 3A at a later date.

Motion: Matt Robinson moved to approve Draft Chapter 3, sections 3B and 3C and revisit 3A at a later date;

Second: Lissa Shepard; Action: Motion passed unanimously

c. Chapter 4 Updates – Audrey Geisler-Klump, Halff

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

Audrey Geisler-Klump, Halff, presented that a total of 139 actions were discussed between the Technical Consultant Team and potential sponsors. From those discussions, 126 actions were formally submitted for the R3RFPG's consideration. Based on the current review, three FMPs were downgraded to FMEs. As reflected in the adjusted figures shown in the pie chart, 27 FMSs remained. At this stage, the R3RFPG proceeded with 43 FMPs and 56 FMEs.

In all three downgraded cases, the projects were not supported by a hydraulic model capable of demonstrating compliance with the TWDB's no negative impact requirement. Consequently, these projects were moved into an evaluation phase to develop the necessary models, with the intent that they could later be resubmitted as FMPs once sufficient supporting information is available.

It was clarified that one FME and one FMP were combined into a single FMP. Additionally, two FMEs were consolidated into one or two existing FMPs, as appropriate. These combinations were made because the projects were substantively the same.

Task 4A was not expected to be substantially complete for the Technical Memorandum and therefore represented a snapshot in time. The figures presented, including the stated adjustments, reflected the numbers that would be carried forward for the Technical Memorandum submittal. Tables 12, 13, and 14 included in the Technical Memorandum packet reflecting the status as of November 21, 2025 and did not incorporate information received the previous day. Accordingly, adjustments to those tables would be required in the packet, specifically moving the affected FMPs from Table 13 to Table 12 so that the same information is presented in a different table to meet TWDB requirements.

On January 7, 2026 the potentially feasible FMXs lists would be submitted as part of the Technical Memorandum to the TWDB, with the understanding that these lists may change as the recommendations process and other required actions or evaluations progress.

By January 2026, FME scoring should be completed, and a ranked list of FMEs presented to the Technical Subcommittee. This will follow the process previously recommended by the Technical Subcommittee and approved by the R3RFPG to identify FMEs to be promoted to FMPs through Task 4C, and that process would continue as planned.

On January 20, 2026 the R3RFPG Technical Subcommittee will meet to review the scored and ranked FMEs, finalize the list of FMEs to advance to FMPs, and determine how they would be submitted to R3RFPG and the TWDB.

- ii. * Consider Approving Technical Memorandum (Task 4B) for Submittal to TWDB – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, shared that the Technical Memorandum represents a snapshot in time, intended to demonstrate to the TWDB that the R3RFPG's plan is progressing and that the scope of work is being addressed. It is understood that adjustments, refinements, corrections, and reorganization can continue after the submittal, as this document primarily serves to show progress. The submittal requires extensive documentation, and a draft Technical Memorandum was submitted last week. Additionally, the R3RFPG will need to include draft meeting minutes from today's meeting which will be incorporated into the package sent to the TWDB.

Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel called for a motion to approve the Technical Memorandum for submittal to TWDB with appropriate attachments.

Motion: Sarah Standifer moved to approve the Technical Memorandum for submittal to TWDB with appropriate attachments;
Second: Lissa Shepard; Action: Motion passed unanimously.

iii. Task 4C Performance of FMEs – Audrey Geisler-Klump, Halff

Audrey Geisler-Klump, Halff, stated that following R3RFPG consideration, the Technical Consultant Team would initiate Task 4C, under which the selected FMEs would be advanced to FMPs based on the approved list. By March 26, 2026 and in advance of that deadline per the proposed schedule, the list of FMEs to be handled by the TWDB would be submitted, along with other required supporting materials.

d. Task 8 Updates – Stephanie Griffin, Halff

Stephanie Griffin, Halff introduced Chapter 8 as a “parking lot” of ideas intended to inform improvements in future cycles of regional flood planning, consistent with the approach used during the first planning cycle. The chapter organized potential recommendations into four categories: administrative and regulatory, funding opportunities, legislative considerations, and an “other” category for additional items.

Several initial items were discussed. The Technical Consultants recommended that the TWDB re-evaluate the formula used to allocate funding across regions for the third planning cycle, with consideration given to factors such as data availability, regional acreage, and population. It was noted that Region 3, despite its large geographic size and number of counties, experienced a reduction in funding from the first to the second cycle while other regions received increases, creating funding constraints and implementation challenges.

The Technical Consultants also recommended that Exhibits C and D be released concurrently with the scope of work during the contracting phase to provide more complete information for sponsors during contract development. Additional items included the need for clearer documentation in Exhibit C regarding floodplain management practices and the recognition of FMXs implemented outside the regional flood planning process or the Flood Infrastructure Fund.

Discussion further highlighted concerns regarding funding accessibility for smaller and rural communities, particularly related to local match requirements and administrative capacity. Examples were cited where communities declined funding opportunities, including early flood warning systems, due to an inability to meet match requirements or manage grant administration. The group noted that the complexity, timing, and length of the overall planning and funding process may present barriers to effective implementation and disproportionately impact smaller communities.

Potential opportunities to improve accessibility, streamline processes, and provide development or grant assistance, possibly through regional entities or councils of governments, were identified for further consideration. The discussion concluded with the understanding that Chapter 8 would remain a living record of issues and recommendations, with additional input to be incorporated and refined as the chapter is formally developed.

e. Task 10 Outreach Updates – Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications

Dorothy White, Cooksey Communications, provided an update. Ongoing stakeholder outreach activities were conducted, including updates to the stakeholder contact list, distribution of notifications regarding the availability of Draft Chapters 2 and 3 and the Technical Memorandum, and the posting of meeting agendas and materials on the project website.

In response to a request made at the October R3RFPG meeting, a general public education presentation was developed. A OneDrive link to the presentation was to be distributed following the meeting, with members encouraged to download and customize their own copies. The presentation was designed to be adaptable, including optional slides and a placeholder slide for highlighting local accomplishments from the first planning cycle. Feedback and suggested revisions were to be submitted via the project email address for incorporation into updated versions.

Technical Consultant support was offered to assist members in tailoring the presentation and providing additional information as needed. Media outreach activities for the meeting included the distribution of media advisories and continued maintenance of media contact lists. The project website and social media platforms were kept current with draft postings and meeting materials, and growth and engagement of the project's LinkedIn group continued, with members encouraged to share and engage with posted updates to expand stakeholder awareness and participation.

f. Project Schedule

Stephanie Griffin, Halff, shared that the R3RFPG is on target to meet the Tech Memo deadline of January 7, 2026, and appreciation was expressed for R3RFPG approvals. On January 20, 2026, the R3RFPG Technical Subcommittee will meet to work on the three designated tasks. In February, the R3RPG will convene to consider approval of the lists for submission to the TWDB to advance FMEs to FMPs, as well as the lists for the R3RFPG to advance FMEs to FMPs. Following the February meeting, the R3RFPG will be in a position to transition to a quarterly meeting schedule. March 26, 2026, marks the firm deadline to submit the list of FMEs to the TWDB for evaluation. In addition to the FMEs, several accompanying submittals will also need to be provided by that date.

Updates from liaisons for adjoining coastal regions

- a. Region 5 Neches RFPG: No update was provided
- b. Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG: Todd Burrer shared that his region will begin public engagement meetings in January, with a total of five in-person meetings planned for that month.

Update from Planning Group Sponsor – Chairman Glenn Clingenpeel, TRA

The Technical Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for January 20, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. In February, the R3RPG will meet in Huntsville, pending confirmation of the facility.

Receive registered public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Grace Darling, Arlington Conservation Council, questioned why approximately 12% of the region lacks any plan or access to funding and expressed concern about why these areas are effectively being orphaned. She asked whether anyone is closely monitoring or advocating for those communities.

Glenn Clingenpeel responded that the 12% referenced consists of areas that are outside of the National Flood Insurance Program.

Announcements

There were no general announcements from planning group members.

Confirm meeting date for next meeting

In February, the R3RPG will meet in Huntsville, pending confirmation of a venue.

Adjourn

2:35 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 DECEMBER 9, 2025.



HEATHER FIRN, Acting Secretary
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

January 5, 2026

Date



GLENN CLINGENPEEL, Chair
REGION 3 TRINITY FLOOD PLANNING GROUP

January 5, 2026

Date