Region 6 - San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning Group
May 12, 2022
9:00 AM
Hybrid Meeting
Item 1: Call to Order
Item 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Item 3:
Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items
(3 minutes limit per person)
Item 4: Texas Water Development Board Update
Item 5: Approval of minutes - April 14, 2022
### Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Present (-) / Absent (+) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy E. Busche</td>
<td>Industries (Chair)</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisa Vinson</td>
<td>Water Districts (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Max</td>
<td>Counties (Secretary)</td>
<td>*Ervin Burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delie Fisseler</td>
<td>Public (At-Large member)</td>
<td>*Mike Turco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrett</td>
<td>River Authorities (At-Large member)</td>
<td>X *Brian Gallagher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Macie Donovan</td>
<td>Agricultural Interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Fethar</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>X</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 *Jill Bouillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Costello</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Shuckert</td>
<td>Flood Districts</td>
<td>*Dereck Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burrer</td>
<td>Water Utilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Maxwell</td>
<td>Coastal Communities</td>
<td>X *Bob Kossar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Quintero</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Gaynor</td>
<td>Upper Watershed</td>
<td>X *Stephanie Zettlueche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Present (-) / Absent (+) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope Zubelk</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ellis</td>
<td>Texas Division of Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Lambrecht</td>
<td>Texas Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Clark</td>
<td>Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Mayne Scrapping</td>
<td>Texas General Land Office</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Ingram</td>
<td>Texas Water Development Board</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malinda Johnson</td>
<td>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Bowser</td>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elie Althausen</td>
<td>Texas Department of Transportation</td>
<td>*Afrid Garra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Heidt</td>
<td>Fort Houston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
<td>Harris-Galveston Subsidence District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wade</td>
<td>Region H Regional Water Planning Group</td>
<td>*Jake Holingsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Bakkoo</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Protection District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Stevens</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liaisons from RFGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Regional Flood Planning Group</th>
<th>Present (-) / Absent (+) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burrer</td>
<td>Trinity Region RFG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Costello</td>
<td>Nueces Region RFG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
<td>Lower Brazos RFG</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaisons from Other Entities</td>
<td>Entiy</td>
<td>Present/Absent/ Alternate Present (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Vogler</td>
<td>Lower Basin RFPQ</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Harris</td>
<td>Trinity Region RFPQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liv Hazelbush</td>
<td>Coachella Region RFPQ</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wade</td>
<td>Region 1 Regional Water Planning Group</td>
<td>*Jake Hollingsworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Consultant Team Members</th>
<th>Entiy</th>
<th>Present/Absent/ Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory Stull</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Puckett</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes McKee</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah Najmuizlein</td>
<td>Holloway Environmental</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Starnes</td>
<td>Holloway Environmental</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Moore</td>
<td>Halff Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Herr</td>
<td>Halff Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Torres</td>
<td>Torres &amp; Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Adrian</td>
<td>Torres &amp; Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quorum:**
Quorum: Yes
Number of voting members or alternates that were present: 15
Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 15: 8

**Attendees:**

In Person: Claudie Garcia (HCED), Fatima Berrios (HCED)

James Bronikowski (TWDB)  
John Brizdzia  
Lisa McCracken (USA/AG)  
Marcus Stuckhart  
Patti Jornal Knudsen  
Peggy Zehler  
Rebecca Andrews  
Stephen Gage (HCTRA)  
Susan Chadwick  
Walter Morris (Knudsen)

***Meeting attendee names were gathered from those who entered information on the WebEx meeting registration. All meeting materials were available for the public at: Meetings - San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning (sanjacintofloodplanning.org)***
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Mr. Buscha called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome and Roll Call
In lieu of Ms. Max, Secretary, Ms. Berrios took attendance. A quorum was determined to be present.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items (Limit of 3 Minutes Per Person)
Mr. Buscha opened the floor for registered public comments. Mr. Graziano, a member of the public, expressed that he wanted to comment at the end of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Texas Water Development Board Update
Ms. Ingram wanted to congratulate the group and the Technical Consultants for the successful submission of the Technical Memorandum submitted in March. Ms. Ingram stated that the Texas Water Development Board was compiling informal comments for the February and March Technical Memoranda which would be provided soon.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 03, 2022
Mr. Buscha opened the floor for comments on the March 3, 2022 meeting minutes. Mr. Barrett provided minor suggested corrections to the meeting minutes, which Ms. Vinson agreed with. Ms. Vinson moved to approve the minutes, as revised. Ms. Powers seconded. Mr. Buscha stated the motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Announcement of New Alternate Members and New Non-Voting Members
Mr. Buscha announced new non-voting members or alternates:
- For the Counties position, Ms. Max’s alternate to be Mr. Evin Burden, Assistant Director, RRO at Harris County Engineering Department
- The new Texas General Land Office representative to be Ms. Karla Freyman-Stripling
- The new Houston-Galveston Area Council representative to be Mr. Justin Bower and Mr. Steven Johnston as his alternate

Mr. Buscha noted that Ms. Max would be retiring from Harris County Engineering Department at the end of May. Mr. Buscha stated the Project Sponsor would begin the solicitation process for the Counties Voting Member position.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Liaison Reports Pertaining to Other Region(s) Progress and Status:
- Trinity Region – Mr. Burrell reported being invited to an upcoming tour for the tunnel built in the region
- Nueces Region – Mr. Buscha stated Mr. Gonzello would be late to join the call and he would provide his update later in the meeting
- Lower Brazos Region – Mr. Vogler stated that the Lower Brazos got through public meetings and things were moving along well
- Region H Water – Mr. Buscha stated that he would meet with Mr. Wade later in the week

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Update from the Project Sponsor regarding the solicitation of the Flood Districts Voting Member Position
Ms. Berrios advised the members that the solicitation closed April 8, 2022. She stated the Project Sponsor received two applications, so no shortlisting meeting was needed. Ms. Berrios stated the tentative
Interviews were scheduled for April 25, 2022 and the recommendation from the Executive Committee would be made during the May SIRFG meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding the Membership of Advisory Committees

a. Technical Committee
Mr. Buscha stated that the Technical Committee was not at the full membership of five. Mr. Buscha noted that with the departure of Mr. Stuckett, the group wanted to include a Flood Districts member and deferred to the group. Ms. Donovan mentioned that Ms. Green, Mr. Stuckett’s alternate, wished to join the Technical Committee and noted that at the last Technical Committee meeting Ms. Green’s comments had to be treated as public comments. Ms. Donovan suggested Ms. Green be appointed to be a member of the Technical Committee. Ms. Vinson stated that the SIRFG could appoint Ms. Green as the interim member until the new Flood Districts Voting Member was appointed. Ms. Donovan made the motion to appoint Ms. Green as the interim member of the Technical Committee, seconded by Ms. Vinson. Mr. Buscha announced the motion carried unanimously to appoint Ms. Green and Ms. Green acknowledged she would be willing to serve.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Update from the Technical Consultant on:

a. Technical Approach for conducting the Needs Analysis (Task 4A)
b. Minimum Standards (Task 3A)
c. Process for Recommending Potentially Feasible FMEs, FMSs, and FMPs (Task 5)
d. Public Engagement, Communications and Outreach Plan, and the Upcoming Public Meeting

Mr. Buscha yielded the floor to the Technical Consultants. Mr. Stull, with Freeze and Nichols, Inc., briefed the group on the agenda and briefly discussed the premise of the discussion. Mr. Moore, with Hallf Associates, reviewed the task requirements and goals for Task 4A Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis. Mr. Moore described Task 4A as a two-pronged approach: 1) to find where the flood risk knowledge gaps are and 2) to find where the greatest known flood risks are. Mr. Moore went on to describe in detail the requirements in the Task 4A Flood Mitigation Needs Analysis:

![FEMA Technical Guidance for Task 4A](image)

Mr. Moore described the approach for the deliverables using location maps depicting studies and projects. Mr. Moore defined Hydrologic Unit Codes (HUCs) as a drainage area. Mr. Moore stated that within FEMA HUC 12, there were a total of 215 HUCs being used for comparison of information against each other. Mr. Moore explained the scoring and ranges within the HUCs. Mr. Moore stated the information gathered related to existing conditions and demonstrated with map graphics including tabular information. Discussion ensued. Mr. Moore went on to criteria number ten which included the Social Vulnerability...
Index (SV). Mr. Moore went over the next steps and mentioned the comments received today would be incorporated.

Mr. Busch announced a five minute recess at 10:28 a.m. and indicated we would get a brief from Mr. Costello upon our return. Mr. Busch reconvened the meeting at 10:33 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: (Continued)
Mr. Costello updated that the Naches region was following the same path as the SJRPG, but said he would aim to attend their technical committee meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: (Continued)
Mr. Stull overviewed task 3A: Floodplain Management Practices and the inventory of existing practices the Technical Consultants have identified.

Ms. Puckett mentioned the goals discussed last fall with the SJRPG were a compliment to Task 3A – Minimum Standards. Ms. Puckett reviewed the guidance for the Task 3A and the difference between recommending or adopting the minimum standards. Ms. Puckett stated it was recommended not to adopt the minimum standards, but instead to recommend floodplain management standards for consideration by regulatory entities. Ms. Donovan stated the Technical Committee had agreed not to provide a recommendation, as they determined that this was a decision for the SJRPG, not just the Technical Committee. Discussion ensued. Ms. Puckett explained the list of potential minimum standards.

Preliminary List of Identified Standards

1. Participation in the RFP
2. Defining Region-wide No Adverse Impact Policy
3. Escalation Minimum FFs
4. Encourage Use of Best Available Rainfall (Atlas-14)
5. Compensatory Storage in the 1% Floodplain (100-year)
6. Compensatory Storage in the 0.25% Floodplain (500-year)
7. Development of Detailed H&H Analysis Criteria/Requirements
8. Incentivizing the Preservation of the Floodplain

Figure 27 taken from SJRPG April 14, 2022 Meeting Materials

Ms. Puckett continued reviewing potential minimum standards. Discussion ensued. Mr. Busch reminded the group to send over suggested language changes to the Technical Consultants. Ms. Puckett explained the schedule of the draft plan, that would be distributed to the group.

Figure 27 taken from SJRPG April 14, 2022 Meeting Materials
Ms. Puckett clarified the roll-out of the draft chapters for discussion. Ms. Puckett stated that voting on the chapters would be distributed between several SIRFPG meetings. Ms. Puckett reviewed the recap of the FMs and the recommendation process.

Ms. Puckett stated plans of utilizing the GIS dashboards for reviewing the data for SIRFPG consideration. Ms. Puckett explained the Texas Water Development Board's guidance issued in March.

Ms. Najmiuddin recapped what was discussed such as metrics, goals, and comments with the Public Engagement Committee. Ms. Najmiuddin explained the recommendations for the public engagement meetings such as three meetings: one virtual open house style meeting and two open house style in-person meetings. Mr. Buscha wanted clarification about the limits of member participation – two from each committee, and no more than six from the full SIRFPG. Mr. Buscha asked for coordination with the Project Sponsor, so no quorum issue would exist at those public meetings.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Update and recommendation from the Technical Committee and possible action from the RPPG as it pertains to the technical approach for conducting the Needs Analysis (Task 4A)

Mr. Buscha opened the floor for discussion on the Technical Committee’s recommendation regarding the approach for conducting the Needs Analysis, as presented by the Technical Consultants under agenda item ten. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Costello asked to have a short Technical Committee meeting to further discuss, and Mr. Stull explained the tight deadline, recommending leaving the agriculture area in for now, with continued discussion. Discussion ensued. Mr. Costello motioned to approve the Technical Committee’s recommendation and Dr. Gaynor seconded. Mr. Buscha announced that the motion passed.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Update from the Public Engagement Committee, discussion, and possible action from the RPPG as it pertains to the development of the Communications and Outreach Plan

Mr. Buscha deferred to Mr. Burrell for the public outreach meeting recommendation from the Public Engagement Committee and noted that there was no action in this item.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Approval and Certification of Administrative Expenses Incurred by the Project Sponsor for the Development of Regional Flood Plan

Mr. Buscha presented the requested administrative expenses for approval. Mr. Costello made the motion to approve, and Ms. Powers seconded. Mr. Buscha announced the motion carried to approve the expenses.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Presentation Of 2022 Planning Group Key Dates and Deadlines:
   a. Upcoming Planning Schedule Milestones
   b. Next SIRFPG Planning Meeting to be held on May 12, 2022

Mr. Buscha stated the schedule was indicated in the meeting materials.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Update and Discussion Pertaining to In-Person RPPG Meeting Location(s)

Mr. Buscha stated that the meeting would continue to be hybrid and the Project Sponsor would continue to seek a meeting location where all the voting members would be invited to attend in-person.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Reminder Regarding Planning Group Member Training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Mr. Buscha reminded the group that any member who hasn’t completed the training needed to do so and to submit records to the Project Sponsor.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Consider Agenda Items for Next Meeting
Mr. Buscha identified the following items for the next agenda:
- Identify possible presentation by Gulf Coast Protection District (GCPD) at the May 12 meeting
- Update on Flood Districts Voting Member position vacancy
- Goals for adoption of FMXs voting

Ms. Vinton suggested to move the GCPD’s presentation to a future meeting. Ms. Baker stated she would coordinate to move the presentation to the June meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 18: Public Comments – Limit 3 Minutes Per Person
Mr. Busche opened the floor to Mr. John Graziano, Manager at Lovin’ G Ranch. Mr. Graziano stated that he and other ranchers had concerns about eminent domain. Mr. Graziano complimented Mr. Moore on his presentation.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 19: Adjourn
Mr. Buscho announced the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

______________________________
Alisa Max, Secretary

______________________________
Timothy Buscha, Chair
Item 6:
Announcement of new Alternate Members and new Non-Voting Members
Item 7: 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 8: Update from the Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action regarding the appointment of the Flood Districts Voting Member Position
Item 9:
Discussion, and Possible Action Regarding the Membership of Advisory Committees
   a. Technical Committee
Item 10: Presentation and update from the Technical Consultant on the progress of the regional flood plan and possible action from the RFPG on Minimum Standards (Task 3A)
Agenda

• Task 3A: Minimum Standards

• Identified FMXs & GIS Dashboard Demo

• Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities

• Task 8: Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations

• Task 10: Public Meetings Update
Task 3A: Floodplain Management Practices

Recommend vs Adopt

Entities are NOT REQUIRED to meet or exceed recommended standards to have FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs included in the flood plan.

Entities ARE REQUIRED to meet or exceed adopted standards prior to the RFPG including any FMEs, FMSs, or FMPs in the flood plan.
List of Identified Standards

1. Participation in the NFIP
2. Defining Region-wide No Adverse Impact Policy
3. Establish Minimum FFEs
4. Encourage use of Best-Available Rainfall (Atlas-14)
5. Compensatory Storage in the 1% Floodplain (100-year)
6. Compensatory Storage in the 0.2% Floodplain (500-year)
7. Development of Detailed H&H Analysis Criteria/Requirements
8. Incentivizing the Preservation of the Floodplain
Minimum Standard

1. Participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)
   • All regulatory entities to implement ordinances that meet minimum requirements per the NFIP
   • All regulatory entities to remain active NFIP participants in good standing
   • All regulatory entities are encouraged to participate in the Community Rating System (CRS) Program to reduce flood insurance rate premiums across the region

2. Development of No Adverse Impact Policies
   • All regulatory entities are encouraged to define a no adverse impact policy appropriate to meet the unique needs of each entity.
   • The no adverse impact policy should be focused on preventing impacts to adjacent properties. Evaluation of impacts should be completed using best available hydrologic and hydraulic modeling, where appropriate.
Minimum Standard

3. Establish Minimum Finished Floor Elevations

- All new habitable structures shall have a finished floor elevation established at or waterproofed to the FEMA Effective 500-year flood elevation as shown on effective Flood Insurance Studies.
- Where regulatory mapping has been updated using Atlas 14 rainfall data, all new habitable structures shall have a finished floor elevation established at or waterproofed to the FEMA Effective 100-year flood elevation as shown on effective Flood Insurance Studies.

4. Encourage use of Best-Available Rainfall Data

- Utilize the latest rainfall data (NOAA Atlas 14) when conducting new analyses, designing drainage infrastructure, and developing regulations and criteria.
Minimum Standard

5. Compensatory Storage Requirements in the 1% AEP Floodplain

- Any reduction in floodplain storage or conveyance capacity within the 1% annual chance regulatory floodplain must be offset with a hydraulically equivalent (one-to-one) volume of mitigation sufficient to offset the reduction, except in areas identified as coastal flood zones (FEMA Flood Zone V and VE). Mitigation shall be provided within the same watershed from which floodplain storage was reduced.
- A full hydrologic and hydraulic analysis should be developed to demonstrate that floodplain fill mitigation provided outside of the development property is sufficient.

6. Compensatory Storage Requirements in the 0.2% AEP Floodplain

- Any reduction in floodplain storage or conveyance capacity within the 0.2% annual chance regulatory floodplain must be offset with a hydraulically equivalent (one-to-one) volume of mitigation sufficient to offset the reduction, except in areas identified as coastal flood zones (FEMA Flood Zone V and VE). Mitigation shall be provided within the same watershed from which floodplain storage was reduced.
- A full hydrologic and hydraulic analysis should be developed to demonstrate that floodplain fill mitigation provided outside of the development property is sufficient.
Minimum Standard

7. Development of Detailed H&H Analysis Criteria/Requirements

- All regulatory entities to develop hydrologic and hydraulic modeling criteria or requirements, as appropriate for the area of the flood planning region.
- All regulatory entities to identify features of a proposed development that would warrant a full hydrologic and hydraulic analysis.

8. Incentivizing the Preservation of the Floodplain

- All regulatory entities are encouraged to explore and develop systems for incentivizing the preservation of the floodplain to reduce development directly within the regulatory floodplain or within 100-ft of the banks of unstudied streams.
List of Identified Standards

1. Participation in the NFIP
2. Defining Region-wide No Adverse Impact Policy
3. Establish Minimum FFEs
4. Encourage use of Best-Available Rainfall (Atlas-14)
5. Compensatory Storage in the 1% Floodplain (100-year)
6. Compensatory Storage in the 0.2% Floodplain (500-year)
7. Development of Detailed H&H Analysis Criteria/Requirements
8. Incentivizing the Preservation of the Floodplain
**What are FMXs**

Evaluated in Task 4B but recommended by the RFPG in Task 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A <strong>proposed flood study</strong> 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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A <strong>proposed project, either structural or non-structural</strong>, that has non-zero capital costs or other non-recurring cost and when implemented will reduce flood risk, mitigate flood hazards to life or property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A <strong>proposed plan</strong> to reduce flood risk or mitigate flood hazards to life or property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designation

Needs Inventory generated by Tech Consultant and Stakeholders

Is there a defined program comprised of multiple projects?

Yes → Does the plan have sufficient information to implement?

Yes → FMS

No → Has the need been evaluated or studied before?

No → FME

Yes → Do we have a current model and sufficient details?

Yes → FMP

No → FME
Designation

Necessary Requirements for FMP

FMP
• Capital Cost
• Demonstrate NAI
• Benefit-Cost Analysis
• Clearly defined; have sufficient data to populate required details

Necessary Requirements for FME/S

FME
• Capital Cost
• Engineering evaluation needed

FMS
• Non-capital costs; recurring costs (Ex: Education Campaign)
Development of the FMX List

Data Collection:

• Survey Submissions
• Direct correspondence with potential sponsors
• Publicly available data

+70 Referenced studies

104 Unique Project Sponsors Represented
FMX Details Included for Initial Review

- FMP/FMS Benefit Area – Location
- FME Study Area - Location
- Project Name & Description
- Project Sponsor
- Associated RFPG Goals
- FMX Type
- Cost Estimates
High-Level Overview

The majority of FMXs in the draft plan will be FMEs:
• FMEs identified by sponsors
• FMEs identified by Needs Analysis (Task 4A)
• In the San Jacinto Region, there are many potential structural projects that demonstrate NAI, but do not have a BCR.

Opportunity to develop FMPs in amended plan.
A wide range of projects have been identified for the San Jacinto region.

- Drainage Criteria Improvements
- Bintliff Ditch Improvements D133-00-00
- Galveston Bay Surge Protection Coastal Storm Risk Management
RFPG Review of FMXs

RFPG to review data pushed to GIS Dashboard and return comments by May 25, 2022 (3-week review time).

Please reach out directly to the Technical Consultant team at SJRFPG.TechCon@freese.com with any questions or comments.
GIS Dashboard Demo

Region 6 San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning

- **24** Flood Management Evaluations
- **73** Flood Mitigation Projects
- **11** Flood Management Strategies

Flood Risk Reduction Actions

*Disclaimer:* This dashboard displays DRAFT data prepared for Region 6 as part of the Texas Regional Flood Planning process. This information is an interim working product for the RPPG and will not become final until formally adopted by the RPPG as part of the Final Regional Flood Plan in January 2023.
Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities

Task Goals:

• Summarize the nature and types of flood response preparations
• Coordinate and communicate to gather information
• No analysis or recommendations for flood response
Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities

- Mitigation
- Preparedness
- Recovery
- Response
Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities

Guidance

• Summarize flood response activities undertaken
• Entities involved in flood response along with roles and responsibilities
• Tie to flood management strategies (FMS) and projects (FMP) which will reduce the amount of flood risk
Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities

Approach

1. Investigate Hazard Mitigation Plans
2. Summarize Entity Response
3. Review other flood response documentation
4. Tabulate roles and responsibilities
5. Draft Chapter 7
Task 8: Administrative, Regulatory, and Legislative Recommendations

Guidance:

• Legislative, regulatory, and administrative recommendations considered necessary to facilitate flood management, planning, and implementation

• Any other recommendations considered necessary and desirable to achieve regional flood mitigation and management goals

• Recommendations regarding potential, new revenue-raising opportunities that could fund development, operation, and maintenance of flood management and mitigation activities
Public Engagement Meeting Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Format</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 24, 2022</td>
<td>In-Person Open House</td>
<td>The Recreation Center at Rob Fleming Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>6464 Creekside Forest Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Woodlands, TX 77389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 26, 2022</td>
<td>Virtual Open House</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 31, 2022</td>
<td>In-Person Open House</td>
<td>Clear Lake Shores Clubhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>931 Cedar Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear Lake Shores, TX 77565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In-Person Meeting Details

- Open House
  - Three Stations
    - Flood Risk
    - Flood Management Practices
    - Studies and Mitigation Solutions
  - Self-paced event with an opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions on the RFP projects.
  - Project Team members will be present to engage with the public
Zoom Meeting Details

• Open House
  • Three Breakout Rooms – Presentations and Q&A in 30 - minute intervals led by the project team
    • Flood Risk
    • Flood Management Practices
    • Studies and Mitigation Solutions
  • “How-to Participate” presentation will help orient members of the public
  • Participants will be able to move between rooms on their own
  • Hollaway staff will be available and present to help troubleshoot any tech issues for the public
Meeting Material - Examples

Navigating the Open House

Project Topic Station Descriptions

A Engineering - Project Alignment
Review and discuss the Preferred Project Alignment and the reasons for selecting this alignment over others.

B Real Estate
Discuss real estate opportunities and challenges related to the project.

C Project Partners
Discuss the involvement and roles of various project partners.

D Environmental Impacts
Examine and discuss the environmental impacts related to the project.

E Land Use
Discuss the potential land use changes and impacts.

F Engineering - Project Structures
Explore the design and construction of key project components.

G Project Summary
Summarize the project goals, timeline, and outcomes.

ABOUT THE SAN JACINTO REGIONAL FLOOD PLAN

The San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning Group (San Jacinto Region) is one of the 16 regional flood planning groups formed by the Texas legislature. The group includes representatives from 11 counties and is charged with developing a regional flood plan.

The San Jacinto Region's flood planning process is designed to identify and address flood risk in the region. It involves collecting data, analyzing risk, and developing a plan to mitigate flood impacts.

STAY UP-TO-DATE

Visit Our Website
sanjacintofloodplanning.org

For Questions & Comments
Email
sanjacinto@tamu.edu

TWIAC Contact:
Image: jason.d.decker@tamu.edu

Take the Regional Survey

SANJACINTOFLOODPLANNING.ORG

SJRFP6 TIMELINE

SANJACINTO@FLOODPLANNING.ORG
Schedule through Draft RFP

- Apr 4: Apr Notice, Apr Materials, Vote on Needs Analysis
- Apr 18: Apr RFP Meeting
- May 2: May Notice, May Materials, Vote on Minimum Standards
- May 16: Send out Chapters 1, Send Out Chapter 7, 8
- May 30: Send out Chapters 2, 3
- Jun 13: Jun Notice, Jun Materials, Vote on FMXs
- Jun 27: Send out Chapter 10
- Jul 11: Send out Chapter 5, 6, 9
- Jul 25: Jul Notice, Jul Materials, Vote on Draft Plan
- Aug 8: Submit Draft Plan

Legend:
- Public Engagement
- Major Votes
- RFP Meeting
- Chapters to RFP
- Deliverable to TWDB

Public Input on FMXs
Item 11: Update from the Public Engagement Committee, discussion, and possible action from the RFPG as it pertains to the approval of the Communications and Outreach Plan, and upcoming Open House Public Engagement Events
Item 12:
Approval and Certification of Administrative Expenses Incurred by The Project Sponsor for The Development of Regional Flood Plan
Administrative Expenses Incurred by Project Sponsor deferred to: June 9, 2022, SJRFPG Monthly Meeting
Item 13: Presentation of 2022 Planning Group Key Dates and Deadlines:

a. Upcoming Planning Schedule Milestones
b. Next SJRFPG Planning Meeting to be held on June 9, 2022
Item 14:
Update and Discussion Pertaining to In-Person RFPG Meeting Location(s)
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: Adjournment