Region 6 : San Jacinto
Regional Flood Planning Group
Public Engagement Committee Meeting
May 5, 2022
10:00 AM
Hybrid Meeting
Item 1:
Call to Order
Item 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Item 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items (limit of 3 minutes per person)
Item 4:
Approval of Minutes
a. July 28, 2021
Meeting Minutes
Public Engagement Committee
July 28, 2021
5:00PM
CISCO WebEx Virtual Meeting

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Engagement Committee Member</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Present (X) / Absent () / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burris</td>
<td>Water Utilities (Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lock</td>
<td>Electric Generating Utilities (Vic. Chair)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Powers</td>
<td>Environmental (Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Quintero</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum:

Quorum: yes
Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: 4
Number required for quorum per current voting membership: 4:3

Other Meeting Attendees: **
Voting: None
Non-Voting: Ele Alkhoury

Catherine Foley
Christyn Cavazos
Cory Stull
Fatima Berrios
Hayes McKibben
Kena Ware
Lisa Mains
Maggie Puckett
Rold Minsky
Walter Morris

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

All meeting materials are available for the public at: Flood Planning Group Meeting Schedule | Texas Water Development Board
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Ms. Berrios called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Mr. Berrios welcomed everyone, took attendance and a quorum was established.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items – limit 3 minutes per person
Ms. Berrios stated there were no registered comments and proceeded with the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Nominations, discussion, and possible action to elect Committee Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary
Ms. Berrios opened the floor for volunteers to fill the Chair position of the Public Engagement Committee.
Mr. Bulter stated he would volunteer to be the Chair of the Public Engagement Committee. Mr. Lock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Bulter then opened the floor for Vice Chair. Mr. Lock volunteered for the position. Ms. Powers then seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Bulter then asked for a volunteer to be secretary. Ms. Powers volunteered. Mr. Lock seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Discussion and possible recommendations concerning setting a future date for the next public outreach meeting, platform, and public input method as required by Texas Water Code §15.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §361.12(4)(d).
Mr. Stull stated that the next Public Outreach meeting was scheduled to be on the end of August to allow the public input meeting to be virtual. He stated Freese and Nichols Inc (FNI) proposed dates on August 23, 24, 30 or 31. Mr. Bulter stated that the 30 and 31 would be preferable. Discussion ensued. After several suggestions, Mr. Powers motioned to move forward with August 30 or 31st for the next Public Engagement Meeting. Ms. Quintero seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Stull stated the Mr. Stokes would be providing an overview for the proposed Public Engagement Meeting. Mr. Stokes stated the Holloway Environmental. (MC) Communications assistant, was proposing to use the same format as the previous Public Engagement Meeting held in May. As in the Initial Public Engagement Meeting, Mr. Stokes recommended that the Public Engagement Meeting in August be translated in Spanish and the bulk of the meeting be public comments. Mr. Stokes stated that expectations be set before the meeting. In order to maintain an organized and effective meeting. Mr. Stokes stated meeting notices would be given both in Spanish and English. The Public Engagement Committee members agreed with the format.

Mr. Stull then stated that the interactive web-map would be demonstrated at the meeting and would be used to gather public input on the San Jacinto RFG website. He stated the map would allow members of the public to place dots or areas on the map of concern and provide their input and feedback. Ms. Quintero asked if the map would be provided in Spanish. Mr. Stokes stated that a separate link to a Spanish map can be provided. Mr. Bulter stated that the MUDs are required to provide notices in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. Mr. Stull stated he did not believe there was any additional requirements for translation, but would verify with the Texas Water Development Board. Mr. Stull added that the format of the Public Engagement Meeting would be Zoom virtual platform.
For the next Public Engagement Meeting, Mr. Stokes asked if the San Jacinto RFPG would want to allow non-registered verbal comments or if the SJRFPG would prefer just written comments provided through the website. Ms. Quintero stated, in order to keep the meeting organized, it would be preferable to encourage all other non-registered comments to be made through the website. Mr. Stokes stated that clear expectations would be given at the beginning of the meeting with a limit on the amount of time each speaker could speak. Mr. Stokes also stated that no comments would be responded to during the meeting. Mr. Burrell then agreed that setting a time limit and specific parameters would be appropriate for the next meeting.

Mr. Burrell stated that the Public Engagement Committee would make the recommendation to allow PNI to set up the next public meeting like the Pre-planning meeting platform with clear expectations to the San Jacinto RFPG.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Update from Technical Consultant on Communications Plan, website launch, and survey
Mr. Stokes provided a brief overview. Mr. Stokes stated that the website is almost ready to launch with all the previously discussed communications tools including the public surveys, interactive map, and with the agreed upon design and functionality. He stated that the URL and accessibility features still needed to be agreed upon by the SJRFPG. He also stated Holloway Environmental will incorporate social media platforms. Discussion on social media platforms ensued.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Discussion and possible recommendations regarding future Public Engagement Committee meeting location/format and logistics
Mr. Minny stated that the San Jacinto RFPG was subject to the Open Meetings Act meaning that after September 1, 2021 all meetings have to go back to in-person meetings. Mr. Burrell stated that he has an office that can accommodate 25 people socially distanced. Mr. Stull stated that the Group did not have to be monthly, however should meet based on content and as needed.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Consider agenda items for the next Public Engagement Committee Meeting agenda
- Discussion from the next Public Engagement Meeting
- Evaluation of the August Public Engagement Meeting

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person
Ms. Bernius stated no request to make comments had been made.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Adjourn
Mr. Burrell adjourned the meeting at 4:06 p.m.

Rachel Powers, Secretary

Todd Burrell, Chair
Item 4: Approval of Minutes
b. March 10, 2022
Meeting Minutes
Public Engagement Committee
March 10, 2022 at 11:30 AM

Hybrid Meeting | Virtual Registration: https://bit.ly/3MhLsFZ
Trini Mendenhall Community Center | 1414 Wirt Rd., Houston, TX 77055

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Engagement Committee Member</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Present (P) / Absent (A) / Alternate Present (AP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burner</td>
<td>Water Utilities (Chair)</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lock</td>
<td>Electric Generating Utilities (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Powers</td>
<td>Environmental (Secretary)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Quintero</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Pothier</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum:
Quorum: Yes
Number of voting members or alternates representing voting members present: 5
Number required for quorum per current voting membership: 5/3

Other Meeting Attendees: **
Voting: None
Non-Voting: None

In person:
Claudia Garcia (HCED), Fatima Berrios (HCED), Connor Stokes (Holloway), Marcello Moszy

Remote:
Bob Leiabrock                          Matt Lopez (IRT-FCD)
Brooke Banajes                          Peggy Zahler
Colleen Gilbert                         Stephan Gage (IRT-HCTRA)
Ginger C. Hrub                          Susan Chadwick
Grant Moss (Beavon Preservation Association) Todd Steckers
Holloway Environmental + Communications Tom Mumford (Holloway)
Justin Bartlett                         Unknown, 2
Mariah Najmuddin (Holloway)

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

All meeting materials are available for the public at: Flood Planning Group Meeting Schedule | Texas Water Development Board
AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order
Mr. Burrer called the meeting to order at 11:31 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Welcome and Roll Call
Mr. Burrer welcomed the meeting attendees and went around the in-person conference room for introductions. Mr. Berrios took attendance, and a quorum was established.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items – limit 3 minutes per person
Ms. Berrios stated there were no registered public comments.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Update from Technical Consultant on public engagement metrics and strategies
Mr. Stokes with Holloway Environmental + Communications, welcomed the committee and gave an update on the SIRFPG website dashboard metrics. Mr. Stokes stated there had been an increase in survey replies. Mr. Stokes updated the committee on the distribution list, which was up to 1,220. Mr. Stokes stated that the eblast would increase and described the SIRFPG social media platforms to the group.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Discussion and recommendations for public engagement metrics that support the goals outlined in the SIRFPG Communications and Media Engagement Plan – June 2021, as well as goals adopted by the SIRFPG in November 2021
Ms. Najmuddin with Holloway Environmental + Communications, began by reviewing the Communication Plan goals presented to the group during the June 2021 Public Engagement meeting. Ms. Najmuddin stated that the goals and the plans should be informed by the Public Engagement Committee and opened for comments. Ms. Quiñero stated she shared the survey with neighbors, and she had to guide the non-technical savvy through it, which she recognized as a barrier. Ms. Quiñero stated that she noticed the font and zoom features on mobile devices proved difficult to read and suggested to bring up the link on the feed so that members could easily share it.

Mr. Lock wanted to ensure goals could be measured. Ms. Powers stated there was no discussion of “meaningful engagement and input from a broad audience” as a goal. Mr. Powers continued that the survey was providing opportunities for input and not getting input, so she suggested to include a goal for meaningful input. Mr. Burrer suggested to revise goal number four to include “…and get meaningful input.” Ms. Powers agreed with Mr. Burrer. Discussion ensued regarding “meaningful” definition. Mr. Stokes stated that the communications consultant intended to track the goals and acknowledged the committee’s concerns with the language in the goals. Ms. Powers differentiated between quantitative vs. qualitative goal setting. Mr. Burrer asked if the Texas Water Development Board provided a definition and whether these goals met the requirements, or not. Mr. Stokes explained further regarding the requirements of having different forms for public participation. Mr. Burrer stated he would like to quantify the term “meaningful” as it related to metrics.

Ms. Powers referred to the previous public comment meeting and noted that most people had questions, not comments. Ms. Powers stated that if people didn’t understand when and how to provide comments, it would be difficult to do so. Ms. Najmuddin suggested the need of a basic awareness campaign where people would be encouraged to visit the website paired with translating the technical terms into common language and making a timeline for the public’s reference. Ms. Powers suggested an “open house” style meeting with one period of the meeting intended for public comment and/or questions. Ms. Powers
continued that the rest of the meeting could be with stations, graphs, and charts to educate people, citing concerns with complying with the Texas Open Meeting Act. Mr. Stokes agreed with an “open house” style meeting and suggested this type of meeting could be useful for the next public meeting. Mr. Stokes suggested the communicans consultant would take the input to the technical consultant to come up with how to incorporate them.

Mr. Stokes stated that the entire Communications Plan was included in the meeting materials and opened for comments or questions. Mr. Stokes began with the introduction of the Communications Plan and continued to present a high-level overview of the plan to the committee and meeting attendees. Mr. Burrer opened for questions and noted the measuring metrics graph at the end. Mr. Stokes pointed out that the graphic used quantitative tracking and didn’t speak for Ms. Powers’ concerns or qualitative tracking. Ms. Powers noted in section four regarding key audiences, should specifically include community-based organizations or ambassadors. Ms. Powers touched on representatives from lower income communities and those with historically less investment in infrastructure. Mr. Stokes concluded that Ms. Powers’ suggestion could be incorporated in the plan. Mr. Burrer opened for further comments, and none were provided.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Discussion and possible recommendations for leveraging SIRFPG member participation in public engagement strategies

Mr. Stokes reviewed a list of recommendations on increasing outreach and level-of-feedback received. Ms. Najmuudin explained further regarding social media platforms and the ability to share by identifying and tagging those organizations and communities that Ms. Powers mentioned previously. Ms. Najmuudin continued by reinforcing that there should be a SIRFPG presence on social media platforms and to be intentional in reaching groups where they were. Ms. Najmuudin continued with the communications consultants’ recommendations and advised the group that they put together informational booklets to attendees of the TMFA Conference to increase awareness, as part of the outreach. Ms. Najmuudin opened the floor for feedback or ideas on what community engagement could look like.

Mr. Burrer stated the recommendations looked great and suggested going through MUDS and the Cities for distribution. Ms. Powers didn’t see recommendations on reaching out to the media and Ms. Najmuudin stated they could put together a press list and come up with a press release. Ms. Quintero suggested to make a presentation on Fox 26 on Saturday morning for awareness. Ms. Quintero suggested having a press release and doing a press conference. Ms. Quintero stated she would get with her contacts at Fox 26 and Univision. Ms. Quintero further suggested to include an interactive text pop-up on the site to give feedback in trying to access the survey. Ms. Quintero raised the question if the group could get feedback from other regions in their encounters with community engagement. Ms. Powers suggested SIRFPG presence on Earth Day which expects 10,000 people. Mr. Lock suggested HTV where the City of Houston broadcasts their open meetings. Mr. Moacir suggested a database of people who opened insurance claims related to flood. Mr. Moacir stated he had a contact at the Houston Business Journal and offered to make that connection as another way to reach the public. Ms. Pothier commented on recommendation number three in the plan and suggested the County Clerk send notices to homeowners/business owners and property taxpayers in their mailouts. Mr. Burrer asked the group for additional recommendations and there weren’t any. Mr. Stokes stated that the next step would be to include the Committee’s recommendations in the plan and get it out for adoption.
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Discussion and possible recommendations regarding the next public outreach meeting format and public input method(s) as required by Texas Water Code §16.062(d) and 31 Texas Administrative Code §561.126(a)(1)

Mr. Stokes stated the consultants were looking at a Summer 2022 date for the next Public Engagement meeting. Mr. Stokes stated the communications consultant wanted to start the planning process for the next Public Engagement meeting. Discussion ensued regarding possible dates. Mr. Stokes could not specify a firm date after Ms. Powers asked for a more targeted date. Ms. Berrios stated that the next mandatory meeting was set for public comments to the draft Regional Flood Plan, which should be ready in May, thus having a meeting in June made sense. Mr. Burrell explored the group to nail down a date for scheduling and suggested to move the date to include Ms. Powers. Ms. Berrios clarified the Regional Flood Plan draft is due in early August and required to be presented to the public for a window of 30-days. Ms. Berrios suggested to follow up with Freese and Nichols, Inc., to pick a date. Mr. Burrell suggested June 31, 2022 with three full weeks to review before the meeting. Ms. Berrios stated to continue to have hybrid meetings and Ms. Powers suggested multiple meetings for a better outcome. Mr. Stokes wanted to ensure that the proposed open house style meeting format wouldn’t interfere with Texas Open Meeting Act. Ms. Powers suggested to keep virtual separate from in-person meetings. Mr. Burrell asked if it was necessary to get permission for funding from the group. Ms. Berrios stated it could be considered by the SJFPC, but only needed Chair approval. Ms. Powers asked Ms. Quintana if this plan aligned for meaningful input from the communities she works with. Ms. Quintana agreed with keeping the in-person separate from the virtual open house. Mr. Burrell asked where we could have the “open house” meetings. Ms. Berrios stated the project sponsor would seek legal input and report back and added that a central location to the region or a community center would be most appropriate.

Mr. Stokes offered second language translations and translations with materials or meetings through the communications consultant. Mr. Stokes brought up the discussion from last year on Vietnamese language or any other language and the group wanted to stay with English and Spanish. Ms. Powers suggested to pose the language services need as a question in the meeting notice to provide opportunity for someone to request additional language, we could accommodate, and the communications consultants agreed. Mr. Burrell asked for further comments on the public outreach discussion and there were none.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Consider agenda items for the next meeting

Mr. Stokes suggested to revisit the implemented recommendations and to further discuss qualitative metrics in the next meeting agenda. Mr. Stokes suggested to revisit the next Public Meeting discussion and to further plan for that meeting. Ms. Powers suggested a late April or early May meeting. Mr. Burrell suggested to decide on a date for the next meeting and suggested for the committee to input and decide.

Mr. Lock suggested April 21 and April 28. May 5 was also suggested as April 28 presented a conflict for the communications consultants. Mr. Burrell suggested May 5 which seemed to be an agreeable date with time to be determined. Mr. Burrell suggested that any time after 9:00 a.m. and before 5:00 p.m. The Project Sponsor committed to send out the invitation once details were ironed out.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Public comments – limit 3 minutes per person

Mr. Burrell opened for public comments. No public comments were made.
AGENDA ITEM 10: Adjourn
Mr. Burrr opened for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Lock moved to adjourn, and Ms. Powers seconded the motion. Mr. Burrr adjourned the meeting at 12:39 p.m.

____________________________
Rachel Powers, Secretary

____________________________
Todd Burrr, Chair
Item 5:
Discussion and possible recommendations for leveraging SJRFPG member participation in public engagement strategies
Update to Noticing Efforts

• Flyer will be sent via email to elected officials, stakeholder list and any organizations identified by the RFPG.

• A press release will be sent two weeks prior to the meeting to identified news outlets.
Item 6:
Update from the Communications Consultant on the content and format for the Open-House style Public Outreach meetings, discussion and associated possible recommendations
Public Engagement Meeting Recap

- Three Meetings
  - Two In-Person Meetings
  - One Virtual Meeting
- Format
  - Open-house style (in-person and virtual)
- Accommodations
  - Live Interpretation
  - Translated Meeting Notices/Materials
- Targeted Timeframe
  - May 23 – June 3, 2022
# 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><strong>The Recreation Center at Rob Fleming Park</strong>&lt;br&gt;6464 Creekside Forest Drive&lt;br&gt;The Woodlands, TX 77389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 26, 2022</td>
<td>Virtual Open House</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 31, 2022</td>
<td>In-Person Open House</td>
<td><strong>Clear Lake Shores Clubhouse</strong>&lt;br&gt;931 Cedar Road&lt;br&gt;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
Virtual 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 Materials

- All meeting materials will be made available to the public in English and Spanish
- Meeting Collateral Examples include:
  - “How to Participate in the Open House” handouts
  - FAQ document on the SJRFPG
  - Interactive maps and an online tool to enhance the engagement experience
  - Exhibit boards highlighting project information
Meeting Material - Examples
Item 7: Discussion and possible recommendation pertaining to any changes and revisions to the Communications and Media Engagement Plan
Item 8: Consider agenda items for the next Public Engagement Committee Meeting
Item 9:
Public Comments – limit 3 minutes per person
Item 10: Meeting Adjournment