Region 6: San Jacinto Flood Planning Group
March 11, 2021
9:00 am
Virtual Meeting
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 5-18
(limit of 3 minutes per person)
Item 5: Approval of minutes from the February 11, 2020 SJRFPG Meeting
# Meeting Minutes
Region 6 San Jacinto Flood Planning Group Meeting
February 11, 2021
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>Russ A. Poppe</td>
<td>Chair, Flood Districts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali A. Vinson</td>
<td>Vice Chair, Water Districts</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Max</td>
<td>Secretary, Counties</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Fisseler</td>
<td>At-Large, Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrett</td>
<td>A-Large, River Authorities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Maca Donovan</td>
<td>Agricultural Interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Armstrong</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul L. Leck</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>Stephen Costello</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy E. Buscha</td>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burrer</td>
<td>Water utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Kinsey</td>
<td>General Land Office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Clark</td>
<td>Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy E. Buscha</td>
<td>Industries/Laison for Trinity</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mills</td>
<td>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Lambercht</td>
<td>Texas Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Ingram</td>
<td>Texas Water Development Board (TWDB)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Johnson</td>
<td>Texas Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Quorum:

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

Alfred Garcia  Burton Johnson
Bob Lux        Chantalia Dangerfield
Brandon Wade   Clarissa Perez
Brooke Bacetes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory Stull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shelley Sekula-Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima Berrios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Hollingworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bronikowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Taebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bouillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Bower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keena Wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Norton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Zeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Keck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Bagha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Gaynor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol Bouratsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Herr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reem Zoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid Mry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kosar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Bakko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Castillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Zertuche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Barr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Cartwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Buscha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Heldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Ramsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Callers: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All meeting materials were available for the public at:

http://www.twdb.texas.gov/floodplanning/regions/schedule.asp
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Mr. Poppe, Chair of the SJIRPG, called the meeting to order at 9:02AM.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Ms. Max, Secretary of the SJIRPG, took roll call and a quorum was established.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Texas Water Development Board Update
Megan Ingram provided a brief update stating that TWDB had begun reviewing the SJIRPG’s RFO, and that TWDB was working with Harris County to create a website for region 6 – SJIRPG.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items 5-17 [Limit of 3 minutes per person]
Written comments were distributed to RFOG members via email prior to this meeting.

Verbal public comments related to the agenda were received from:

a) Neil Gaynor, Montgomery County MUD 6, President – Agenda Item 9 – Mr. Gaynor expressed his concern indicating that the RFOG should have representation of Montgomery County area and surrounding areas, given that it takes up a large portion of the Region 6. He proposed the SJIRPG should establish a new voting member category: “Upper Watershed.” He then declared his interest as a representative for Montgomery County as a committee member or liaison role, with Stephanie Zertuche as his alternate.

Ms. Max summarized written comments as shown below:

a) Gordy Bunch – Mr. Bunch provided a letter advocating for Neil Gaynor to become a voting member to represent the Montgomery area communities, with Stephanie Zertuche as his alternate.

b) Bob Kors – Mr. Kors shared his concerns on flooding issues related to Galveston Bay water surface elevations and impacts from and to upstream watersheds. To support his concern he provided two scientific articles pertaining to Hurricane Harvey and its impacts on Galveston Bay. He also wanted to make the SJIRPG is aware of the flood mitigation projects in process by the USACE.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Approval of minutes from the December 10, 2020 SJIRPG Meeting
After a minor comment made by Mr. Barrett, Mr. Costello moved to approve the meeting minutes as corrected. Ms. Bernhardt seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Approval of minutes from the January 14, 2021 SJIRPG Meeting
After several comments made by Mr. Barrett and Ms. Vinson, Ms. Bernhardt moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Vinson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Announcement of new Alternate Members and new Non-Voting Members
Ms. Max announced new alternates for existing members, both voting and non-voting.

a) Joel Clark selected Brian Koch as his alternate.

b) Jeff Taebel, from the Houston-Galveston Area Council, was announced as a new non-voting member with Justin Bower as his alternate.
d) Elie Alhouri, from the Texas Department of Transportation, was announced as a new non-voting member with Alfred Garcia as his alternate.

d) Tom Heitz, from Port Houston, was announced as a new non-voting member.

e) Michael Turco, from the Harris-Galveston Subsidence District, was announced as a new non-voting member with Christina Petersen as his alternate.

Lastly, Mark Vogler was announced as the new Lower Brazos Liaison appointed by Region 8 RFPG.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action on Liaison to the neighboring Region 8 Lower Brazos Regional Flood Planning Group.

Mr. Poppe opened the discussion by reporting that the Executive Committee recommended that the RFPG should wait to designate liaisons until new voting and non-voting members joined the RFPG. He also stated that the Executive Committee had made a recommendation to have only voting and non-voting members of the SIRFPG to serve as liaisons.

Ms. Vinson agreed that the RFPG should wait to appoint a liaison, but asked if Michael Turco would be interested in serving as the liaison to Region 8. Mr. Turco stated his willingness to serve as a liaison, but said he would need to check his calendar to ensure he could serve considering the significant time commitment.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Update from Executive Committee, discussion on Regional Flood Planning Group Membership and recommended actions for future consideration.

a) Discussion to add additional voting and/or non-voting member categories

b) Discussion to add additional non-voting members

Mr. Poppe opened the discussion and stated that the Executive Committee recommended that the addition of new voting members should be incremental. He stated that the current size of the group was 22 voting and non-voting members, and stated the SIRFPG should be deliberate when adding additional voting members.

Mr. Vinson concurred. She stated she supported the creation of the Upper Watershed category proposed by Mr. Gaynor, and asked if the SIRFPG members felt strongly about any other categories.

Mr. Barrett stated that he agreed with Mr. Poppe with waiting, however he also agreed with Ms. Vinson on supporting the additional Upper Watershed category to give upper portions of the watershed better representation.

Ms. Max then reminded the RFPG that moving forward there would be various opportunities to involve new voices that could represent these areas with the creation of new committees/sub-committees. She stated that those committees would support the creation and establishment of the regional flood plan, so the input from these areas would be represented.

Ms. Armstrong passionately stated that the group was lacking Montgomery County representation. She stated the TWDB gave the RFPG authority to add representation where it was missing. She emphasized that politics, flooding knowledge, and regulations within counties differed significantly, and stated Montgomery County should be involved from the start.

Ms. Bemhardt then reassured the members of the public that she represented the entire region as the Environmental Interest stakeholder representative. She suggested that once the consultant is on board,
they could help generate public input, and that the RFP could help generate public input, and that the RFP could generate knowledge and input to make the best-informed decisions possible. Discussion ensued.

After further deliberation, no action was taken, and Mr. Poppe suggested the RFP move on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Update on solicitation notices requests and responses for both voting and non-voting members.

Mr. Poppe opened the discussion by stating that the Executive Committee agreed that the new solicitation notices should follow the original membership solicitation process. He then directed the discussion to the Harris County Sponsor and asked them to provide an overview of the proposed solicitation process.

Ms. Berrios, on behalf of the Harris County Sponsor, gave a brief overview on how solicitation notices were created for each category. She also explained how the RFP process was created with the help of the RFPG. She then emphasized that all new voting members would have until July 30, 2023, which aligns with the term of the initial members. Mr. Berrios then walked through the information shown on the nominating form and opened the floor for comments and suggestions from the RFPG.

After various comments were made by Mr. Vinson, Mr. Bowers, and Mr. Barret, the RFPG agreed they would approve the notices, with the recommended corrections, to allow for distribution as soon as possible.

Mr. Finkel then stated that he had several colleagues that would be interested, and supported the solicitation notices be sent out as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Discussion concerning pre-planning public input as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(6) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(a)(4) and recommended actions for future consideration.

Mr. Poppe provided a reminder that no official action could be taken on this agenda item, but mentioned that the RFPG could have a discussion.

Ms. Vinson started the discussion by stating that the Executive Committee recommended that the SRFPG move forward to hold public meetings, but stated public meeting should be held separately in addition to regular meetings. She also stated public meetings should be held as soon as possible.

Mr. Poppe reported that without a consultant the group would have to do the heavy lifting, and Ms. Bohnhardt followed by asking how other Regional Flood Planning Groups had executed this process.

Ms. Ingram, on behalf of The Texas Water Development Board, clarified there was a variation of how other RFPGs were handling this matter. She stated that other RFPGs waited until their consultants were hired, but others simply added it as an agenda.

Mr. Busca asked what exactly the RFPG was looking for in regards to public input, to which Mr. Poppe stated that public input would help guide decisions when developing the regional flood plan, and bring awareness to the RFPG about particular concerns and issues in certain communities. Discussion ensued.
After further discussion, Mr. Poppe stated the March agenda should include an item to address public meetings and input.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action on the Texas Water Development Board grant scope submitted by SIRPG Project Sponsor

Ms. Max opened the discussion by reminding everyone that the Scope of Work was modified to better incorporate the guiding principles for state flood plans. She stated that there was concern from some of the members about the language in the Scope of Work. Ms. Max then walked through the Scope of Work, highlighting the changes that were suggested.

Ms. Donovan followed by thanking the SIRPG for considering incorporating her suggestions.

Mr. Costello mentioned that there were some concerns of the language used in the scope in task 3A(1). Mr. Poppe replied by stating that those areas Mr. Costello was concerned about came straight from the TAC, and could not be changed.

Mr. Barrett then asked if Atlas 14 rainfall data was mentioned anywhere in the Scope of Work, or if it was flexible enough to allow the use of Atlas 14. Mr. Poppe replied by stating that in the TAC it stated that the most up to date, available data should be used.

Ms. Donovan moved to accept the Scope of Work as discussed. Mr. Costello seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Update, discussion, and possible action concerning technical consultant procurement from Executive Committee, RFP Review Committee, and/or Project Sponsor

Ms. Max began the discussion by summarizing that the RFP had been created, which included the process for consultant selection. She stated that the consultant selection group would most likely short list top submittals, and would make a recommendation to the SIRPG for approval. She also added that TWDB, SIRPG, and Harris County Commissioners' Court would need to approve the selection.

Ms. Max then gave a brief overview of the minimum criteria and the evaluation criteria. Once she explained the selection process, the minimum criteria and evaluation criteria, she asserted she needed the RFP to decide how to make the selection during this meeting in order to stay on schedule.

Ms. Max provided three alternatives:
(1) A Harris County Committee, which would include herself,
(2) Harris County Staff with one SIRPG Member that would not include herself,
(3) SIRPG Committee, which would be subject to the Open Meetings.

She then stated that the RFP Review Committee recommended that the SIRPG should select the Harris County Committee option.

Ms. Donovan, a member of the RFP Review Committee, agreed that the Harris County Committee would be the best option to expedite the process to remain on schedule. Ms. Wixon concurred with Ms. Donovan.
Mr. Barrett asked if the consultant selection group could provide a short list of the highest ranked firms for consideration by the RFPG. Ms. Max replied stating that this option, which aligned the most with option (2), might delay the process if the RFPG did not accept the selection, and would also require discussion in open session. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Vinson stated that the RFPG must approve the selection per its bylaws, and asked in which order the Harris County Sponsor would seek approvals of the selection. Ms. Max stated that she could have the RFPG approve first, but it might be more difficult to stay on schedule since the RFPG only meets once a month. Ms. Max stated she would prefer to get Commissioners’ Court approval first since they meet every 2-3 weeks. Ms. Vinson then suggested that an interim meeting of the SIRFPG could be scheduled if necessary.

Mr. Poppe informed the SIRFPG a 7-day posting requirement would be needed to hold an interim meeting. He also affirmed option (2) and (3) required much more time for posting.

Mr. Buscha stated the RFPG should have faith that Harris County staff would perform their job effectively and select the right consultant, considering this option was preferred due to time restraints. Ms. Donovan concurred and mentioned Harris County had experience with the procurement process.

Mr. Costello asked if Flood Control District staff could be included in the consultant selection. Ms. Max replied she would have to verify with the Harris County Attorney.

Mr. Poppe gave a 10 minute recess at 11:10 AM and starting the continued the meeting at 11:20 AM.

Ms. Max confirmed that Flood Control District staff could be a part of the consultant selection committee as non-voting members, and said she would love to have Flood Control District staff on the committee.

Mr. Costello then asked how many people would be needed for the consultant selection committee and stated that he would like to see at least two representatives from Flood Control District. Mr. Buscha concurred.

Mr. Costello moved to have a Harris County committee do the selection process. Mr. Buscha seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Discussion and possible recommendation to the SIRFPG concerning approval and tracking of public engagement and speaker requests on behalf of the SIRFPG, including possible delegation of request approval to the Chair and/or Vice Chair.**

Mr. Poppe stated that all public engagements were welcomed but the RFPG should have a process for formal requests. Ms. Vinson agreed that a tracking process and approval process would be appropriate and beneficial. Ms. Max also agreed.

Mr. Fosler stated that the Group should establish talking points to ensure the same message would be shared by all speakers.
Ms. Bernhardt mentioned that TxDOT could help prepare those talking points. Mr. Poppe then proceeded to ask Ms. Ingram to make that information/presentation available. Mr. Poppe then asked the Secretary to document these, which Ms. Max agreed to do.

Ms. Vinson agreed that RFPG members should present consistent information and that speaking engagements should be tracked. Ms. Max proceeded assuming her staff would determine what information and parameters would be appropriate to document for speaking engagements. Ms. Max stated all speaking engagements should be sent to the San JacintoFMPS@hcina.org email for tracking purposes.

Ms. Vinson noted that in the future a formal media policy should be adopted, and the RFPG should designate a media spokesperson, who has media experience.

Ms. Vinson moved to authorize the Chair or Vice Chair to approve speaking engagements on behalf of the RFPG. Mr. Poppe seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Presentation of 2021 Planning Group key dates and deadlines**
**Upcoming planning schedule milestones** The next San Jacinto RFPG meeting will be on March 11, 2021 at 9:00 am.
Mr. Poppe said all agenda items for the next RFPG meeting should be given to the SJRFPG Secretary by February 18th. Ms. Max stated that RFPQ deadlines were priority right now, and announced that the RFQ would become live February 12, 2021 on Circast. She reminded all members not to provide additional information aside from what was posted on Circast.

Mr. Poppe stated that all RFQ questions should be directed through Circast. He stated that all firms must follow the process set in place for RFQs. Ms. Max further clarified that if any preferential information was provided to any firms by RFPG members, it would automatically disqualify the firm. Ms. Max stated that a copy of advertisement could be distributed, and stated that the Harris County staff would be happy to send the advertisement to certain firms if RFPG members desired.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Reminder regarding Planning Group member training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act**
Mr. Poppe reminded RFPG members of the required Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act trainings.

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Agenda items for consideration for next meeting**
- Update from current liaison on other Flood Planning Region Groups’ Progress
- Discussion and update for RFPQ Website
- Presentation from Texas Living Waters Project (discussed to present in April’s meeting not March)
- Presentation from the Texas General Land Office
- Discussion for conducting public meetings to gather input from the public for the development of Region’s 6 RFP
- Schedule and Budget Updates
- Discussion and possible action for the Lower Brazos liaison
- Discussion and possible action for new voting and non-voting members or categories
AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person
Ms. Bannerfield stated no comments were provided by the public.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 18: Adjourn
Mr. Poppe moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Max second the motion and it carried unanimously. The meeting was concluded at 12:00PM.

______________________________
Alisa Max, Secretary

______________________________
Russ Poppe, Chair
Item 6: 
Announcement of new Alternate Members and new Non-Voting Members
Item 7: Update from Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action on Liaison to the neighboring Region 8 Lower Brazos Regional Flood Planning Group
Item 8:
Discussion and possible action on Regional Flood Planning Group Membership, including the consideration of the addition of new voting and non-voting members/ member categories and update on current solicitation efforts for new members in categories already approved
Item 9: Discussion and possible action pertaining to the development of a new Region 6 - SJRFPG Website
Item 10: Discussion and possible action concerning public engagement strategies including organizing and setting a future date for a public meeting as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(a)(4).
Item 11:
Discussion and update to the SJRFPG concerning tracking of public engagement and speaker requests on behalf of the SJRFPG and development of media request guidance
Public Engagement Tracking Form

SJRFPG members speaking on behalf of the SJRFPG must email this completed form to SanJacFlfIPG@eng.hctx.net after each public engagement event they speak at for record keeping.

Speaker(s):

Name of Event:

Sponsor(s):

Date: ____________ Time: ____________

Address:

Approximate Number of Attendees:

Main Talking Points Given by Speaker(s):

•
•
•
•
•
•
•
Item 12: Update, discussion, and possible action concerning technical consultant procurement and grant status from TWDB, and/or Planning Group Sponsor
Item 13:
Update and discussion from the Planning Group Sponsor regarding project schedule and budget.
# 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 SOW Task #</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TWDB</td>
<td>Designation of RFPG members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>RFPG First Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Public participation, stakeholder input, post notices, hold meetings, maintain email lists and website</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TWDB</td>
<td>Publish Request for Regional Flood Planning Grant Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Submission of Applications for Regional Flood Planning Grants to TWDB</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TWDB/Sponsor</td>
<td>Review and Execution of Regional Flood Planning Grant Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Solicitation for Technical Consultant by RFPG process</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Pre-Planning Meetings for Public Input on Development of RFPG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Selection of Technical Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RFPG/Sponsor</td>
<td>Execution of Technical Consultant Subcontract</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Planning Area Description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Existing Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Future Condition Flood Risk Analyses</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Evaluation and Recommendations on Floodplain Management Practices</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation and Floodplain Management Goals</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation Need Analysis</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Identification and Evaluation of Potential FMEs and Potentially Feasible FMSs and FMPs</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Preparation and Submission of Technical Memorandum to the TWDB</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TWDB</td>
<td>Issue Notice-to-Proceed on Task 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Recommendation of FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Impacts of Regional Flood Plan</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</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>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Response Information and Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Preparation and Submission of Draft RFP to the TWDB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Public Input on Draft RFP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TWDB</td>
<td>TWDB Review and Comment on the Draft RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Incorporate TWDB &amp; Public Input into Final RFP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>RFPG</td>
<td>Adopt and Submit the 2023 RFP to the TWDB</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acronyms:**
- RFP - Regional Flood Plan
- RFPG - Regional Flood Planning Group
- FME - Flood Management Evaluation
- FMS - Flood Management Strategy
- FMP - Flood Mitigation Project

**Notes:**
- 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/2020DraftSOW.pdf](https://www.twdb.texas.gov/flood/planning/doc/2020DraftSOW.pdf)
Item 14:
Update from Liaisons pertaining to other region progress and status updates
a. Trinity Region
b. Neches Region
c. Lower Brazos Region
d. Region H Water
Item 15:
Texas General Land Office (GLO) Presentation – GLO Combined River Basin Flood Study Overview
Texas General Land Office
Community Development and Revitalization (GLO-CDR)
Flood Studies within Combined River Basins
Study Overview

“We work to rebuild communities, to put Texans back in their homes and help businesses recover after the trauma of disaster.”

~ George P. Bush, Commissioner
Mission Statement:
GLO-CDR Planning team designs and oversees planning studies to collect, analyze, and communicate disaster-related data to assist decision makers to better protect Texans from future disasters.

What do decision makers need to make good decisions? Good data

- Evaluate actual risk – data must be accurate and reliable
- Support cost effective mitigation strategies
- Determine funding sources for future projects
GLO-CDR Planning Team

Jet Hays
Deputy Director of Integration
Jet.Hays.GLO@recovery.texas.gov

Colleen Jones
Director of Planning
Colleen.Jones.GLO@recovery.texas.gov

Shonda Mace
Region - West
Shonda.Mace.GLO@recovery.texas.gov

Ellen Kinsey
Region - Central
Ellen.Kinsey.GLO@recovery.texas.gov

Tyler Payne
Region - East
Tyler.Payne.GLO@recovery.texas.gov
Delivery Partners
Regional Flood Study Goals

- Evaluation of flood risks within the study area
- Development of cost-effective flood mitigation strategies
- Determination of funding sources for mitigation projects
Data and information produced by the GLO’s Combined River Basin Flood Studies program will inform TDIS.

TDIS will house critical flood risk information through an accessible online dashboard to support preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation for Texas.

Provides users with the most current and accurate information available to assess related disaster risks, impacts, and mitigation strategies.

Texas A&M University Systems (TAMUS) will house the disaster database.
Strategic Framework

1. Stakeholder Engagement
2. Data Collection
3. Risk Analysis
4. Alternatives Analysis
5. Funding & Technical Assistance
## Strategic Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RISK ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING &amp; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Coordinated Approach

REGIONAL FLOOD PLANNING GROUPS

FLOOD RESILIENCY

FMS
FME
FMP

RIVER BASIN FLOOD STUDY

ACRONYMS

FMS: Flood Management Strategies
FME: Flood Management Evaluations
FMP: Flood Mitigation Projects

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT
DATA COLLECTION
RISK ANALYSIS
ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
FUNDING & TECHNICAL SUPPORT
Identification of Project Funding

STATE-LEVEL GRANTEEES

FLOOD MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
FLOOD MANAGEMENT EVALUATIONS
FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECTS
How Can the Flood Basin Study Benefit the RFPG Planning Process?

- The Combined River Basins Flood Study will identify potential flood mitigation projects (FMPs) that can be incorporated in future Flood Planning cycles.

- The Combined River Basins Flood Study will connect identified FMPs to funding sources, extending the reach of the TWDB funding for regional flood planning and mitigation efforts.

- The Combined River Basins Flood Study takes advantage of available Hurricane Harvey related federal funding, a one-time opportunity to reduce flood risk in Harvey-impacted communities.
Next Steps

**SPRING 2021 – WINTER 2021**
- Targeted Outreach: Project Goals & Objectives
Next Steps

- **Stakeholder Engagement**
  - Fall 2020
  - Winter 2020
  - Spring 2021
  - Summer 2021
  - Fall 2021
  - Winter 2021
  - Spring 2022
  - Summer 2022
  - Fall 2022
  - Winter 2022
  - Spring 2023
  - Summer 2023
  - Fall 2023
  - Winter 2023
  - Spring 2024
  - Summer 2024

- **Data Collection**

- **Risk Analysis**
  - Spring 2021 – Fall 2021
    - Model Development Plan
    - Coastal & Riverine Pilots

- **Alternatives Analysis**

- **Funding & Technical Assistance**
Next Steps

**Spring 2021 – Spring 2022**
- Develop Recommendations for 6 Actionable Projects
Questions?

Contact

Ellen Kinsey

Ellen.Kinsey.glo@recovery.texas.gov
Item 16: Presentation of 2021 Planning Group key dates and deadlines
a. Upcoming planning schedule milestones
b. The next San Jacinto RFPG meeting will be on April 8, 2021 at 9:00 am.
Item 17:
Reminder regarding Planning Group member training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Item 18:
Consider agenda items for next meeting
Item 19:
Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person
Item 20: Adjourn