Item 1: Call to Order
Item 2:
Welcome and Roll Call
Item 3:
Texas Water Development Board Update
Item 4: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items 5-16 (limit of 3 minutes per person)
Item 5:
Approval of minutes from the previous meeting.
### Meeting Minutes
Region 6 San Jacinto Flood Planning Group Meeting
December 10, 2020
9:00AM
CISCO WebEx Virtual Meeting

#### Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Member</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Present / / Absent / Alternate Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Macia Donovan</td>
<td>Agricultural interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Max</td>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Lock</td>
<td>Electric generating utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah P. Bernhardt</td>
<td>Environmental interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ A. Poppe, Chair</td>
<td>Flood districts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy E. Buscha</td>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Costello</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Fisler</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrett</td>
<td>River authorities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Armstrong</td>
<td>Small business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allia Vinson</td>
<td>Water districts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burrier</td>
<td>Water utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-voting Member:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-voting Member</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Present / Absent / Alternate Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Terry</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Johnson</td>
<td>Texas Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Lambrecht</td>
<td>Texas Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>[*]Manuel Martinez-alt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Clark</td>
<td>Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Kinsey</td>
<td>General Land Office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Ingram</td>
<td>Texas Water Development Board (TWDIB)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mills</td>
<td>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quorum:
Quorum: Yes
Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: 12
Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 12: 7

#### Other Meeting Attendees:

| Arthur Bradelhoff    | Chantavia Dangerfield                         |
| Bill Adams           | Christine Peterson, Jr                       |
| Brooke Barretes      | Cory Mull                                    |
| Bruce Nichols        | Diane Cooper                                  |
| Dr. Shelley Sekula-Gibbs | Fawzi Abou-Hossa                           |
Glenna Sloan
James Bronkowski
Jeff Taebel
Jennifer Eckhart
Jill Boullion
John Youn
Justin Brower
Keta Ware
Krista Melner
Lance McLeod
Laura Cahill
Laura Norton
Laura Zimmerman
Leslie Horbit
Erika Lattu
Manuel S. Martinez
Matt Nelson
Matt Chastain
Matt Zeve

Michael Bloom
Michael Turco
Morgan White
Neil Gaynor
Nicholas Panyard
Pam Hawkins
Rachel Herr
Rebecca Andrews
Reem Zoua
Sally Bakko
Stephanie Castillo
Stephanie Griffin
Stephanie Zertuche
Susan Chadwick
Terry Barr
Thuy Luong
Tommy Ramsey
Kim Nygren
Anonymous Attendees (no name provided): 5

**Meeting attendee names were gathered from those who entered information for joining the GoToWebinar meeting.

All meeting materials are available for the public at:  
http://www.tmbh.texas.gov/file/45/langcrg/regions/schedule.asp
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Russ Poppe called the meeting to order at 9:08AM. A roll call of the planning group members was taken to record attendance and a quorum was established prior to calling the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome, Meeting Facilitation Information and Instructions
Russ Poppe welcomed members to the meeting. Russ Poppe provided meeting facilitation information and instructions.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Texas Water Development Board Update
TWDB deferred their update to item 12 of this agenda.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items 5-18 (Limit 3 min per person)
It was announced that prior written comments had already been distributed to Group members via email from TWDB. It was asked how to make those comments available to the public and, until such time as a consultant team is brought on board and creates a website for the SRFPO to host those comments, TWDB was requested to determine how best to make those comments available, whether on the website or upon request. No discussion or comments made on written comments received.

Verbal public comments related to the agenda were received from:

a) Jeff Taeble, HUG – Item 10- Adding to written comments already provided, encouraged engaging regional government groups; HUG would prefer to participate as voting members; Jeff Taeble is primary representative proposed Justin Brewer as alternate.

b) Laura Norton, Resident of Montgomery County – Item 10- Encouraged representation of Montgomery County on the Board: (1) Whole county in Region 6, (2) On a trajectory to pump more ground water, subsidence, suggests adding the subsidence conversation to any solutions based approach, and (3) With our growth we are at critical point to implement flood prevention measures instead of corrective measures.

c) Leslie Herbst, Port Houston – Item 10- Discussed interest and membership collaborations of The Regional Flood Planning Group and Port Houston (formerly known as Port of Houston Authority).

d) Neil Gaynor, Resident of the Woodlands and Montgomery County – President MUD6 - Item 10- Speaking in regards to membership to Regional Flood Planning Group.


Russ Poppe referenced a written comment of interest received from The Harris-Galveston Subsidence District, Mr. Mike Fonse.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Approval of minutes from the previous meeting
Matthew Barrett noted the misspelling of Alia Vinson’s name under Item 6.

A motion was made by Alia Vinson to approve the minutes as revised to correct the spelling of her name.
The motion was seconded by Gene Hisseler.
The vote to approve the minutes was made by a vote of 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstain (Russ Poppe).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Announcement of Alternate Members
Russ Poppe opened discussion explaining alternate member’s role according to the bylaws.
Announcement of alternate members received prior to the meeting were announced and several additional alternate members were named at the meeting, and were allowed by group consensus and the Chair’s agreement. The alternates announced are:

Voting Members
Agricultural - named MaryAnn Piacentini as alternate to Elisa Donovan
Counties- named John Blount as alternate to Allisa Max
Flood Districts- named Matt Zeve as alternate to Russ Poppe

Non-Voting Members
General Land Office- Colleen Jones as alternate to Ellen Kinsey
Texas Department of Agriculture- Manuel Martinez as alternate to Kristen Lambrecht
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department- Bill Adams as alternate to Adam Terry (received from Chat function)
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality- Kym Nygren as alternate to Kelly Mills (received from Chat function on meeting)

Russ Poppe commented those are all of the alternates received in writing so far, and reminds that alternates can be submitted at any time. Gene Fisseler suggests a shorter time frame than the 48hrs to announce alternates in the event of an emergency, Russ Poppe confirms bylaws gives the chair discretion to some changes to provide substitutions.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Nominations, discussions and possible action to elect RFGP Vice Chair and Secretary
Russ Poppe opened nominations for Vice Chair:
A motion was made by Stephen Costello to appoint Alia Vinson as Vice Chair, Gene Fisseler seconded the nomination, Alia Vinson accepted the offer.
The vote to select Alia Vinson as Vice Chair passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

Russ Poppe opened nominations for a Secretary:
Allisa Max motioned to serve as Secretary
A motion was made by Stephen Costello to appoint Allisa Max as Secretary and Jenna Armstrong seconded the motion.
The vote to elect Allisa Max as Secretary passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Nominations, discussion and possible action to elect two members-at-large to serve on the RFGP Executive Committee
Russ Poppe opened nominations for the Executive Committee’s At-Large Member No. 1:
Paul Lock nominated Gene Fisseler as At-Large Member No. 1.
A motion was made by Allia Vinson to appoint Gene Fisseler as the Executive Committee's At-Large Member #1 and Stephen Costello seconded the motion, Gene Fisseler accepted the offer. The vote to elect Gene Fisseler as At-Large Member #1 passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

Russ Poppe opened nominations for the Executive Committee's At-Large Member No. 2: Allia Vinson motioned to appoint Matthew Barrett as At-Large Member No. 2. Jenna Armstrong seconded the motion, Matthew Barrett accepted the offer. The vote to elect Matthew Barrett as at-large member #2 passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Discussion and possible action on Liaisons to Adjacent Planning Groups

a) Trinity, Lower Brazos, Neches
Russ Poppe opens discussion and nominations for liaisons, also mentions one of the written comment received is from The City of Galveston who has already expressed interest and offered the name Brandon Hock as a liaison.

Elisa Donovan motioned to nominate Sarah Barnhardt as a liaison. Prior to accepting the nomination, Sarah Barnhardt requests there be more information about the responsibilities and time commitments of the liaisons for better commitment making decisions. Allia Vinson requests information from the TWDB on what the expectations are, could be attending other RFG meetings, suggests TWDB could send the information to the Board. TWDB states they will provide additional guidance at a future meeting.

Allia motioned to defer this topic to the Executive Committee for additional deliberation and outreach and for that group to bring back a recommendation at the next meeting. Stephen Costello seconded the motion.

The vote to defer the topic on possible liaisons to adjacent planning groups to the Executive Committee for further discussion at the next meeting passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Discussions of Regional Flood Planning Group Membership

a) Nominations for additional voting and non-voting member categories
b) Discussion and consider taking action to add group member categories in either voting or non-voting capacities, as applicable
c) Discussion and consider taking action on development of a process for solicitation and selection of new Group members, as applicable

Russ Poppe opened the discussion explaining per the bylaws the distinction between the two categories (voting/non-voting) Allia Max, clarified the discussion is for the categories of voting members and not actual voting members. Open discussion between group.

a) There are 12 categories already identified by the TWDB that each current member represents. Other categories brought up for consideration by the group include:
Subsidence/Groundwater, Coastal Cities, Flooded Residents, Affordable Housing, Equity Advocates, Educational Interests, Port Interests, Urban Planning, Councils of Governments, Natural Sciences/Geo Sciences/Erosion Specialist, Liaison with Water Planning Group, Green Infrastructure/Sustainability, Land Trust/Conservatories, Communications/Public Engagement.

The need for greater diversity on the committee was discussed; this can be achieved in choosing members for additional categories chosen. It was also discussed that not all categories have to be on the committee, or be voting members, as there will be other pathways to participate as well. Size of committee was discussed, with the desire for it to “not get too big”.

b) Russ Poppe opened topic for discussion. No action was taken at this time

c) Russ Poppe opened topic for discussion

Gene Fisseler suggested including those already engaged (meeting attendees, etc.) be looked at when soliciting new members. Alla Vinson suggests the topic be referred to the Executive Committee, to look at all letters and public comments and come back with a recommendation of categories that can be later discussed with the larger group, as well as follow bylaws requirements.

Jenna Armstrong motions Items 10a-c be referred to the Executive Committee with a proposal to bring back recommendations to the Full Group at a later meeting. Alisa Max seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Discussion and possible action on potential changes to bylaws
a) Discussion and possible action on process to amend bylaws
b) Any changes necessitated by Regional Flood Planning Group Membership Discussion in Item

a) It was proposed to amend Article XV of the bylaws to create a clear mechanism to amend the bylaws by modifying the sentence to read, “The voting members shall adopt and/or amend these bylaws by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present.”

All-Vinson motioned to amend the bylaws with the language recommended above. Tim Buscha seconded the motion. The vote to change/amend the bylaws by a vote of 2/3 of the attending members passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

b) No bylaw changes were necessitated per discussion of Item 10, so no action was taken on item b.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Texas Water Development Board Presentation – Process Overview
Megan Ingram presented on “Funding 101” to the group, and introduced grant application process. The presentation concerning the scope of work for the consultant to perform once the grant is awarded was tabled and is anticipated to be presented at the next RFPG meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Updates from Planning Group Sponsor regarding status of Regional Flood Planning Grant contract with the TWDB
a) Discussion on status of application for Regional Flood Planning Grant funds
b) Discussion of technical consultant procurement process
c) Discussion on Scope of Work posted with TWDB RFA

The Project Sponsor representative from Harris County, Alisa Max, confirmed the grant application is on target for submission to the TWDB in time for the January 21, 2020 submission, including the anticipated submittal to Harris County’s Commissioners Court on January 5, 2020.

TWDB stated that the technical consultant procurement process may begin prior to the award of the grant without jeopardizing grant funds.

The scope of work was briefly discussed, but conversation was tabled until the next RFPG meeting as that will be when the TWDB will present it. Some RFPG members wanted to discuss additions to the TWDB scope, but it was noted TWDB provided a project scope with the grant documents. Alisa Vinson recommended that Planning Group members read the scope prior to the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Discussion and possible action regarding RFPG public website (required per §361.21(b))
Alisa Max, as Project Sponsor, stated that in conversation with TWDB, TWDB has agreed to host a website for the Group until a technical consultant is on board and is able to create one. Megan Ingrams, TWDB confirmed that is correct.

It was asked if any Group members wished to create website to use in lieu of the TWDB website. None offered, and it was agreed by consensus that having the TWDB host the group’s website until such time the consultant creates one for our Region makes the most sense.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Discussion and possible action regarding a means by which the RFPG will accept written public comment prior to and after meetings (required per §361.21(c))
Alisa Vinson request Megan Ingram, TWDB, give an overview of the current process used to accept and distribute written public comment. Megan explains she forwards feedback TWDB receives to all Group members as part of her process. Alisa Vinson offers thoughts “to whom should comments or materials be directed?” and “make sure a means by which people can communicate to the group, even if they don’t have access to the internet” to provide a physical address as well as an email address/website link to submit comments. Alisa Max noted that agendas include information currently on who to send public comment to at Harris County (Project Sponsor) and when that information is received she is also ensuring it is distributed to all Group members as well. Alisa further confirmed a SIRFPG email will be created, and the information will be included on all meeting agendas (and the Group’s website when created by the consultant) as it becomes available.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Discussion and possible action regarding the required solicitation for persons or entities who request to be notified of RFPG activities (required per §361.21(e))
Russ Poppe opens the discussion. Timothy Buscha continuing to solicit via the TWDB. Alisa Max suggest interested persons can email the information to the public comment email address on the
agendas and/or later to the SJFPG email as well. If the information comes to the Project Sponsor in any of the three ways, it will be captured and acted on.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Consider meeting frequency and regular meeting dates for calendar year 2021**

Russ opened discussion stating according to the requirements of the Group’s bylaws Article 9 Section 2, we are required to establish meeting dates for the upcoming year at the second meeting.

Alisa Vinson motioned to hold virtual monthly meetings, on 2nd Thursday of each month at 9am, with a reconsideration of location after the COVID related variances have been lifted. Paul Lock seconded the motion. A vote to set the meeting frequency and regular meeting date to 2nd Thursday at 9am passed by a vote of 12 Ayes and 0 Nays.

It was further discussed that the Executive Committee will need to meet prior to the next Group meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 18: Consider agenda items for next meeting**

Russ Poppe opened discussion for topics to discuss on next meeting agenda. The following items were proposed:

- Liaisons to adjacent Planning Groups
- Discussion of Group membership- new members/ categories?
- Grant Application/Consultant Firm Solicitation process/Scope of Work, including TWDB presentation
- GLO Flood Basin Study
- Committess
- A meeting schedule, include deadlines
- Other topics proposed by the Executive Committee or other members

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 19: Public Comments – limit 3 minutes per person**

No additional public comment was requested.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 20: Adjourn**

Russ Poppe opened asking for any further comments for the meeting, no comments made

Jenna Armstrong made a motion to adjourn.

The motion was seconded by Russ Poppe.

The motion to adjourn was passed by unanimous consent.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 AM by Russ Poppe.

*Approved by the Region 6 San Jacinto RFPG at a meeting held on January 14, 2022.*

Alisa Max, Secretary
Item 6: Announcement of Alternate Members
Item 7: Discussion related to use of the Chat function during Open Meetings
Item 8:
Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action on Liaisons to Adjacent Planning Groups

a. Trinity, Lower Brazos, Neches, Coastal Communities
Item 9:
Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action on Regional Flood Planning Group Membership

a. Nominations, discussion, and possible action to add additional voting and non-voting member categories
b. Discussion and possible action on process of solicitation and selection of new Group members, as applicable
c. Discussion and possible action on potential changes to by-laws necessitated by Regional Flood Planning Group Membership discussion from Item 9 a.-b.
Item 10: Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action concerning formation of RFPG Committees
Item 11: Texas Water Development Board presentation and discussion – Scope of Work and Process Overview
Texas Water Development Board
Flood Planning Presentation
Regional Flood Planning Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS:
• RFPG Responsibilities: Scope of Work Overview (20 minutes)
RFPG Responsibilities: Scope of Work Overview (20 minutes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWDB Contract Reimbursement Accounting Number (CAS)</th>
<th>Exhibit A - Contract SOW Task</th>
<th>Exhibit C - General Guidelines for Regional Flood Plan Development</th>
<th>Regional Flood Plan Chapter Number</th>
<th>Primary TAC Section</th>
<th>2023 Regional Flood Plan Chapter, Associated TAC Sections, and Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>§361.30; §361.31; §361.32</td>
<td>Planning Area Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>361.33</td>
<td>Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>361.34</td>
<td>Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Content
A general description of the region, including:

- social & economic character
- flood-prone areas, types of major flood risks, and key historical flood events
- political subdivisions with flood related authority
- the extent of local regulation and development codes relevant to flooding
- existing or proposed natural flood mitigation features and constructed major flood infrastructure
Task 2A & 2B – Existing & Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses

Perform existing and future condition **flood hazard analyses** to determine the location and magnitude of both 1.0% and 0.2% annual chance flood events.

Perform existing & future condition **vulnerability analyses** to identify vulnerabilities of communities and critical facilities.

Develop existing & future condition **flood exposure analyses** to identify who and what might be harmed for both 1.0% and 0.2% annual chance flood events.
Task 3A – Evaluation & Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices

• Consider how current floodplain management practices or regulations increase flood risks.
• Consider how the 1.0% annual chance floodplain and associated flood risks may change over time.
• Consider adopting minimum floodplain management/land use standards that an entity must adopt prior to including any evaluations, projects, or strategies in the regional flood plan.

West Fork San Jacinto River near Humble, Texas after Hurricane Harvey
Image: Steve Fitzgerald, Harris County Flood Control District
Task 3B – Flood Mitigation & Floodplain Management Goals

• Identify specific and achievable flood mitigation and floodplain management goals
  • Short (10 year) & Long-Term (30 year)
  • State the levels of residual flood risk after goals are fully met.
Task 4A – Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis

- Identify locations within the region that have the greatest flood mitigation and flood risk study needs.
- Based on the analyses and goals developed by the RFPG under Tasks 2A through 3B
### Key Terms for Tasks 4 & 5: FME, FMP, FMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Management Evaluation (FME)</strong></td>
<td>A proposed flood study of a specific, flood-prone area that is needed in order to assess flood risk and/or determine whether there are potentially feasible FMSs or FMPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Management Strategy (FMS)</strong></td>
<td>A proposed plan to reduce flood risk or mitigate flood hazards to life or property (may or may not require associated FMPs to be implemented).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Mitigation Project (FMP)</strong></td>
<td>A proposed project (structural and non-structural) that when implemented will reduce flood risk, mitigate flood hazards to life or property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 4B – Identification and Evaluation of Potential FMEs & Potentially Feasible FMSs and FMPs

- Identify potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs based on process developed with public input.

- Evaluate potential FMEs and potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs based on a variety of factors described in rules and guidance.

- The FMPs should be permittable, constructible, and implementable.
Task 4C – Prepare and Submit Technical Memorandum

- Include all deliverables from Tasks 1 to 4B detailed in the Scope of Work
- TWDB Guidance Document will provide more information.
- Tentative Due Date: January 2022
Task 5 – Recommendation of FMEs, FMSs & FMPs

• Recommend FMEs that are most likely to identify potentially feasible FMSs and FMPs based on evaluations under Task 4B
• Recommend FMSs and FMPs to reduce the impacts of flood based on evaluations under Task 4B
• Recommendations should be based on comparison of alternatives
Regional & State Flood Planning Long-Range Planning Process

Regional Flood Plans will identify flood risk and recommend FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs within regions.

State Flood Plan will rank recommended FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs statewide.

Future state financial assistance may be allocated using a to-be-determined prioritization criteria.*

*Funding to implement projects can also come from local, federal, or other sources.
Task 6A – Impacts of Regional Flood Plan

• Summarize the relative reduction in flood risk that implementation of the plan would achieve.

• Describe impacts of recommended FMSs and FMPs on environment, agriculture, recreation, water quality, erosion, sedimentation, and navigation.

• State that FMPs will not negatively affect neighboring areas.
Task 6B – Impacts on Water Supply

• Summarize how Regional Flood Plan will affect water supply.
• How would FMSs and FMPs contribute to water supply?
• How would FMSs and FMPs impact water supply, availability, or projects in the State Water Plan?
Task 7 – Flood Response Information and Activities

- Summarize existing flood response preparations.
- Coordinate with entities in the region to gather information.
- RFPGs do not perform analyses or other activities related to disaster response or recovery.

Image: Texas State Guard Hurricane Harvey emergency response.
Image: Texas State Guard
Task 8 – Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations

• Develop policy recommendations to implement and achieve the RFPG's stated goals and plans.
• Consider potential new revenue-raising opportunities to fund flood activities in the region.
Task 9 – Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis

• Survey and report on how sponsors propose to finance recommended FMEs and FMPs
• Include recommendations on the proposed role of the State in financing FMEs and FMPs

Dam on the Llano River under Hwy 16 in Llano, Texas. Image: TWDB
Task 10 – Public Participation & Plan Adoption

Administrative activities not included in other tasks, including:

• Meeting preparations, notices, agendas, materials, minutes, presentations, and public comments

• Website creation and maintenance

• Intraregional and interregional coordination and communication to develop the regional flood plan.
Item 12:
Update from Planning Group Sponsor regarding status of Regional Flood Planning grant and technical consultant procurement

a. Discussion of application for Regional Flood Planning Grant funds
b. Discussion of technical consultant procurement process
c. Discussion on Scope of Work presented by TWDB RFA
## Grant Application
### Draft Cost allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Area Description $107,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses $278,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses $254,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices $48,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals $24,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis $73,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Identification and Evaluation of Potential Flood Management Evaluations and Potentially Feasible Flood Management Strategies and Flood Mitigation Projects $430,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Prepare and Submit Technical Memorandum $48,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recommendation of Flood Management Evaluations and Flood Management Strategies and Associated Flood Mitigation Projects $538,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Impacts of Regional Flood Plan $97,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Contribution to and Impact on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan $24,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flood Response Information and Activities $24,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations $24,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis $48,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adoption Plan and Public Participation $421,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,446,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to comments heard at last Planning Group meeting, as compared to TWDB proposed budget, we are proposing to increase public engagement by $55,000 over minimum allocation by decreasing Items 1, 2a, and 2b by $15k each and Item 4b by $10k.

Proposed budget includes $2,373,000 for consulting team and $73,000 for expenses, totaling $2,446,000.
Assurance:
As part of the grant application, Harris County is required to provide assurances that the grant funds will NOT be used to performing any duplicate work.

The project therefore will be relying heavily on existing work done by local governments in our region where available.
### Working Conceptual Schedule**

First Cycle of Regional Flood Planning

As of December 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Planning SW (Task #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TWDB</td>
<td>Designation of RFPG members</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>RFPG First Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Public participation, stakeholder input, post notices, hold meetings, maintain email lists and websites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TWOB</td>
<td>Publish Request for Regional Flood Planning Grant Applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Submission of Applications for Regional Flood Planning Grants to TWOB</td>
<td>DUE Jan 21, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TWOB/Sponsor</td>
<td>Review and Execution of Regional Flood Planning Grant Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Solicitations for Technical Consultant by RFPG process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Pre-Planning Meetings for Public input on Development of RFPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Selection of Technical Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Execution of Technical Consultant Subcontract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Planning Area Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation Need Analysis</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Identification and Evaluation of Potential FMEs and Potentially Feasible FMEs and FMPs</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Preparation and Submission of Technical Memorandum to the TWOB</td>
<td>DUE Jan 7, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TWOB</td>
<td>Issue Notice-to-Proceed on Task 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Recommendation of FMEs, FMEs, and FMPs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Impacts of Regional Flood Plan</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Contributions to and Impacts on Water Supply Development and the State Water Plan</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Response Information and Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Preparation and Submission of Draft RFPG to the TWOB</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Public Input on Draft RFPG</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TWOB</td>
<td>Review and Comment on the Draft RFPG</td>
<td>DUE Aug 3, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>TWOB</td>
<td>Incorporate TWOB &amp; Public Input into Final RFPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>TWOB</td>
<td>Adopt and Submit the 2023 RFPG to the TWOB</td>
<td>DUE Jan 28, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This conceptual schedule contains approximate timeframes for high-level planning activities for the purpose of illustrating the anticipated order of and interrelationship/overlap between key activities. Each RFPG & Sponsor will develop their own working schedule and will direct its own planning effort which will vary by region. Milestone dates shown red are required deadlines contained in the Regional Flood Planning Grant Contracts. Details work associated with each task can be found in the Draft Scope of Work: [https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/doc/2020DraftSW.pdf](https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/doc/2020DraftSW.pdf)
Grant Application

Key Dates in TWDB provided schedule in Grant Application

January 21, 2021- Grant Application Due
End of March- Estimated execution of TWDB Grant Contract

January, 2021- Estimated Start of Consultant Procurement Process
  * In order to keep the schedule, the RFQ needs to be issued by early February
End of May- Estimated execution of Consultant Contract

January 7, 2022- First Technical Memorandum due to TWDB
August 1, 2022- Draft Regional Flood Plan to TWDB
January 10, 2023- 2023 Final Regional Flood Plan to TWDB
Item 13:
Discussion and possible action concerning pre-planning public input as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(a)(4)
Item 14: 
Presentation of 2021 Planning Group meeting dates and known deadlines

2nd Thursday of each month at 9am

a. The next San Jacinto RFPG meeting will be on February 11, 2020 at 9:00 am.
Item 15: Reminder regarding Planning Group member training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Item 16: Consider agenda items for next meeting
Item 17: Public Comments (limit 3 minutes per person)
Item 18: Meeting Adjourn