Region 6: San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning Group
September 9, 2021
9:00 am
Hybrid Meeting
Item 1: Call to Order
Item 2:
Welcome and Roll Call
Item 3:
Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items 5-19
(limit of 3 minutes per person)
Item 4: Texas Water Development Board Update
Item 5:
Approval of minutes
  a. August 12, 2021
# Meeting Minutes
Region 6 San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning Group
August 12, 2021
9:00 AM
CISCO WebEx Virtual Meeting

## Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Member</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Present_x/ Absent_(-) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Flood Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Vinson</td>
<td>Water Districts (Interim Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alissa Max</td>
<td>Counties (Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Hiscottor</td>
<td>Public (At Large member)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrett</td>
<td>River Authorities (At-Large member)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Mauk-Domanov</td>
<td>Agricultural Interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna Armstrong</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Lock</td>
<td>Electric Generating Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Powers</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 Burre</td>
<td>Water Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Maxwell</td>
<td>Coastal Communities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Quintero</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Graynor</td>
<td>Upper Watershed</td>
<td>X*  Stephano Zetzuche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Non-voting Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-voting Member</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Present_x/ Absent_(-) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Adams</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>X*  Hope Zubek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Johnson</td>
<td>Texas Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Lambert</td>
<td>Texas Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Clark</td>
<td>Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Jones</td>
<td>Texas General Land Office</td>
<td>X*  Brooke Bacuetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Ingram</td>
<td>Texas Water Development Board</td>
<td>X*  Morgan White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mills</td>
<td>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality</td>
<td>X*  Melissa Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Taebel</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Alkhoury</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>X*  Alfred Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Heidt</td>
<td>Port Houston</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
<td>Harris-Galveston Subsidence District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wado</td>
<td>Region H Regional Water Planning Group</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Liaisons from RFPG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison from RFPG</th>
<th>Regional Flood Planning Group</th>
<th>Present_x/ Absent_(-) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burre</td>
<td>Trinity Region RFPG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Buscha</td>
<td>Neches Region RFPG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
<td>Lower Brazos RFPG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaisons from Other Entities</td>
<td>Entity</td>
<td>Present/Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Vogler</td>
<td>Lower Brazos RFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Harris</td>
<td>Trinity Region RFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wade</td>
<td>Region H Regional Water Planning Group</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quorum:**

Quorum: Yes

Number of voting members or alternates that were present: 22

Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 15:

- Andy Palermo
- B. Gallagher
- Colleen Jones
- Conner Stokes
- Cory Stull
- David Mass
- Fatima Berrios
- Frederick Sunderman
- Glenn Sloan
- Hayes McKibbon
- Jake Hollingsworth
- James Bronikowski
- Jill Bouillon
- Kena Ware
- Krista Melnar
- Kristin Lambrecht
- Laura Atlas
- Lisa Mains
- Liz Hafele Bach
- Mac Martin
- Maggie Puckett
- Marcus Stackett
- Michael Kock
- Morgan White
- Rebecca Andrews
- Rhett Zoun
- Reid Mchay
- Robert Krasar
- Raleigh Moore
- Sally Bakko
- Trace Camble
- Usman Misoom
- Unknown: 4

**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.tpwd.texas.gov/floodplanning/regions/schedule.asp
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Ms. Wisson called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Ms. Max took attendance and reported that a quorum was present.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items (limit of 3 minutes per person)
Ms. Berrios stated that Mac Martin, with the Texas A&M Forest Service, had sent in a written comment that expressed the relationship of proper forest management and stormwater runoff as it pertains to water quality.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Texas Water Development Board Update
Ilyke Moore, on behalf of Megas Ingram, stated that the TWDB had processed all additional funding allocation survey responses from all the Regional Flood Planning Groups (RFPGs) and would be assisting all the RFPGs to amend their contracts for the grant fund increase in the coming months.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Update from Project Sponsor on current solicitation efforts for the Flood Districts voting-member position
Ms. Berrios stated that a total of four applications had been received for the Flood Districts voting member position. She stated that the notices were circulated to the county clerks, all RFPG members, original applicants, and Citizens Environmental Coalition. Ms. Berrios stated the Executive Committee would be holding a meeting to interview applicants on August 27, 2021, and to conduct interviews on August 31, 2021.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Approval of minutes
a) July 8, 2021
After minor corrections were received, Mr. Fissler moved to approve the meeting minutes as revised. Ms. Donovan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Announcement of new Alternate Members and new Non-Voting Members
Ms. Max provided the following member alternate announcements:
- Noll Gaynor, representative of the Upper Watershed category, assigned Stephanie Zortucha as his alternate.
- Rachel Powers, representative of the Environmental Interests, assigned Jill Bouillon as her alternate.
- The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department reassigned its non-voting member representative to Hope Zubrck and kept Robert Adams as its alternate.
- The Texas Commission of Environmental Quality reassigned its non-voting member representative to Melinda Johnstone and kept Kim Nygren as its alternate.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Liaison Reports pertaining to other region(s) progress and status:
a. Trinity Region – Mr. Burrey stated that the Trinity Region was progressing similar to Region 6 and that there was no real update.
b. Naches Region – Mr. Buscha stated that the Naches Region was progressing similar to Region 6 and their consultant, Frasse and Nichols Inc. (FNI) was in parallel with FNI’s activities for Region 6. He stated the Region had begun to meet in person and are meeting about every other month. Ms. Liz Haselbach added and confirmed a meeting was scheduled today.
c. Lower Brazos Region – Mr. Turco stated that the Lower Brazos Region sent surveys to stakeholders to gather input on floodplain management goals and has begun their report. He also mentioned the Region had released its website.

d. Region H Regional Water Planning Group – Mr. Wade stated Region H will hold a meeting on November 3, 2021, and start the pre-planning for the next planning cycle.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Presentation and updates from the SIRFPG Technical Consultant

Mr. Stull provided a brief high-level overview of what he would cover during his presentation, highlighting all the progress the Technical Committee had made. He stated FNI was primarily focused on Tasks 3A and 3B, which determine the minimum standards defined as Floodplain Management Goals. Mr. Stull stated FNI had begun data collection efforts to help determine the RFPG’s Floodplain Management Goals.

Mr. Stull explained that the Technical Committee will be meeting to help develop Floodplain Management Goals for presentation to the RFPG. Mr. Stull added an email will be sent to all constituents for their feedback on the proposed Floodplain Management Goals. Mr. Stull then mentioned a vote was going to be presented during the next planning meeting that would facilitate discussion and identify the RFPG’s goals. Mr. Stull stated that goals should be realistic, attainable, and specific to the San Jacinto Region.

Mr. Stull then discussed Tasks 4A and 4B, which identify Flood Management Evaluations (FMEs) and Flood Mitigation Projects (FMPs). Mr. Stull stated that projects can be structural or non-structural. Mr. Stull stated the Technical Committee would meet to discuss the process of identifying FMEs, and FMPs to better manage the floodplain.

Mr. Stull then discussed the website and stated it is expected to go live the following week. Mr. Stull stated it could be accessed at: SanJacintoFloodPlanning.org. All meeting notices, materials and meeting minutes will be available on the website. Mr. Stull stated that the website will be accessible to the visually impaired persons and to Spanish speakers. Mr. Stull mentioned the survey and interactive webinar are located on the landing page, which will also be presented in Spanish and English. Mr. Stull added that another Public Input meeting was scheduled for August 31, 2021, and would be given in a similar fashion as the previous Pre-Planning Meeting, but emphasized that the website would be the main method to collect public input. Mr. Stull then provided a tentative timeline until January when the Technical Memorandum is due. He then opened the flood for questions.

Mr. Busch stated the base/generic presentation for the SIRFPG should be updated to reflect the progress made by FNI. Mr. Stull agreed. Mr. Fisseler then asked if the website would be live next week, and asked to be notified. When the website is activated Mr. Fisseler asked if there were opportunities for additional languages, to which Mr. Stull replied that, as of now, only Spanish and English were available. Mr. Fisseler then asked for verification that constituent and stakeholder input would not be due until September. Mr. Stull agreed and stated that example goals would be sent out in an email to all SIRFPG members, and stated he hoped the members would relay the information to their interest groups.

Ms. Quintero asked if the survey and portal would be in Spanish, and if there was a limit on the number of pins/areas that members of the public could add on the interactive webinar. She clarified that she would be inputting information on behalf of members in her community that were older and less technically savvy. Mr. Stull stated there is no limit on the number of entries a single user could make, and confirmed the survey portal are available in Spanish.
AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Update, recommendations, and possible action from the Technical Committee
Ms. Donevan stated that the Technical Committee met and she had no further updates beyond the presentation already provided by Mr. Stull. She added that the Technical Committee supported the initiative to send an email to all stakeholders and constituents to gather their feedback as they moved forward in developing the Floodplain Management Goals.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Update, recommendations, and possible action from the Public Engagement Committee
Ms. Vinson stated the Public Engagement Committee met and had selected Todd Burrier as the Chair, Paul Lock as Vice Chair, and Rachel Powers as Secretary of the committee. She then opened the floor to the Chair of the Public Engagement Committee, Todd Burrier. Mr. Burrier stated that they had their first meeting and had scheduled the Public Input meeting for August 31, 2021.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Update and discussion pertaining to future public input meeting as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(a)(4)
Ms. Vinson stated that the Public Input meeting was scheduled to be August 31, 2021 in the evening.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Presentation of 2021 Planning Group key dates and deadlines:
   a. Upcoming planning schedule milestones
   f. Next SIRPG planning meeting to be held on September 9, 2021
Ms. Vinson stated that Mr. Stull had provided a timeline for the remainder of the year.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Update and discussion pertaining to the logistics of in-person SIRPG meetings, and possible action regarding in-person meeting location
Ms. Vinson stated that beginning with the September meeting, Region 6 would be utilizing the provision in the Open Meetings Act that allows videoconference meetings for entities in three or more counties. She noted the provision requires only the presiding officer to be present at the in-person location, but enables all other members to participate virtually. Ms. Vinson then encouraged all members of the public to join remotely if possible, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, but noted that the in-person meeting location will be open to the members of the public who wish to attend in-person. Ms. Vinson then asked Ms. Berrios to provide an update for in-person locations.

Ms. Berrios stated that she had reached out to the Houston Advanced Research Center; however, she had not heard back. Ms. Berrios stated that Trini Mendenhall and Timberlane UD community center were available. Ms. Powers suggested the use of Green town Labs and Mr. Burrier also volunteered his office’s conference room. Ms. Berrios stated she would follow up with both Mr. Burrier and Ms. Powers to determine the next meeting location.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Reminder regarding Planning Group member training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Ms. Vinson provided a reminder to all SIRPG members that both these trainings were mandatory.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Nominations, discussion, and possible action to elect San Jacinto SIRPG Chair
Ms. Vinson provided a general overview of the process the SIRPGs would take for nominations of the new Chair and stated officer elections were held annually, so elections will occur again in January 2022. She then opened the floor for nominations to fill the SIRPG Chair vacancy.
Mr. Fisseler nominated Mr. Buscha. Mr. Costello seconded the nomination and reminded everyone that Mr. Buscha was also a member of the Technical Committee. Ms. Vinson asked Mr. Buscha whether he would be interested in serving in the position of Chair and gave him the floor to state his qualifications.

Mr. Buscha stated he was the President of IDS Engineering Group, was the third generation of ownership, and had vast experience as a Drainage Engineer. He stated his first 11 years he worked for the USDA NRC5 (formerly SCS) in soil conservation. Mr. Buscha then said he was a Field Engineer working on various drainage projects and dam designs, and has also worked with the Texas Division of Emergency Management in supporting communities in flood damage recovery with a complimentary funding program through USDA, the Emergency Watershed Protection Program. Mr. Buscha mentioned he helped manage drainage projects throughout most of Texas. Lastly, Mr. Buscha stated for the past 13 years he was lived and worked in the San Jacinto River watershed area, and is active in the local engineering community.

Mr. Fisseler moved to appoint Mr. Buscha the new Chair. Mr. Costello seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Ms. Vinson thanked Mr. Buscha and welcomed him to take over running the meeting as Chair.

Mr. Buscha stated his gratitude for the opportunity. Mr. Buscha stated he was looking forward to working with the Project Sponsor and Consultant.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Nominations, discussion, and possible action relating to the composition of:

- Executive Committee — Ms. Vinson stated that Mr. Buscha will now serve as the Chair of the Executive Committee, pursuant to the Bylaws.
- Technical Committee — Mr. Buscha stated he was serving as Vice Chair to the Technical Committee and asked to be replaced. Ms. Zertuche stated Neil Gaynor would be happy to join. Mr. Costello moved to appoint Neil Gaynor as a member of the Technical Committee. Mr. Fisseler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
- Public Engagement Committee — After brief discussion, no changes or additions were made to the Public Engagement Committee and the item was deferred to the next planning meeting.
- Liaisons — Mr. Buscha asked to be replaced as the Neches Region Liaison. Mr. Costello volunteered himself to replace Mr. Buscha as the Neches Region Liaison. Mr. Fisseler moved to appoint Mr. Costello as the new Neches Region Liaison. Ms. Powers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 18: Presentation from the General Land Office (GLO): Texas GLO Combined River Basins Flood Study — Project Status Update — Survey Results & Data Collection

Krista Melnar and Laura Atlas gave the presentation on behalf of the GLO. They provided an Overview of the Combined River Basin Study.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 19: Consider agenda items for next meeting

- Possible action to appoint a fifth member to Public Engagement Committee
- Appointment of the Flood Districts voting member position
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Presentation
- Regular standing items
  - Update from Technical Consultant — presentation of Goals
Update from the Technical Committee
Update Public Engagement Committee

AGENDA ITEM NO. 20: Public comments (limit 3 minutes per person)
Ms. Berrios stated that a question had been received from Susan, last name unknown, who asked if the Houston Metropolitan Watershed Assessment completed by the Army Corps of Engineers had been considered. Ms. Berrios stated the Technical Consultant had been given a copy of the report and was aware of it.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 21: Adjournment
Mr. Buscha adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

_________________________
Alisa Max, Secretary

_________________________
Timothy Buscha, Chair
Item 6: Announcement of new Alternate Members and new Non-Voting Members
Item 7:
Recommendation from the Executive Committee to the Regional Flood Planning Group Members for the representation of the Flood Districts voting membership position, and possible appointment. The SJRFPG may go into an executive session pursuant to Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code for the consideration of personnel matters, specifically, persons being considered for appointment as new voting members of SJRFPG.
Item 8: Nomination, discussion, and possible action pertaining to the composition of the Public Engagement Committee and Technical Committee
Item 9: Liaison Reports pertaining to other region(s) progress and status:
   a. Trinity Region
   b. Neches Region
   c. Lower Brazos Region
   d. Region H Water
Item 10:
Presentation and updates from the SJRFPG Technical Consultant
a. Floodplain Management Goals
b. SJRFPG member Mentimeter input
Technical Consultant Update

September 9, 2021
Update Overview

• Outreach & Data Collection
• Task 4B: Identifying potentially feasible FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs
• Task 3B: Overview and discussion of 3B goals
• Task 3B: 3B goal workshop (interactive mentimeter)
Outreach & Data Collection

- 1,030 Individuals on SJRFPG Distribution List
- 317 Unique Users Accessed the Data Collection site
- 11 General Public Survey Responses
- 9 Webmap submissions

*122 unique users accessed the map in the 24-hours after the public meeting.
Task 4B: Research Update

- **Objective:** Collect publicly available data on identified flood mitigation projects
  - Searched stakeholder's websites for projects such as Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs), Hazard Mitigation Plans (HMPs), etc.

- Inventory all unfunded CDGB-MIT and TWDB FIF applications

- **Next Step:** Coordinate directly with Stakeholders and potential project sponsors

17 – Unfunded Federal Infrastructure Fund (FIF) Applications

45 – Unfunded Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-MIT) Applications
Task 3B: Goal Timeline

- **Aug. Technical Committee Meeting**: Discuss, workshop, and approve goal and sub-goal categories
- **Sep. RFPG Meeting**: RFPG to discuss, workshop, and prioritize goal and sub-goal categories
- **Sep. Technical Committee Meeting**: Discuss, workshop, and approve S.M.A.R.T. goals
- **Oct. RFPG Meeting**: RFPG to discuss, workshop, and adopt or conditionally adopt S.M.A.R.T. goals
Task 3B: Significance of Goals

1. Guides the Overall Approach of and Recommendations in the RFP
2. By establishing S.M.A.R.T. goals, allows for SJRFPG to track progress towards overall goal of RFP:

   “To protect against the loss of life and property”
Task 3B: SMART Goals

TWDB Technical Guidance Exhibit C:

“RFPGs must identify specific and achievable flood mitigation and floodplain management goals that, when implemented, will demonstrate progress towards this overarching goal”
## Task 3B: TWDB Table 10

Here's what was provided as a starting point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term (10 year)</th>
<th>Long Term (30 year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce 5-year moving average of flood-related fatalities in the flood planning region by 50% by 2033.</td>
<td>Eliminate the occurrence of all flood-related fatalities in the flood planning region by 2053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce 5-year moving average of flood-related injuries in the flood planning region by 75% by 2033.</td>
<td>Eliminate the occurrence of flood-related injuries in the flood planning region by 2053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduce exposure of existing structures in the current 1% annual chance floodplain by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 1,000 structures by 2033.</td>
<td>Reduce exposure of existing structures in the current 1% annual chance floodplain by elevating, acquiring, relocating, or otherwise providing flood protection to 10,000 structures by 2053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remove 1% annual chance floodplain from the 5% of structures in the floodplain by 2033.</td>
<td>Remove 1% annual chance floodplain from 20% of structures in the floodplain by 2053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Remove 10% annual chance floodplain from 15% of low water crossings in the floodplain by 2033.</td>
<td>Remove 10% annual chance floodplain from 30% of low water crossings in the floodplain by 2053.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. By 2033, increase the coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing studies in 50% of the areas identified as having current data.</td>
<td>By 2053, have complete coverage of flood hazard data across the region by completing studies in 100% of the areas identified as having current data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 3B: Goal Categories

- Protect Life Safety
- Protect Property
- Improve Data
- Improve Policy & Regulations
- Improve Flood Mitigation Projects & Strategies
- Expand Funding
- Expand Education & Outreach
Task 3B: Process

S.M.A.R.T. GOALS

Sub Goal Categories

Goal Categories

Feedback from RFPG and Tech. Com.

Technical Committee Discussion

Protect Life Safety

Protect Property

Improve Data

Improve Policy & Regulations

Improve Flood Mitigation Projects & Strategies

Expand Funding

Expand Education & Outreach
Task 3B: MENIMETER – Interactive Session

*Transfer to Mentimeter
Overall Plan Goal: "to protect against the loss of life and property"
What do you want to see accomplished in the plan?
What do you consider to be an impediment to effective floodplain management in the Region?

1st | Lack of funding
2nd | Lack of consistent policies/regulations
3rd | Lack of policy enforcement
4th | Lack of staff/resources
5th | Inadequate floodplain mapping
6th | Outdated design standards
7th | Limited access to flood insurance
8th | Other (to discuss)
What do you consider to be a major contributor to flood risk in the Region?
What do you consider to be an impediment to managing flood risk to life and property in the Region?

1st  Lack of emergency response coordination
2nd  Lack of adequate public communication methods
3rd  Lack of sustainable/resilient infrastructure
4th  Lack of operation and maintenance efforts
5th  Lack of interjurisdictional cooperation
6th  Other (to discuss)
Which RFPG goal category should be the most important for the San Jacinto Region? (Assign weight out of 100 points)

- Protect Life Safety: 0%
- Protect Property: 0%
- Improve Data: 0%
- Improve Policy & Regulations: 0%
- Improve Flood Mitigation Projects & Strategies: 0%
- Expand Funding: 0%
- Expand Education & Outreach: 0%
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: PROTECT LIFE SAFETY

1st  Reduce number of deaths

2nd  Improve emergency access and response (including mobility, access to shelter, and warning systems)
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: PROTECT PROPERTY

1st
- Reduce flood risk from structures (residential, commercial, public)

2nd
- Reduce impacts to Critical Facilities

3rd
- Reducing impacts to economic and agricultural production
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: IMPROVE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Goal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Identify and assess existing flood infrastructure within the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Improve understanding of flood risk; Increase extent and improve detail of H&amp;H modeling and mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Develop critical infrastructure database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: IMPROVE POLICY & REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Increase NFIP/CRS participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enhance local code, drainage criteria manuals and development standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Improve enforcement of floodplain management regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Improve interjurisdictional coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: IMPROVE FLOOD MITIGATION PROJECTS & STRATEGIES

1st  Increase sustainability and resiliency
2nd  Incorporate use of green infrastructure\n     nature-based solutions
3rd  Provide benefits to socially vulnerable\n     and low/moderate income areas
4th  Provide multi-benefits to community,\n     environmental and cultural resources
5th  Improve asset management, operation\n     and maintenance efforts
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: EXPAND FUNDING

1st
Increase communities with dedicated stormwater funding mechanisms

2nd
Expand eligibility for and use of funding programs (Local, State, Federal, Public/Private Partnerships)
Rank the most important sub goals within the goal category: EXPAND EDUCATION & OUTREACH

1st
- Improve flood awareness and disaster preparedness

2nd
- Increase number of flood insurance policyholders
Return to powerpoint
Item 11: Update, recommendations, and possible action from the Technical Committee
Item 12:
Evaluation and discussion of the August 31, 2021 Public Input meeting as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(a)(4)
Existing Flood Risk Public Meeting Stats

Total Registrants: 181
Total Registered Speakers: 15
Total Attendees: 75
Total Speakers: 3
Total visits to website: 1,387
Item 13: Presentation of 2021 Planning Group key dates and deadlines:
   a. Upcoming planning schedule milestones
   b. Next SJRFPG planning meeting to be held on October 14, 2021
September RFPG Mtg
09/02/2021

Adopt RFP Goals
10/14/2021

Approve Process for Identifying FMEs, FMSs, FMPs
10/14/2021
Item 14:
Update and discussion pertaining to the logistics of in-person RFPG meetings, and possible action regarding in-person meeting location
Item 15: Reminder regarding Planning Group member training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Item 16:
Presentation from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) – Galveston District: Metropolitan Houston Regional Watershed Assessment
METROPOLITAN HOUSTON REGIONAL WATERSHED ASSESSMENT SEC 729

USACE, Galveston District
9 September 2021
Lisa Mairs, PM
Carrie McCabe, RPEC

“The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.”
Authorization: Section 729 of WRDA 1986, as amended, allows USACE to study the water resources needs of river basins and regions of the United States.

Type of Project: Flood Risk Management (FRM)

Non Federal Sponsor: Harris County Flood Control District

MILESTONE SCHEDULE

Shared Vision Milestone
January 2020

Recommendation Milestone
April 2021

Draft Watershed Plan
May 2021

Final Watershed Plan
August 2021
CURRENT FRM EFFORTS

GLO
$75 Million total of CDBG Funds

TWDB
Regional Flood Planning Groups
State Flood Plan 2024

City of Houston
Resilient Houston Framework

HGAC
Regional Flood Management Committee

HCFCD
Data and Technical investments
2018 Bond Program
Feasibility- partnering and leading
HCFCD is currently updating analysis data and tools
CHARACTERIZING RISK IN THE REGION

3 flood risk sources in the region
- Coastal
- Fluvial
- Pluvial

Data and Mapping captures coastal and fluvial

Pluvial is evident but not yet diagnosed

MAAPnext will support pluvial analysis
### Problems

- Infrastructure upgrade needs exceed available agency resources
- Frequent flooding impacts communities with limited resources to rebuild, restart, repurpose and drives loss of green space in the pursuit of solutions
- Habitat is lost as a result of new development
- The adjacent or intertwined authorities of several agencies, in combination with the economic incentive to minimize current expenditures for current developments create a patchwork of regulations and therefore system quality

### Constraints

- Dense development creates physical limitations to structural solutions in some areas
- Changes in FRM implementation and actions must align with existing authorities or be consistent with the agency mission to support augmenting the authorities
- Stakeholders should express concurrence with recommendations
- Funding allocations are not unlimited; FRM investments create an opportunity cost for other investments
INVENTORY AND FORECAST

- Current FRM standards evolved from prior risk assessments

- Flood risk will continue to increase

- Mapping updates will change Harris County .2% flood zone to 1% flood zone

- Structural alternatives have partially addressed flood risk in the region and no one measure or agency will solve residual flooding

- Future FRM must leverage time and cooperation, address constraints and broaden impact assessment

- Current agency efforts create the best opportunity to align priorities and consider resilience
BROAD FINDINGS

Multiple agencies are impacted and engaged

Public underestimates flood risk

Traditional FRM approaches won’t catch up

• Increasing precipitation, population & development

• Constraints in built communities

Technical and analytical investment should be specific and coordinated

Risk communication must emphasize responsibility and tradeoffs

Scale of flood risk will require paradigm change and coordination

• Crossjurisdictional, higher level layering of actions is necessary
Leverage ongoing efforts to organize FRM priorities and encourage long term focus:

- Alignment of Agency (TWDB, GLO, CoH) efforts provide unique opportunity to broaden FRM solution lens, recommend larger coordinated efforts

- Use HUB to create engagement, drive risk communication and data collection, and use the Watershed Authority to reflect Stakeholder interests

Key Themes:
- Regional Coordination (RCoord)
- Risk Communication (RComm)
- Mitigation (Mit)
- FRM Investment and Equity (Inv/Eq)
- Drainage and FRM strategies (Dr)

Scale of Implementation:
- Household
- Neighborhood
- Bayou
- Region
FUTURE ACTIONS

Regional Coordinating Body Creation
  • Inviting stakeholders to scope what it should do, how to fund it, where to house it
  • Leverage the TWDB effort to assess needs and keep communication ongoing

Risk Communication
  • Suggesting future analysis of risk and priority areas and topics when the remapping is completed by HCFCD

Updating Watershed Assessment
  • Revisiting the priorities and data on a regular interval
Item 17:
Consider agenda items for next meeting
Item 18: Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person
Item 19: Adjourn