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## Meeting Minutes
Region 6 San Jacinto Regional Flood Planning Group
June 9, 2022 at 9:00 AM
Houston Advanced Research Center 8801 Gosling Rd., The Woodlands, TX 77381

### Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Member</th>
<th>Interest Category (Executive Committee role)</th>
<th>Present (P) / Absent (A) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy E. Bucshon</td>
<td>Industries (Chair)</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nia Virden</td>
<td>Water Districts (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Counts (Secretary)</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Fassler</td>
<td>Public (At-Large member)</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barrett</td>
<td>River Authorities (At-Large member)</td>
<td>X (In-Person) *Brian Gallagher (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illisa Mcla Donovan</td>
<td>Agricultural Interests</td>
<td>*Maryanne Placentini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornie Potter</td>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul E. Lock</td>
<td>Electric Generating Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Powers</td>
<td>Environmental Interests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Costello</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denia Green</td>
<td>Flood Districts</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Burrer</td>
<td>Water Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Maxwell</td>
<td>Coastal Communities</td>
<td>X *Bob Kosar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Quintero</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Gaylor</td>
<td>Upper Watershed</td>
<td>X (In-Person)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-voting Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Present/Absent (P) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope Zulek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Lambrecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Frayre Stripling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ingrass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Galveston Area Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Althony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Heidt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Turco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Badko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listeners from RFPG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Flood Planning Group</th>
<th>Present/Absent (P) / Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Region RFPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neches Region RFPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Brazos RFPG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 6 RFPG; 06/09/22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaisons from Other Entities</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Present/absent/</th>
<th>Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Vogler</td>
<td>Lower Brazos RPFG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Harris</td>
<td>Trinity Region RPFG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV Haselbach</td>
<td>Naches Region RPFG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradon Wade</td>
<td>Region H Regional Water Planning Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Consultant Team Members</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Present/absent/</th>
<th>Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory Skill</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Puckett</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes McAlister</td>
<td>Freeze and Nichols Inc</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Moore</td>
<td>Halff, Associates</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Torres</td>
<td>Torres &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Aldian</td>
<td>Torres &amp; Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Herr</td>
<td>Halff, Associates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah Nagumo</td>
<td>Holloway Environmental + Communications</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Present/absent/</th>
<th>Alternate Present (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatima Bennion</td>
<td>Harris County Engineering Department</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Garcia</td>
<td>Harris County Engineering Department</td>
<td>X (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum:
Quorum: Yes
Number of voting members or alternates that were present: 11
Number required for quorum per current voting membership of 15: 8

Attendees**:
In Person: Ervin Burden (HOED), Peter Marchetti (Halff), John Graziano, Shane Porter (Atkins)

Remote:
Call-in User: Reem Zoun (TWDB)
Chris Ferrier (Stewart Consulting Group) | Susan Chadwick
Cristian Avena | Tanner Helveg
Jason Becker | Time Petersen
Marcus Stuckett | Unknown: 1

**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 (sanjacinto/floodplanning.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
Ms. Bernas took attendance. A quorum was determined to be present. Mr. Buscha recognized the in-person voting members in attendance.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Registered Public Comments on Agenda Items (Limit of 5 Minutes Per Person)
Mr. Buscha opened the floor for registered public comments. Mr. Grisiano, a member of the public, expressed that he would listen and comment at the end of the meeting, if he deemed appropriate.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Texas Water Development Board Update
Ms. Ingram stated there were no updates from the Texas Water Development Board.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 12, 2022
Mr. Buscha opened the floor for comments on the May 12, 2022 meeting minutes. Mr. Barrett and Ms. Bakko offered minor comments. Ms. Vinson made the motion to approve the minutes, as revised. Mr. Fisseler seconded. Mr. Buscha called for a vote and stated the motion to approve the May 12 meeting minutes carried.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Announcement of New Alternate Members and New Non-Voting Members
Mr. Buscha announced Lisa Miers as the alternate for the US Army Corps of Engineers.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Liaison Reports Pertaining to Other Region(s) Progress and Status:
- a. Trinity Region – Mr. Buscha stated Mr. Burrier was not on the call.
- b. Neches Region – Mr. Buscha stated Mr. Costello was not on the call.
- c. Lower Brazos Region – Mr. Turco updated that the Lower Brazos met on May 26 and were aligned with SJRFP. No additional information was provided.
- d. Region H Water – Ms. Vinson stated Mr. Wade was unavailable.
- e. GCPO – Mr. Bakko updated that the GCPO’s Executive Director and two board members will attend the ISEC conference in The Netherlands. Ms. Bakko also announced that the US House of Representatives passed HR7776 (Water Resources Development Act of 2022), which authorizes the Texas Coastal Study Storm Protection System project. No information was provided on when the Senate will consider its version of the bill.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Update from the Executive Committee, discussion, and possible action regarding the appointment of the Counties Voting Member Position
Mr. Buscha stated that on June 1 the Executive Committee met and interviewed Mr. Ervin Burden. The Executive Committee agreed to bring the recommendation for Mr. Burden to be named as the new Counties representative voting member. Ms. Vinson stated the Executive Committee unanimously agreed to recommend Mr. Burden. Mr. Barrett stated support for the recommendation. Mr. Buscha opened for comments. Ms. Vinson moved to appoint Mr. Burden to fill the Counties voting member position and Mr. Fisseler seconded. Mr. Buscha announced the motion carried. Mr. Burden accepted.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Discussion, and Possible Action for the appointment of the new Secretary
Mr. Buscha identified the duties of the Secretary. Mr. Buscha stated that, in accordance with the bylaws, a new Secretary must be elected by the group within 90 days of the seat being vacated. The Chair...
delayed formal discussion until adequate time is available to give full consideration and discussion to the matter. In the meantime, as provided by the bylaws, Mr. Buscha appointed Mr. Burden to serve as an interim Secretary until a formal nomination process can be held and voted on by membership at the August monthly meeting. Mr. Burden accepted.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Update from the Technical Consultant regarding progress of the regional flood plan and:

a. Possible action to recommend identified FMXs

b. Updates on ongoing public engagement and communications efforts

Mr. Buscha stated that meeting materials were distributed prior to the meeting and yielded the floor to the Technical Consultants. Mr. Stull, with Freeze and Nichols, Inc. introduced Chris Fenner with Stewart Consulting Group to go over Task 9: Flood Infrastructure Financing Analysis. Mr. Fenner stated the goal of the task was to provide relevant and useful information on how the various sponsors could find strategies for funding to bring projects forward to completion. Discussion ensued. Mr. Stull opened the floor to comments and there were none. Mr. Stull reminded the group to be aware of a funding survey that has been sent out and for stakeholders to be on the lookout for it.

Mr. Stull reiterated that a lot of information has been provided to the members regarding FMXs. Mr. Stull stated there are more than 500 FMXs included in the plan for recommendation. Ms. Puckett stated a central objective of the flood planning process is to identify (and recommend) actions and solutions. Ms. Puckett stated that the Technical Consultant provided a tabular list of projects and one page project summaries (one-pagers), to accompany the GIS dashboard. Ms. Puckett reviewed updates to the FMX list which included responding to comments from sponsors. Ms. Bakko stated her concern for the Galveston Bay Storm surge project description and Ms. Puckett acknowledged Ms. Bakko’s comments. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Puckett stated considerations for FMXs, FMXs, and FMPs. Ms. Puckett stated the goal was to vote to recommend the list of FMXs. Ms. Placentini inquired about timing and Mr. Stull clarified. Ms. Vinson added that the objective today was to approve recommendation for the plan and the plan amendment was currently underway, meaning the list was not final. Ms. Puckett guided the SIRPFG through the one-pager contents. Discussion ensued regarding Benefit Cost Ratio methodology and draft plan amendment process.

Mr. Buscha asked for a motion to recommend the FMX list presented by the Technical Consultants. Concerns were raised that a vote recommending the list included in the regional flood plan should not be construed that the SIRPFG recommends implementation of all the FMXs. Rather, a recommendation to include the list is simply to give the FMXs the opportunity for access to state funding should the FMXs receive final approval in the jurisdictions responsible for their approval. There was a consensus that a disclaimer be included in the report stating that the recommendation to include the list of FMXs is not an endorsement of their implementation. Ms. Vinson made the motion to recommend the list as reflected on the spreadsheet, subject to non-substantive changes and finalizing fields of information. Dr. Gaynor seconded. Mr. Fosler suggested we include an agenda item in a future meeting for review of this and other such disclaimer language. Mr. Buscha clarified that the disclaimers would be documented in the draft plan that the SIRPFG would be voting on in July. Mr. Buscha called for a vote to recommend the list of FMXs. Mr. Buscha called for a vote and stated the motion carried.
Mr. Moore, with Halff and Associates, gave a brief overview of Task 7: Flood Response Information and Activities. No comments were made.

Ms. Najmuddin recapped the successful public engagement efforts of the three open house-style meetings. Ms. Najmuddin reviewed the metrics and reviewed lessons learned. Discussion ensued.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 11: Approval and Certification of Administrative Expenses Incurred by The Project Sponsor for the Development of Regional Flood Plan
Mr. Buscha confirmed the Project Sponsor expenses. Ms. Vinson moved to approve the Project Sponsor expenses. Ms. Powers seconded. The vote was taken and Mr. Buscha stated the motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12: Presentation of 2022 Planning Group Key Dates and Deadlines:
   a. Upcoming Planning Schedule Milestones
   b. Next SJRFPG Planning Meeting to be held on July 14, 2022
Mr. Buscha stated that at the July meeting, the SJRFPG would be approving the draft Regional Flood Plan. Mr. Stull added that future milestones would be distributed to the RFPG.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13: Update and Discussion Pertaining to In-Person RFPG Meeting Location(s)
Mr. Buscha stated that future RFPG meetings would continue to be hybrid and the Project Sponsor would continue to seek a centralized meeting location where all the voting members would be invited to attend in-person. Mr. Buscha requested to have the July meeting at KARC. Mr. Buscha noted that an upcoming Public Engagement Committee meeting was to be scheduled.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 14: Reminder Regarding Planning Group Member Training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Mr. Buscha reminded the group that anyone who hasn't completed the training needs to do so and submit records to the Project Sponsor. Mr. Buscha requested alternate members from the Flood Districts and the Counties voting members.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 15: Consider Agenda Items for Next Meeting
Mr. Buscha identified the following items for the next agenda.

  • Technical Consultant will add agenda items for SJRFPG approval

AGENDA ITEM NO. 16: Public Comments – Limit 3 Minutes Per Person
Mr. Buscha opened the floor to public comments. Ms. Berrios stated there were no public comments.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 17: Adjourn
Mr. Buscha announced the meeting was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

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 and other Related Entities:
   a. Trinity Region
   b. Neches Region
   c. Lower Brazos Region
   d. Region H Water
   e. Gulf Coast Protection District
Item 8: Presentation and Update from the Technical Consultant on the development of the Regional Flood Plan:

a. Disclaimer(s) added to the Regional Flood Plan
b. Approval of the Draft Regional Flood Plan and authorization to submit the plan and required materials to the TWDB contingent upon incorporation of any necessary, non-substantive comments or changes including, but not limited to:
   i. Updates necessary to adhere to recently issued TWDB guidance
   ii. Non-substantive updates necessary to address recently received comments from the TWDB on the Technical Memorandum
   iii. Updates necessary to address additional or outstanding RFPG comments
Agenda

• Review of recent Draft RFP development
  • RFPG Review and Comments on Chapters 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9
  • Updates to FMXs
  • ‘Disclaimers’ in Chapters 3 and 5
• Draft RFP Review Period & Next Steps for Submittal to the TWDB
  • Submittal to the TWDB
  • Input of the Draft RFP
• Approval of the Draft RFP
• Update on Future Public Meeting to Receive Input in Draft RFP
Draft Regional Flood Plan

Posted to the San Jacinto RFPG website and available to the public.

- Volume 1 – Chapter text (295 pages)
- Volume 2 – Appendices (4,118 pages)

The document will remain draft until January 2023.
Development of the Draft RFP: RFPG Review of Draft Chapters

• Draft Chapters were posted on the Technical Documents tab of the San Jacinto RFPG website (sanjacintofloodplanning.org).

• Comments received as well as responses have been centralized and provided as meeting materials for transparency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter:</th>
<th>Posting Date:</th>
<th>Review Deadline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 1</td>
<td>6/14/2022</td>
<td>6/21/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 2</td>
<td>6/17/2022</td>
<td>6/24/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 7</td>
<td>6/17/2022</td>
<td>6/24/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 8</td>
<td>6/28/2022</td>
<td>Noon 7/5/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Chapter 9</td>
<td>6/28/2022</td>
<td>Noon 7/5/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the Draft RFP: Updates to FMXs

• After the RFPG meeting to recommend FMXs on 6/9, a funding survey was sent out to all identified FMX sponsors to request financing information to satisfy requirements of Task 9.

• Additional survey responses can be submitted for inclusion in the plan after August 1st via public comment.
Development of the Draft RFP: Updates to FMXs

- Some responses indicated that some FMXs were already funded or ongoing. Those FMXs were designated as **not recommended**.
- Other reasons for being removed from recommendation were:
  - FMX was already recommended in a neighboring region or was duplicative
  - FMX did not provide direct flood risk reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FMX</th>
<th>FMXs Identified</th>
<th>FMXs Recommended by RFPG</th>
<th>FMXs Recommended in the Draft RFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FME</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development of the Draft RFP: Disclaimers in Chapter 3

At the RFPG meeting on 5/12 to recommend minimum standards, the RFPG emphasized the need to clearly explain within the Chapter the reasoning behind recommending vs adopting minimums standards.

The following was included in the Draft RFP:

“Given the abbreviated schedule of the first cycle of regional flood planning, there would not be opportunity for entities to take action to implement those minimum standards were the San Jacinto RFPG to choose to adopt standards. If the San Jacinto RFPG were to choose to adopt standards, only entities that already have regulations in place that meet or exceed those standards would be eligible for future funding through programs administered by the TWDB. Therefore, the San Jacinto RFPG specifically chose to recommend standards as opposed to adopting them so as to not limit the funding eligibility of entities within the region.”
Development of the Draft RFP: Disclaimers in Chapter 5

At the RFPG meeting on 6/9 to recommend FMXs, the RFPG emphasized the need to clearly explain within the Chapter that recommendation of FMXs is not an explicit endorsement by the RFPG.

The following was included in the Draft RFP:

“It was clarified by the San Jacinto RFPG at this meeting that the vote to recommend these actions does not remove the need for these actions to meet other applicable regulation or criteria. … Recommendation by the San Jacinto RFPG also does not serve as a specific endorsement of the actions, but rather recommendation that the actions be eligible for future funding through the TWDB.”
Submittal of the Draft Plan

In addition to volumes 1 & 2 of the Draft RFP, submittal will also include:

- GIS Data; metadata
- Supporting figures
- Supporting map documents
- Supporting excel tables
- Packaged HH Models
- 2 printed copies
Submittal of the Draft Plan

In addition to volumes 1 & 2 of the Draft RFP, submittal will also include:

- GIS Data; metadata
- Supporting figures
- Supporting map documents
- Supporting excel tables
- Packaged HH Models
- 2 printed copies

To meet the deadline of August 1st, submittal of underlying data and the Draft RFP will need to begin ahead of the due date.
Submittal of the Draft Plan

The next couple weeks will be focused on **Quality Control** including:

- Standardization
- Consistency across Draft RFP Chapters
- Addressing remaining RFPG comments
  - Previous Request: RFPG to review the posted Draft Regional Flood Plan and provide comments to the Technical Consultant by Monday 7/18/2022.
- Compliance with minimum SOW requirements and adherence to recently provided TWDB submittal guidelines (7/1/22)
  - No changes to content or technical approaches, but updates to how that content is presented/captured in the draft RFP.
Input on the Draft RFP

- **7/14/22** RFPG Approval
- **8/1/22** Submittal to TWDB
- **9/20/22 – 9/29/22** Meeting to Receive Input on Draft RFP
- **RFPG/Technical Consultant Review & Address Comments**
- **December RFPG Meeting Approve Final RFP**
- **Late October Receive TWDB Formal Comments**
- **1/10/23** Submittal to TWDB
Approval of the Draft RFP

RFPG to vote to approve the Draft Regional Flood Plan and authorize the Technical Consultant to submit the plan and required materials to the TWDB contingent upon incorporation of any necessary, non-substantive comments or changes including, but not limited to:

- Updates necessary to adhere to recently issued TWDB guidance (7/1/22)
- Non-substantive updates necessary to address recently received comments from the TWDB on the Technical Memorandum (5/20/22)
- Updates necessary to address additional or outstanding RFPG comments
Public Input on Draft RFP

- Preferred Date(s) Location(s)
  - 9/20-9/22; 9/27-9/29
- Two meetings:
  - Central Location (in-person) and Virtual
- Meeting Accommodations
  - Translation
  - Translated Meeting Notices/Materials
  - Languages Provided
- Public Input Methods
- Meeting Materials
Item 9: Update and recommendation(s) from the Public Engagement Committee; discussion, and possible action from the RFPG as it pertains to the development of the Communications and Media Engagement Plan
Overview of Changes

- General revisions to grammar and formatting
- List of Non-Voting Members updated to include TxDOT, GCPD and USACE (pg. 3)
- Contact information internal communications updated (pg. 7)
  - Added Erwin Burden
  - Added SJRFPG Sponsor Email

Non-Voting Members

The SJRFPG is statutorily required to include non-voting members from seven state agencies:

- TWDB
- Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
- Texas General Land Office (GLO)
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD)
- Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA)
- Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB)
- Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM)
  - Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
  - Gulf Coast Protection District (GCPD)
  - United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE)
Overview of Changes Con’t

- Added clarification on multilingual communication (pg. 9)
- Added county as a descriptor to stakeholder databases within key audiences to include geographic diversity (pg. 9)
- Added clarifying language to define key messaging (pg. 10)
  - Appendix B added to include an example of key messaging

6.1. Key Messaging

Key messaging refers to relevant project information that provides a concise overview of the project scope of work, goals and work products developed over the project lifecycle and may be tailored to fit the needs of different stakeholder groups.

Key messaging for the SJRFPG will promote this Plan’s goals and be refined, as necessary. In coordination with the technical consultant team and Harris County, Holloway will use this messaging to develop communications collateral to enable engagement of the SJRFPG’s key audiences.

Holloway will maintain and update primary and secondary key messaging to support communication with the various key audiences. Primary messages convey broader, less detailed information, and secondary messages include more detailed information supporting the primary message. Key messaging will be consistent across all communications. An example of Key Messaging can be found in Appendix B.

Excerpt from the DRAFT SJRFPG Communications and Media Engagement Plan – June 2022
Section 6.1 Key Messaging, pg. 10
Overview of Changes Con’t

• Updated Media Engagement protocol to avoid unintentional quorum of the Executive Committee. (pgs. 14-15)

Should any representative of the SJRFPG be contacted by a member of the media or receive a media inquiry, the following response is required:

I. Inform the media that the SJRFPG Chair is the Public Information Officer for the SJRFPG and is the official spokesperson. The SJRFPG Chair is the only person who can comment. If a representative of the SJRFPG receives a call from or is approached by a reporter, the SJRFPG representative must politely decline to answer any questions and let them know that the message will be delivered to the SJRFPG Chair immediately.

II. Anyone receiving a media inquiry must take down the reporter’s name, affiliation, phone number, and a summary of the reporter’s inquiry to convey to the spokesperson. This will enable Holloway to keep a record of who calls so that information can be provided to the spokesperson for a response.

III. After steps I and II are complete, the person receiving the inquiry must contact the SJRFPG Chair or Vice Chair immediately using the contact information set forth below; not both. If the SJRFPG Chair or Vice Chair is not available, the person will contact the SJRFPG’s sponsor. The project Sponsor can continue to coordinate with the Chair or Vice Chair for media response. The spokesperson needs to receive the reporter’s name, affiliation, phone number, and a summary of the inquiry that the reporter is calling about so that the spokesperson can respond to the reporter promptly.

Excerpt from the DRAFT SJRFPG Communications and Media Engagement Plan – June 2022
Section 10. Media Engagement, pg. 14
Item 10:
Approval and Certification of Administrative Expenses incurred by the Project Sponsor for the development of Regional Flood Plan
Administrative Expenses Incurred by Project Sponsor for 5/7/2022 – 6/3/2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Hours Worked</th>
<th>Total Salary</th>
<th>Social Security</th>
<th>Group Insurance</th>
<th>Workers Comp</th>
<th>Unemployment Insurance</th>
<th>Retirement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2022</td>
<td>5/20/2022</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>104.43</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>153.48</td>
<td>FY2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2022</td>
<td>5/20/2022</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>1,151.87</td>
<td>88.13</td>
<td>325.67</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>180.84</td>
<td>1,757.80</td>
<td>FY2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2022</td>
<td>6/3/2022</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>594.47</td>
<td>45.48</td>
<td>168.08</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>907.18</td>
<td>FY2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
<td><strong>1,885.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>144.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>525.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>296.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,869.62</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 11:
Presentation of 2022 Planning Group Key Dates and Deadlines:
   a. Upcoming Planning Schedule Milestones
   b. Next RFPG Planning Meeting to be held on August 11, 2022
Item 12: Update and Discussion Pertaining to In-Person RFPG Meeting Location(s)
Item 13: Reminder Regarding Planning Group Member Training on Public Information Act and Open Meetings Act
Item 14: Consider Agenda Items for Next Meeting
Item 15:
Public Comments – Limit 3 Minutes per Person
Item 16: Adjournment