

Meeting Minutes
Region 13. Nueces Flood Planning Group Meeting
December 06, 2021
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Lj Francis called the meeting to order at 11:35am.

Voting Members:

Debra Barrett	Agricultural	absent
Shanna Owens	Counties (Proxy Sara Williams)	present
Lauren Hutch Williams	Environmental	present
Larry Thomas	Flood Districts	present
Jeff Pollack	Industries (Proxy Sarah Garza)	present
Lj Francis	Municipalities	present
Adnan Rajib	Public	absent
Sky Lewey	River Authorities	present
Larry Dovalina	Water Utilities (David Wright)	present
Andrew Rooke	Small business	present
JR Ramirez	Water Utilities (Proxy Russell Pulfer)	present/on line
David Baker	Electric Generating Utilities	present

Non-Voting Members:

Tressa Olsen	TWDB	present
Ryke Moore	TWDB	present
Jim Tolan	Texas Park & Wildlife Department	present/on line
Brian Hurtuk	Texas Div. of Emergency Management	absent
Nelda Barrera	Texas Department of Agriculture	absent
Simone Sanders	General Land Office	absent
Kendria Ray	TX State Soil & Water Cons. Board	present/on line
Joel Anderson	TCEQ	present/on line
Patrick McGinn	Liaison to San Antonio RFPG & Rio Grande RFPG	present
Dave Mauk	Liaison from the San Antonio RFPG	absent

Guests:

Anna Aldridge		on line
Debbie Farmer		on line
James Bronikowski		on-line
Kathleen Chapa		on-line
L. Muniz		on-line
Matt Nelson		on-line
Genell Hobbs		on-line
Reem Zoun		on-line
Laura Raun	HDR/LRPR	present
Luke Whitmire	Bandera County River Authority	present
Roger Garcia	ACFMO/OEM	present
Vamshi Konduru	Michael Baker International	present
Lora Robbins	City of Hondo	present
Sarah West	Freese & Nichols	present
Shelby Slavinski	Texas Water Ambassador	present
Travis Pruski	Nueces River Authority	present
Kristi Shaw	HDR	present
Bryan Martin	HDR	present

Agenda Item 2: Prayer

Lj Francis led the prayer.

Agenda Item 3: Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Agenda Item 4: Approval of minutes from the October 25th, 2021 Full FRPG Meeting

A motion made by Larry Thomas and a second by Sky Lewey to approve the minutes of the October 25, 2021, Nueces Regional Flood Planning Group meeting was passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 5: TWDB updates/presentation

Ms. Tressa Olsen, TWDB Planner for Region 13, told the group that two conference calls were held on Wednesday, December 8, 2021. The first call was attended by technical consultants and planning group sponsors for further guidance on flood mitigation strategies and instructions for Exhibit D deliverables. Planning group chairs were invited to the second conference call, which focused on updates followed by a discussion between the chairs and a

summary update from the first call held for the Technical Consultants and Flood Planning Group Sponsors. Chairman Francis asked what time the conference calls were held. Ms. Olsen replied that the first call was at 9:30am and the second at 2:30pm.

Agenda Item 6: Discussion and possible action regarding filling an open voting membership seat for Electric Generating Utilities member category – David Baker, Hondo, Texas.

Chairman Francis told the group that he believed everyone had reviewed David Baker's resume and he stated that group had met David at the last meeting. He entertained a motion to appoint David Baker as the Electric Generating Utilities member category. A motion was made by Andrew Rooke with a second by Lj Francis to appoint David Baker to the group as the Electric Generating Utilities member. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 7: Discussion and possible action regarding the draft Technical Memorandum; presentation and authorize submission to TWDB.

Ms. Shaw told the group that there needed to be a discussion on the technical memo that is due to the TWDB in January. She thanked everyone for the information provided thus far as it helped the process of identifying flood related activities, projects, and management strategies. The group has been supportive of the plan, and it reflects the community needs and local plans that are already in progress.

Ms. Shaw stated that a link was sent to the flood planning group members. She told the group that the information contained in the link was reformatted and may be different from the past. The reformatting was to present the information in alignment with the next steps needed to put together the draft and final plan. She explained to the group how to view the information. This information will continue to evolve into the regional flood plan for presentation on the story map, a tool developed with not only the group in mind, but the public as well. She encouraged the group to let her know if there were any questions or any additional information they wanted to see.

She continued by stating that since the last meeting when the technical memorandum was presented to the group, they had received additional information from flood planning members, technical consultants doing flood projects in the area, and flood plain administrators. She stated that she was happy that the Nueces River Authority communicated the information through updates to the Region 13 website. The tech memo is a midpoint deliverable. We want to be far enough along to be able to hit the ground running in January and February and take a deeper dive and evaluate some of the projects.

Lauren Williams stated that not all goals in the spreadsheet contain the full information and that it needs to be re-formatted to expand the row in the tables for a couple of the goals. Ms. Shaw stated that she would look at this and revise prior to submittal.

Ms. Shaw replied that the first bullet is a list of flood-related authorities within the basin. It contains a table that was used as the origin for a geodatabase file. We identified the entities in the region and then followed up with calls to confirm. It is divided by counties and then city. It also includes the drainage and conservation districts as well.

The second bullet is a list of previous flood studies. This data was gathered based on information that we received from surveys that we sent out at the beginning of the flood planning process about August of this year. Most of these studies are either done within the last 10 years or in the process of being completed.

The third bullet summarizes the geodatabase and the current or future flood areas.

Chairman Francis asked about the significance of the 10-to-15-year time frame.

Ms. Shaw replied that most of the studies were within that 10-to-15-year period.

Mr. Francis stated that there wasn't an arbitrary cut off it is just what you received and the timeline you are working on.

Ms. Shaw said that it was also based on conversations with folks we reached out to and the active plans they were implementing.

Ms. Shaw continued by stating that the Region 13 Historical Data-Flood Extent is populated based on the information received from the workshops held at the beginning of the flood planning process. We did a roadshow where we had four meetings at various locations throughout the region and gathered information on flood prone areas. Through the public comment map, deployed on the Region 13 website maintained by the Nueces River Authority, we gathered about 200 points within the region that are considered flood prone. All that information was provided by the community and citizen interest. That was important because about 75 to 80% of this region doesn't have active or current maps; so that feedback was valuable for our understanding of where the current risks lie. In addition to that we pulled in some of the Base Level Engineering studies and other efforts that identified both the 100 year and 500-year inundation maps.

Bryan Martin stated that the map pulls in a lot of data and so there is a lot of information on the interactive map.

Chairman Francis asked if information is available to the public yet.

Ms. Shaw said it is not publicly available yet. She continued by stating that during the actual development of the plan, we would like to keep the StoryMap within the flood planning group. The link can be shared but we are going to use this as a key tool when we are gathering public comments on the draft plan itself. Right now, it is constantly in the state of being updated so we have not publicly broadcasted the link.

The Flood Mapping Gaps shows the gap analysis, where there are/aren't active or reliable flood maps. The color coding is based on the amount of mapping that has been done, and what is considered outdated. This flood planning effort is not to remap areas as much as it is to identify the high-risk areas and assign projects. It is important to understand where the gaps are; especially when we are developing the recommendations and the need for further studies.

Lauren Williams asked if the entire area within the polygon is a concern or is the data point showing the issue?

Ms. Shaw replied that the points were assigned for the flood prone areas based on the Region 13 Public Interactive tool. The polygons are locations where current studies are underway and where they are focusing their efforts. Our goal is to stay aligned with that process because they are gathering and updating information and we want to follow up and collect that data.

The Mapping Availability and Risk Score maps show areas where we have more detailed models that are reliable. When this map is overlaid with the risk score it takes into consideration several different aspects related to property and loss of life. A score is calculated to assess highest risk to identify priority areas when assigning projects. It also shows areas that need additional focus to identify and evaluate studies and propose projects to manage future flood risks.

Ms. Lewey ask why the actual rivers are not more prominent on the map?

Ms. Shaw replied that she thought it was because so much data is being brought and that detail is not being transferred here from the base layer. The rivers are shown in the interactive map and have all the points are plotted. It will also be added to the Mapping Availability and Risk Score map.

We recently received a call from the US Corps of Engineers, and they have some projects down in the Live Oak, San Patricio, and Nueces County area. Much of the area in those

studies overlays the effective data that we have currently, however that information will be included in this mapping as well. The map also shows where there are models that are active and can be used for flood planning purposes.

Mr. Martin stated that the map shows where modeling was used to define inundation boundaries from the flood plains. We do have some good models like for the Sabinal River that the USGS put together and the US Corps of Engineers model along the Nueces.

Chairman Francis asks what percentage of the region has no data in terms of models?

Mr. Martin replied that approximately 75% of the region does not have hydrologic and hydraulic models.

Mr. Francis stated that Kristi had stated that our goal is not to develop new models, but to identify areas where projects are needed. For the areas that we have no data, how do we evaluate if there is a need.

Ms. Shaw stated that would connect back to the risk categories. We do have a map that is part of the interactive tool and what we're focusing on right now are things that feed into the tech memo. There is also a section on the story map that gives the details on risk evaluation, both current and future.

Ms. Williams asked if the purpose of this map is to provide information to the public that may not read the technical memorandum or is the map there for the public to understand it better?

Ms. Shaw replied that is to understand the memorandum better. It's to give you the ability to go into the specific sections included in the technical memorandum. The last link in the memo is about 60 pages of written text.

Ms. Williams stated that looking at the map without digging into the memo, there are a lot of acronyms that would be hard to understand.

Ms. Shaw replied that a list of acronyms will be developed and included in a tab prior to the plan being submitted for public feedback.

Chairman Francis stated that it would be helpful to have a guide on how to navigate the technical memorandum. He suggested that the map state something like you may want to review this before you go into the memo. Ms. Lewey asked if the legend was supposed to be visible on every map.

Mr. Martin stated that there are legends available for every map included in the interactive maps. You go the upper right-hand corner and open the legend. If it is a static map the legend already is provided.

Ms. Shaw continued by viewing the flood mitigation and management goals tab of the interactive site. The goals and the process we went through as a subcommittee and adopted by the RFPG are identified here. There is a list of goals that were put together for both 10- & 30-year metrics.

The RFPG process is also to identify potentially feasible flood management strategies, and flood management projects. The current list of flood management evaluations to be evaluated in the plan are from the list of potential FMEs/FMSs/FMPs. This is where we got most of the comments within the last month or so; and it was on flood management evaluations. Since we compiled the original list, we have received comments back from the Counties of Nueces and Duval, as well as the Cities of Hondo and Pearsall. Today's list has been updated based on the comments we received. The list also shows what flood planning goals the projects are aligned with. When we meet in January and February of next year, we will be talking a bit more about not only the risk areas but where there are identified projects. We will be using this list as a basis in conversations with the local stakeholders to verify that there aren't any additional projects. We would also remove those projects that are considered unfeasible or no longer relevant.

Chairman Francis asks, in this initial phase of developing the flood plan are we submitting all the projects that we received without looking at the feasibility?

Ms. Shaw stated yes, the TWDB board asked for a list of feasible and unfeasible projects. We were also asked to submit additional information on the top projects, so as of this date, we are going to sift through all the projects in detail and keep all of them feasible at least for the time being. We don't want to inadvertently eliminate a project especially one that is in progress or needs funding.

The last bullet is the 60 plus page technical memo that's going to be submitted to the TWDB. Between now and the time of memo submittal, we will verify that the story map is current with the information in the tech memo and that both reflect the comments we have received over the last couple of weeks. If there are no additional comments as far as content is concerned, we would like to consider the tech memo for submittal to the TWDB by January 7th which is the date it is due.

Chairman Francis asked if the group was in the position to submit before the deadline.

Ms. Shaw stated that she believed that we are probably in the situation where we are close.

Chairman Francis ask if they be submitting the 66-page document in text format with the additional data sets that are being submitted as well?

Ms. Shaw replied, yes, the board has requested the geodatabases for a couple of the mapping needs and that's going to be submitted according to the TWDB's format guidance.

Mr. Martin said that more information on the engineering will be added to the technical memorandum. You will see the actual information from the Corps of Engineers for example. There is more text detailing the work and more narrative for people that really want to dig in. Shown in the Draft Technical Memo this is the Corp of Engineers model at the Nueces River. The USGS Sabinal Study Reach, upstream of Utopia, TX are conducting a gage program for flood early warning purposes. They are very well-made models that are valuable to have.

Ms. Shaw stated that the list will be updated to reflect the County's Nueces and Duval, as well as the Cities of Hondo and Pearsall information. The next step once the memo gets sent to the TWDB will take place in the early part of next year when we will develop focused information for some areas based on the current and future risk analysis. Then we will be conducting outreach and meeting with people within the areas to make sure that we've collected the latest and greatest data available. We will meet as a group and discuss the level of detail. We'll summarize what's being done or will be done on the projects listed in the plan. For those that are studies or evaluations that are in the early stages, we'll be deciding as a group what additional level we're wanting to take those to and maybe prioritize according to the need and resources that are available for that activity.

Ms. Williams asked when speaking about outreach, are we referring to municipalities or is that going to include a broader group of stakeholders than just the people that are developing the plans or strategies?

Ms. Shaw replied that we will be reaching out to the cities and the communities that have flood support jurisdiction in the areas that have high risk, then we will likely have a couple of meetings, similar to what we have done before with the road show where we can discuss information and gather local input, especially on the county and regional level.

Ms. Williams then ask if the meetings are open meetings where the public participate as well.

Ms. Shaw stated that the meetings will be open meetings because we want to be able to get public feedback. The meetings will be similar to the road show meetings. Ms. Shaw continued, that brings up a good point, because in January we are going to have a meeting of

the planning group. If there are specific ways you feel would be most effective to conduct this outreach within the community, please let us know. It might vary because we've got several different sub basins that we are looking at, however we want to hear what you feel would be most effective as an outreach strategy.

Chairman Francis ask if there was a timeline for the outreach yet?

Ms. Shaw replied that it will happen January, February, and March because the draft plan is due in May. We are going to need time to do the evaluations. What comes out of those meetings is going to be the starting point for the evaluations.

Mr. Martin told the group that the Overall Flood Risk per HUC 12 Watersheds is the key map detailing the highest risks in terms of floods. There are areas in the basin considered high risk but with no projects, or mapping identified and a limited level of flood enforcement based on what we know. There are areas that have high needs but, but no studies or projects that are looking at how to address those needs.

Ms. Shaw stated that ends up getting rolled into the plan when we are looking at evaluating strategies as part of Task 5 as well as Task 12 making sure that in these areas where there isn't a project, we need to be able to identify projects. We will want to work with local stakeholders so that it can truly be a bottom-up process.

Chairman Francis ask if there was a way through modeling and analysis of the data where the technical consultant could possibly conduct evaluations or projects without getting that from a stakeholder?

Ms. Shaw stated that they are looking at projects that are working well within the region, such as some of the flood warning systems and that could serve as a template for other areas to use.

Chairman Francis then asked if we are getting ready to submit to the TWDB, is this an opportunity for the public to see what data is available?

Ms. Shaw stated that the technical memorandum once submitted, will also be posted to the Region 13 website.

Chairman Francis then told group members he would entertain a motion to authorize submission of the draft technical memorandum as it is presented with minor changes as was discussed earlier. A motion to authorize submission of the Technical Memorandum with the minor changes discussed was made by Andrew Rooke with a second provided by David Baker. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 8: Discussion and possible action regarding authorizing the Nueces River Authority to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Regional Flood Planning Grant contract with the TWDB, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope of work and budget.

Ms. Shaw shared some slides and invited the TWDB to join the conversation about the overall flood planning process. She explained that there were additional state funds that were allocated to regional flood planning. The TWDB identified three additional tasks to support this effort recognizing that was additional work required to complete the plan within the constrained timeline. They issued a new schedule for the work and detailed how it's going to be rolled into the final regional flood planning process. There are a few deadlines that don't change, the technical memorandum is still due January 7th, the draft regional plan is still due in August of 2022 and the final flood plan is due in January of 2023. There are additional tasks. Task 11 is the data analysis and outreach that we were speaking of earlier and so that is to be done in concert with the Tasks 1 – 10. She explained that the technical team is working on the technical memorandum right now and teeing up for Task 11 in January. Tasks 12 and 13 are to be part of an amended plan that will be due in July of 2023. Task 12 looks at additional in-depth evaluations on the FMEs, FMSs and FMPs as a result of Task 11 outreach. For instance, if a study is currently in progress and it would be good for that study to be included in the regional flood plan, the regional planning group will have the ability to include it and expand the evaluation for flood strategies. The amended schedule also allows for Task 13 which is included to allow the group to go back into the plan to update it and amend the original plan by July of 2023.

RWDB Planner Tressa Olsen stated that the original budget was \$1,143,700. The TWDB added a total of \$728,100. The new total for region 13 is now \$1,871,800.

Ms. Williams asked Kristi Shaw why the meeting in October was optional.

Ms. Shaw replied that the meeting in October would be based on whether we need an additional meeting to support Task 12 activities. At this time, it is too early to forecast whether the October meeting will be required. We do not expect that we would have comments back from the resource agencies on the draft plan which is why we are showing a December meeting. After we submit on August 1st, there is a 120-day comment period for resource agencies. The October meeting would likely just be associated with the newer tasks.

Ms. Williams asked if we are going to guide what is involved in Task 12 & 13 in some of the meetings forthcoming.

Ms. Shaw replied that will be based on the information that will be gathered as a result of the public outreach and data collection process included in Task 11.

A motion made by Andrew Rooke with a second by David Wright to accept the amended budget presented by the TWDB. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 9: Discussion and possible action regarding authorizing the Nueces River Authority to negotiate and execute an amendment to the Region Flood Planning Grant Contract with HDR, Inc., technical consultant, to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning, including necessary revisions to the contract scope and budget.

A motion was made by David Wright with a second by Lauren Williams to allow the Nueces River Authority to negotiate and execute an amendment to the regional flood planning grant with HDR to incorporate additional funding for the first cycle of regional flood planning and include necessary revisions to the contract scope and budget. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 10: Discussion and possible action regarding region 13 Nueces RFPG Administrative Budget and authorizing Nueces River Authority to pay bills up to the end of December 2021.

Travis Pruski explained to the members that HDR submits an invoice for work associated with development of the Region 13 Flood Plan. The Nueces River Authority evaluates the invoice to assure the work has been conducted and then request monies for payment from the TWDB.

Chairman Francis stated that this is standard business operation, but the members must authorize all payments for monies that have been allocated.

Mr. Pruski stated that the items occurring on the statement before the group has already happened, but the group needs to approve the spending of this money. The items listed are broken down by task and how much money has already been allocated towards them. It breaks down what was done in Agenda item 7 & 8.

Mr. Thomas asks with the addition of tasks 11 through 13, the total contract is \$1,871,800, what was the increase?

Ms. Shaw replied that it was an increase of \$728,100.

Mr. Thomas ask if that contract amendment needed to be added to the amount on the form submitted by the Nueces River Authority?

Mr. Pruski stated that the total amount would be revised as soon as the contract has been signed by the Nueces River Authority, HDR and the TWDB.

A motion to approve the payment of the bills was made by Larry Thomas and a second was provided by Andrew Rooke. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 11: Update from Planning Group Sponsor – Nueces River Authority regarding administrative matters of the Regional Flood Planning Group.

Mr. Pruski stated the meeting schedule for 2022 will be January 31st, March 28th, May 30th, June 27th, (tentatively July 18th) and December 12th. He stated that there may be a need for an October meeting date, but it is not likely.

Agenda Item 12: Update from Patrick McGinn Liaison to Region 12 San Antonio RFPG and Region 15 Lower Rio Grande RFPG.

Mr. Patrick McGinn stated that Region 12 had four subcommittees appointed to update the regional flood planning group on the different events going on with respect to the tasks that they were assigned. Task 3A and 3B were discussed and they took action and voted for the flood mitigation and flood management goals. They also discussed the action authorizing the planning group sponsor to negotiate and execute the amendment for the regional flood planning grant. They approved revising the regional flood planning grant and contracts with the technical consultant to incorporate additional funding for their first cycle. They discussed their past schedules and goals.

Agenda Item 13: RFPG members' comments:

Mr. Pruski thanked group members for their attendance and that he was proud that we are the first group to submit the required technical memo. He said that he feels like the group has done a really great job. There has been a lot of work since we met initially back in October 2020. Thanks again for coming to the meetings and being active. He continued by stating that Kristi Shaw and Bryan Martin have done amazing work. I am impressed at where we are today. We get to listen on the calls with the other regions and we have a really great group here.

Agenda Item 14: Adjourn

Chairman Francis adjourned the meeting at 12:49 pm.